The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and merciful God, who has given us grace in times past and hope for the years to come, strengthen us to continue to grow in grace and in our knowledge of You. Quicken our hearts with warmer affection for You and Your creation. Stir up the talents in each of us and give us a desire to serve You and humanity.

Bless the Members of this body and the staffs that serve them. Increase their faith as You increase their years. Give them the moral fitness to live lives of integrity and faithfulness. May they not falter under the burdens they are asked to carry in these uncertain days. Bless them with clear minds and open eyes that they will not seek to solve tomorrow’s problems with yesterday’s solutions.

We thank You for our new Senate page class. Inspire our pages to trust You passionately so that You will direct their steps. We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. President, I welcome everyone back to begin this second session of the 109th Congress.

We will lock in a debate structure in a few moments so we will be able to alternate hours back and forth between the two sides of the aisle. This will help facilitate the schedule so Members will have a better understanding of when they will have the opportunity to come to the floor to give their statements and to participate in that debate.

We will remain in session all day today and into the night this week to accommodate Senators who wish to make statements. As I mentioned, every Senator will have the opportunity to speak, but it is my hope we will be able to lock in a time certain for a vote on this qualified nominee as soon as possible in order that our fellow Senators will know when that confirmation vote will occur. I would like to be able to do that shortly. I have been in discussion with the Democratic leader, and we will continue that discussion on that particular matter.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR., TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FRIST. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 490, the nomination of Samuel Alito to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me for 1 minute while I bring up an issue that we were discussing yesterday?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me for 1 minute while I bring up an issue that we were discussing yesterday?
Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will be happy to yield. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

LYBBING REFORM

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his lead in urging rapid action on this important legislation. We need to put together a bipartisan coalition to address this issue as quickly as possible. We need to sit down with Members of both sides of the aisle in whatever format the majority leader and the Democratic leader decide so we can get to work right away and get legislation done to curb the lobbying excesses that have brought to light that need to be fixed.

At another time I would like to talk with the majority leader about the issue of earmarks, but I thank the majority leader for urging rapid action on this issue. Our current system is a basis for legislation, and I hope we will be able to immediately sit down with Members from the other side of the aisle, come to conclusions and agreements—since it is pretty obvious the majority of the folks on this side of the aisle are for moving forward. I thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader for urging rapid action in addressing this issue which is causing us, our image and our country, to lose the eyes of the American people.

I thank the majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, just a very short comment. I have been in discussion with the Democratic leader on this issue and distinguished colleague from Arizona has just said, we on the Republican side have put together a working group in terms of how to address this very important issue. It has to be done in a bipartisan way. America at this body has to respond to abuses that we have all seen in our Government today. I think we all need to be committed to address this in a bipartisan way.

We have a great structure to build upon in the legislation that has been introduced in a bipartisan way with Senators MCCAIN and LIEBERMAN. I look forward to working with both sides of the aisle in developing an appropriate response over the coming days.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the time from 10 a.m. until 8 p.m. tonight be divided, with the time from 10 to 11 under the control of the President or his designee, the time from 11 to noon under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, with each hour rotating back and forth in that same manner. I further ask unanimous consent that on Thursday this same division occur, with the first hour from 10 to 11 under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there an objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today, I am honored to open debate on the nomination of Judge Sam Alito to be the 110th Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I enthusiastically support his confirmation.

Judge Alito deserves to become Justice Alito. Those who oppose him are smearers of a decent and honorable man and imposing an unfair political standard on all judicial nominees.

I support Judge Alito because he is exceptionally qualified to be a Supreme Court Justice. I support Judge Alito because he is a man of integrity and modest judicial temperament.

I support Judge Alito because he has a record that demonstrates a respect for judicial restraint, an aversion to political agendas on the bench, and a commitment to the rule of law and the Constitution.

There is no question that Judge Alito is exceptionally well qualified. He is measured, brilliant, deeply versed in and respectful of the law, and a man of character and integrity. But there is another reason why I support Judge Alito. I support Judge Alito because denying him a seat on the Supreme Court could have devastating long-term consequences for our judicial nomination process. Let me address these issues one at a time.

Exceptional qualifications: From the moment President Bush nominated him last October, Judge Alito’s exceptional qualifications had a “wow” factor that impressed Senators of both parties. In every respect, Judge Alito is a nominee who meets the highest standards of excellence.

He is a graduate of Princeton and Yale Law School. He has dedicated his 30-year legal career to public service as the Solicitor General, where he argued 30-year legal career to public service as the Solicitor General, where he argued 30-year legal career to public service as the Solicitor General, where he argued

... the Constitution—and it’s a solemn obligation is to the Constitution. Every single case, the judge has to do what he can't have any preferred outcome in any particular case...
Washington Post expressed this concern, even though they would have chosen a different nominee than Judge Alito:

He would not have been our pick for the high court. Yet Judge Alito should be confirmed based on his positive qualities as an appellate judge and because of the dangerous precedent his rejection would set. Supreme Court confirmations have never been free of politics, and Judge Alito’s work lies within it. While we harbor some anxiety about the direction he may push the court, we would be more alarmed at the long-term implications of blocking his nomination.

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

Mr. FRIST. Thirteen years ago, a Republican minority in the Senate voted to confirm the qualified nominee of a Democratic President by an overwhelming vote of 96 to 3. Despite a well-documented liberal record, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg sits on the Supreme Court today because Republican Senators chose to focus on her qualifications and not to obstruct her nomination. It is our fundamental constitutional duty and responsibility.

Mr. FRIST. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Frist. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order be rescinded.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
Act, to make that one last effort. That would include, of course, the White House and the other body to do it.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has worked extraordinarily hard on this legislation. I, like so many others, hope to continue to work with him. I think with a little nudge from the White House—that nudge may have to be a quiet one among the principals in both bodies—that can be done. I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for the work he is doing on this bill.

I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for yielding, even though it is on his time.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his comments. I thank him for the hard work he has done in the past year on the Judiciary Committee on many matters, including the PATRIOT Act. I think we have set a tone and have been able to agree on almost all matters. If there are modifications made, agreeable on all sides, before February 3, I would be more than willing to be a party to that.

My preference is the bill which passed the Senate, but we have a bicameral Congress and the House has its own point of view, and I think they have been reasonable. We have a good bill, certainly a bill in the conference report which is vastly improved with respect to civil rights over the current bill. If those modifications are made, agreeable on all sides, before February 3, I would be more than willing to be a party to that.

The Judiciary Committee, on the second item, is scheduled to hold a hearing on the wartime Executive power and NSA's surveillance authority on February 6. As we customarily do, we stated his intention to bring it up on the asbestos reform bill. The leader has no objection, it is so ordered.

RECORD at the conclusion of my statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania from the White House—that nudge may be necessary. There are more ideas. But this legislation is one where, when it is affected, it will be decades before this kind of an effort can be mustered again.

I have one additional comment on the scope of the work. After it was passed out of committee in late July of 2003, I asked Judge Becker to assist as a mediator. We had meetings in his chambers in Philadelphia—two full days in August. We had about 50 meetings since, attended by sometimes more than 40 or 50 people.

We are still open for business to consider modifications. We know the legislative process is one where, when it comes to the floor, there are amendments. There are more ideas. But this is an issue which is of tremendous urgency. The President has spoken about it. The Speaker of the House is firmly behind legislation by the Senate. The Speaker of the House of Representatives has spoken about it. But candidly and openly, we face very powerful interests who are opposed to any action.

There are very substantial dollars involved. There is very substantial pain and suffering involved. Those of us who have worked on the bill—led by the distinguished Senator from Vermont and myself and others—have gone to the White House and to the Hill. We still are open for business and invite comments. But anybody who has amendments, we would like to hear from you as early as possible so we can consider them, try to work out time agreements, and try to move the bill ahead in a managers' context.

I am glad to yield to Senator LEAHY. Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, again I agree with what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said. This is a bipartisan bill. In fact, to emphasize it, he and I have sent a letter to all of our colleagues, signed jointly, asking them, if they have amendments they wish to offer, to let us know.

It should be emphasized that not only did we have hours upon hours of hearings, but we had many open meetings in the office of the Senator from Pennsylvania, in my office, and the offices of others. We made sure that the stakeholders, all the stakeholders were able to come to those meetings. We also made sure that the office of every Senator—everybody who expressed any interest, Republican or Democrat—was invited to those meetings. They were wide open. In fact, almost all of the Senators on both sides of the aisle either attended those meetings or had staff attend those meetings.

At these meetings that we had, again, every single stakeholder was involved. It was open. It was bipartisan. That was made clear by the Senator from Pennsylvania from the beginning, that they would have to be open and bipartisan. Re, as would be expected, was that commitment all the way through.

I would wish to declare two things the Senator from Pennsylvania just said that were of concern to me. One, if we do not do it now, we lose the opportunity. I believe it will be decades before anybody would put together the kind of coalition that has been possible to put together. The other thing he said was that it is not just some of the powerful financial stakes involved, but it is a powerful amount of suffering that is going on by the people who are suffering from asbestos poisoning in all the different forms. They are the ones who are held in limbo throughout all this time. We can bring some relief to them now: not the possibility of relief 10 years from now after a series of lawsuits go through, but now.

We have had members of the Supreme Court, ranging from the late Chief Justice William Rehnquist to Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and certainly two differing philosophies—who have called upon the Congress to bring about a legislative solution because our courts are unable to handle all the cases that might come up. Let's be clear about that. There are some who say we are litigating forever on this, but the fact is our courts are unable to handle it. It cries out for a legislative solution.

I urge people to come to this with an open mind, vote it up or down, vote it amendments up or down. I have heard some opponents quoted as being prepared to demagogue this bipartisan bill. This bill did not just suddenly spring...
out of nowhere: it was worked on in such a way that it is a bipartisan bill. And I might say there is pain in it for everybody. Everybody has had to give something in this. The Senator from Pennsylvania did not get everything he wanted. I didn’t get everything I wanted. The stakeholders who came to the table, virtually all of them openly and honestly, they gave up a lot on it. But the people who are suffering from asbestos poisoning in whatever form are actually those who will benefit. We ought to get on with it.

EXHIBIT 1
DEAR COUNTRYWOMAN, The Patriot Act is due to expire on February 2006 after being extended from its prior expiration date of December 31, 2005. The Senate is faced with three options: 1. Invoke cloture on the Conference Report and pass the Conference Report as the House of Representatives has already done; 2. Extend the Patriot Act for a period of time. The current discussion with the White House is to extend it for four years; or 3. Let the Act expire.

To my knowledge, no one wants to let the Act expire. Technically, the House/Senate Conference has been discharged with the filing of the Conference Report. While it is always possible to take another course of action such as changing the Conference Report if there is unanimous agreement, the House has taken the emphatic position that there will be no more concessions from the Conference Report and the House is very firm in this position.

Everyone, including those who are urging further House concessions, agrees that the Conference Report is much more protective of civil rights than the current Patriot Act. I am enclosing a side-by-side comparison. While I would have preferred the Senate bill, we do have a Bicameral System and the Conference Report was hammered out after extensive negotiations with significant concessions by the House. Senate proponents for further House concessions had, at one point, stated their willingness to sign the Conference Report if three conditions were met including a change in the sunset date from seven to four years. Those conditions were met and there was insistence on further concessions.

I urge the Senate to invoke cloture and pass the Conference Report as the best of the available alternatives.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.
SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON


Requests for Business Records (“Library Provision”) Section 215

Application to the FISA Court for an order under Section 215 requires a statement of facts. Records of the FISA judge finds that the statement of facts contains “reasonable grounds to believe that the tangible things sought are relevant to an investigation”. May not be used for threat assessments.

Explicit right of recipients of Section 215 requests to consult legal counsel

Right to consult with legal counsel is not provided for. May not be used for threat assessments.

No analogous incentive for the FBI to demonstrate a connection to terrorism or espionage.

No explicit right of recipients of Section 215 requests to challenge the nondisclosure requirement in court and have it set aside if the court finds that compliance would be unreasonably burdensome.

No requirement that minimization procedures be used.

No public reporting.

No reporting to Congress on Section 215 requests for sensitive documents.

No public reporting.

No requirement that the Justice Department’s Inspector General audit the use of Section 215.

No requirement that the Senate Intelligence Committee audit the use of Section 215.

Additional Protections

Reporting to Congress the number of emergency employments of electronic surveillance and the total number of subsequent orders approving or denying such electronic surveillance.

No such reporting.
Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for those comments.

There is no doubt about the suffering of those who are afflicted with mesothelioma and asbestosis and other ailments. There is also no doubt about the tremendous impact it has on the many of the United States. It has been estimated that there could be a bigger boost than any kind of tax cuts you could have or any sort of economic recovery program you could have to be able to deal with the more than 75 companies that have gone into bankruptcy and others where bank ruptcy is threatened.

The amount of work that the Senator from Vermont has specified has been gigantic. It has been 5 years in process. Senator Harkin took the lead with the trust fund concept where the manufacturers and the insurers have agreed to put up some $140 billion into the trust fund with no government payments and $100 million coming out of the pocket of the taxpayers.

The meetings which have been held and the efforts and the momentum which we have had can’t be recaptured. I think it is fair to say, certainly during my tenure here of 25 years. It has never been legislation worked on to the extent this legislation has been, with the complexity of the problem and the involvement of Senators and staff and so-called stakeholders. If it is not fair, it is never.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I support the nomination by President Bush of Circuit Court Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr., to the Supreme Court of the United States because he is qualified.

My conclusion, my staff and I have undertaken an extensive review of Judge Alito’s record and of his some 361 opinions in total. We have categorized 238 of those as major decisions while serving on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. We have reviewed 49 of the cases that Judge Alito handled during his tenure as U.S. attorney. We have made an analysis of 43 speeches and articles Judge Alito authored and evaluations of 38 formal opinions, petitions, and Supreme Court briefs which Judge Alito wrote while serving in the Department of Justice.

Additionally, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony of some 30 hours and 20 minutes where we had 17 hours and 45 minutes of questioning of Judge Alito and testimony from 33 outside witnesses.

It is on the basis of that voluminous record that it is my personal view that Judge Alito ought to be confirmed.

He has a background from a father who was an immigrant from Italy, not

EXHIBIT 2

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, January 24, 2006.

HON. ALBERTO R. GONZALEZ,

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL GONZALEZ: I write to let you know some of the subjects which I would like you to address in your opening statement on the Judiciary Committee hearing scheduled for February 6, 2006, on “Wartime Executive Power and the NSA’s Surveillance Authority.”

(1) In interpreting whether Congress intended to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) by the September 14, 2001 Resolution (Resolution), would it be relevant to Congress’ consideration of the Resolution that the Administration did not specifically ask for an expansion for Executive powers under FISA? Was it because you thought you couldn’t get such an expansion as when you said: “That was not something that we could likely get?”

(2) If Congress had intended to amend FISA by the Resolution, wouldn’t Congress have specifically acted to as Congress did in passing the Patriot Act giving the Executive expanded powers and greater flexibility in using “national security letters”? (Emphasis added)

(3) In interpreting statutory construction on whether Congress intended to amend FISA by the Resolution, what is the impact of the rule of statutory construction that repeal or changes by implication are disfavored? (Emphasis added)

(4) In interpreting statutory construction on whether Congress intended to amend FISA by the Resolution, what would be the impact of the rule of statutory construction that specific statutory language, like that in FISA, trumps or overrules more general pronouncements like those of the Resolution?

(5) Why did the Executive not ask for the authority to conducting electronic surveillance when Congress passed the Patriot Act and was predisposed, to the maximum extent likely, to grant the Executive additional powers which the Executive thought necessary?

(6) Wasn’t President Carter’s signature on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) by the Resolution, what would be the impact of the rule of statutory construction that repeal or changes by implication are disfavored?

(7) Why didn’t the President seek a warrant for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act authorizing in advance the electronic surveillance in issue? (The FISA Court has the experience and authority to issue such a warrant. The FISA Court has a record establishing its reliability for non-disclosure or leaking contrasted with concerns that disclosures to many members of Congress, Congress reviewed a high risk of disclosure and leaking. The FISA Court is a least as reliable, if not more so, that the Executive Branch on avoiding disclosure or leaks.)

(8) Did the Executive Branch not seek after-the-fact authorization from the FISA Court within the 72 hours as provided by the Act? At a minimum, shouldn’t the Executive have sought authorization from the FISA Court for law enforcement individuals to listen to a reduced number of conversations which were selected out from a large number of conversations from the mechanical surveillance?

(9) Was consideration given to the dichotomy between conversations by mechanical surveillance from conversations listened to on the ground that providing the content that the former was non-invasive and only the latter was invasive? Would this distinction have made it practical to obtain information relating to the conversations which were subject to human surveillance or after-the-fact approval within 72 hours?

(10) Would you consider seeking approval from the FISA Court for this time for the ongoing surveillance program at issue?

(11) How can the Executive justify disclosure to only the so-called “Gang of Eight” instead of the full intelligence committees? What was the Executive’s testimony that the intelligence community would constitute the unauthorized disclosure of classified information or information relating to the surveillance sources and methods? (Emphasis added)

(12) To the extent that it can be disclosed in a public hearing (or to be provided in a closed executive session) are the facts upon which the Executive relies to assert Article II wartime authority over Congress’ Article I authority to establish public policy on these issues opposing to the extent this legislation has been approved by the President as contrasted to being enacted over a Presidential veto as was the case with the War Powers Act?

(13) What case law does the Executive rely upon in asserting Article II powers to conduct the electronic surveillance at issue?

(14) What academic or export opinions does the Executive rely upon in asserting Article II powers to conduct the electronic surveillance at issue?

(15) When foreign calls (whether between the caller and recipient both on foreign soil or one of the callers or recipients being on foreign soil and the other in the U.S.) were routed through switches which were physically located on U.S. soil, which electronic surveillance inside the United States, absent a claim of unconstitutionality on encroaching on the foreign powers which the Executive thought necessary, to grant the Executive additional powers and greater flexibility in using “national security letters”? (Emphasis added)

Sec. 501. [50 U.S.C. 413] (a)(1) The President shall ensure that the congressional intelligence committees are kept fully and currently informed of the intelligence activities of the United States, including any significant anticipated intelligence activity as required by this title. (Emphasis added).

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize withholding information from the congressional intelligence committees or to the extent this legislation has been approved by the President as contrasted to being enacted over a Presidential veto as was the case with the War Powers Act.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize withholding information from the congressional intelligence committees. (Emphasis added)

(10) Would you consider seeking approval from the FISA Court for this time for the ongoing surveillance program at issue?

(11) How can the Executive justify disclosure to only the so-called “Gang of Eight” instead of the full intelligence committees? What was the Executive’s testimony that the intelligence community would constitute the unauthorized disclosure of classified information or information relating to the surveillance sources and methods? (Emphasis added)

(12) To the extent that it can be disclosed in a public hearing (or to be provided in a closed executive session) are the facts upon which the Executive relies to assert Article II wartime authority over Congress’ Article I authority to establish public policy on these issues opposing to the extent this legislation has been approved by the President as contrasted to being enacted over a Presidential veto as was the case with the War Powers Act?

(13) What case law does the Executive rely upon in asserting Article II powers to conduct the electronic surveillance at issue?

(14) What academic or export opinions does the Executive rely upon in asserting Article II powers to conduct the electronic surveillance at issue?

(15) When foreign calls (whether between the caller and recipient both on foreign soil or one of the callers or recipients being on foreign soil and the other in the U.S.) were routed through switches which were physically located on U.S. soil, which electronic surveillance inside the United States, absent a claim of unconstitutionality on encroaching on the foreign

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.
born with a silver spoon in his mouth, came up the hard way, had the extraordinary academic record at Princeton and the Yale Law School, worked as an Assistant U.S. Attorney, then was U.S. Attorney and worked in the Department of Justice, and for 15 years has been on the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

I think he answered questions put to him more extensively than any other nominee in recent times. It was unfortunate for him that the full text of the prepared statement be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, which specifies the details of the questions asked and provides analysis of many of his cases.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, Judge Alito came under very extensive questioning on the issue of a woman’s right to choose in his work on a brief on the Thornburgh case where he advocated not reversal of Roe v. Wade but cut back on some of the provisions, and because of a statement which he had made in 1985 when applying for a position with the Federal Government wherein he expressed the view that the Constitution did not protect the right to an abortion. Judge Alito testified at length that he has an open mind on this subject.

I think it is fair to say that when a committee is made by a lawyer in an advocacy capacity that it represents the view of a client on a position taken and not a personal view. With respect to the statement that he made about his view of the Constitution in 1985, he has since gone to great lengths to analyze the Supreme Court’s decisions on the issue of a woman’s right to choose and has made assurances that he has an open mind on the subject.

He was questioned extensively on this subject. He was cut off with it for 20 minutes on my first round of questioning. And Judge Alito expressed his regard for stare decisis, the Latin expression for let the decision stand.

He commented that he agrees with the position of Chief Justice Rehnquist on the Miranda case involving suspects’ rights on statements and confessions. Chief Justice Rehnquist, earlier in his career, had been against Miranda and later changed his view to support Miranda because of his work on a brief. It became embedded in the culture of police practices. And Judge Alito stated that he thought there was weight to be accorded to cultural changes.

I think it is fair to have that statement of principle apply on a woman’s right to choose.

Judge Alito later testified that he agreed with Justice Harlan’s dissent in the case of Poe v. Ullman, that the constitution is a living document; and that he agreed with Justice Cardozo in Palko v. Connecticut that it reflects the changing values and mores of our society.

He is not an originalist. He does not look only original intent. He does not look only to the static black letter, but he understands the importance of evolving values and of evolving reliance.

I questioned him at length about the reliance factor in Casey v. Planned Parenthood. I think Judge Alito went as far as he could go on the assurances of maintaining an open mind on this important subject.

When it came to the issue as to whether he reviewed it and regarded it as settled law, his testimony was virtually identical to the testimony of Chief Justice Roberts, who testified that it was settled. As Chief Justice Roberts put it in his confirmation hearings, it is settled beyond that. Chief Justice Roberts left open the unquestionable right and duty of the Court to review all cases on the merits when they are presented and to afford appropriate weight to stare decisis and to precedents. No position that precedents can never be overturned.

I think a fair reading of the record is that Judge Alito went about as far as he could go without answering the questions. There was no specific case, which would be beyond the purview of what a nominee ought to do.

In taking up questions of Executive power, Judge Alito could not answer questions posed about the President’s authority to go to war with Iran. How could a nominee answer a question of that magnitude in a nomination proceeding without knowing a lot more about the circumstances? And judges make decisions after they have a case and controversy, when they have briefs admitted, when they have arguments prepared, when they have discussions with their colleagues, and they reflect on a matter and come to conclusion, and not sitting at a witness table in a Judicial Committee hearing. Judge Alito answered the questions as to the considerations which would be involved. Again, he went about as far as he could go.

On the question of congressional power, I questioned him at length on concerns I have about what the Supreme Court has had to say about declaring acts of Congress unconstitutional because the Supreme Court disagrees with our position on something.

The columns of the Senate building are lined up exactly with those of the Supreme Court, situated across the green. An interesting historical note, in an early draft of the Constitution, the Senate was to nominate Supreme Court Justices. That would be an interesting process, given the political complexion of the Senate today.

Back to the point. What superior wisdom and what superior method of reasoning comes when a person crosses the aisles of the Senate to the American people? Our method of reasoning may not be too good, but it is our method of reasoning. To have the Court say that they declare acts unconstitutional because they do not like our method of reasoning is, candidly stated, highly insulting. Judge Alito said the obvious: Our method of reasoning was as good as the Court’s.

I am in the delusion in the Americans with Disabilities Act, where the Supreme Court has imposed a test of what is proportionate, taking it out of thin air in a 1997 decision, what is congruent and proportionate is a test which cannot be applied with any consistency. It lends itself to legislation from the bench. Justice Scalia characterized it accurately, calling it “a flabby test,” where the Court was functioning as the taskmaster of Congress to see that we had done our homework. Judge Alito’s answers showed an appropriate respect for separation of powers and congressional authority.

The decisions of the Supreme Court questioning the constitutionality of a statute has led a number of Senators on the committee to prepare legislation which would give the Congress standing to go to the Supreme Court to argue to uphold our legislation. We thought initially about having a Judicial Committee observe what the Court had done and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.

We respect the Court as the final arbiter of the Constitution. That is our system. But the arguments and the considerations and the record which Congress amasses ought to be considered by the Court. Now the constitutionality of statutes is for the Solicitor General. But in cases where the Court had done and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.

The issue of Executive authority and the current surveillance practices came up for discussion in Judge Alito’s confirmation hearings. Again, he could not say how he would rule on the case, but he could not say how he would rule on the current surveillance practices, as a friend of the court, and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.

The issue of Executive authority and the current surveillance practices came up for discussion in Judge Alito’s confirmation hearings. Again, he could not say how he would rule on the case, but he could not say how he would rule on the current surveillance practices, as a friend of the court, and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.

Many issues were discussed. Judge Alito approached them with an open mind. One subject of particular concern to this Senator is the issue of televising the Court, which I think ought to be done. The Supreme Court of the United States today makes the final decisions on so many of the cutting-edge issues of the day. It is what is proportionate, taking it out of thin air in a 1997 decision, what is congruent and proportionate is a test which cannot be applied with any consistency. It lends itself to legislation from the bench. Justice Scalia characterized it accurately, calling it “a flabby test,” where the Court was functioning as the taskmaster of Congress to see that we had done our homework. Judge Alito’s answers showed an appropriate respect for separation of powers and congressional authority.

The decisions of the Supreme Court questioning the constitutionality of a statute has led a number of Senators on the committee to prepare legislation which would give the Congress standing to go to the Supreme Court to argue to uphold our legislation. We thought initially about having a Judicial Committee observe what the Court had done and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.

We respect the Court as the final arbiter of the Constitution. That is our system. But the arguments and the considerations and the record which Congress amasses ought to be considered by the Court. Now the constitutionality of statutes is for the Solicitor General. But in cases where the Court had done and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.

Many issues were discussed. Judge Alito approached them with an open mind. One subject of particular concern to this Senator is the issue of televising the Court, which I think ought to be done. The Supreme Court of the United States today makes the final decisions on so many of the cutting-edge issues of the day. It is proportionate, taking it out of thin air in a 1997 decision, what is congruent and proportionate is a test which cannot be applied with any consistency. It lends itself to legislation from the bench. Justice Scalia characterized it accurately, calling it “a flabby test,” where the Court was functioning as the taskmaster of Congress to see that we had done our homework. Judge Alito’s answers showed an appropriate respect for separation of powers and congressional authority.

The decisions of the Supreme Court questioning the constitutionality of a statute has led a number of Senators on the committee to prepare legislation which would give the Congress standing to go to the Supreme Court to argue to uphold our legislation. We thought initially about having a Judicial Committee observe what the Court had done and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.

We respect the Court as the final arbiter of the Constitution. That is our system. But the arguments and the considerations and the record which Congress amasses ought to be considered by the Court. Now the constitutionality of statutes is for the Solicitor General. But in cases where the Court had done and from that, thought about seeking to intervene as amicus curiae, as a friend of the court, and took it the final step: Why not go to the Court and argue our cases ourselves, through counsel, which is an appropriate way. Congress has the authority to grant standing. We can grant standing to ourselves to see to it that our views are appropriately presented to the Court.
no reason why the Court proceedings should not be televised. Senator BIDEN and I made that specific request on the case of Bush vs. Gore and got a response from Chief Justice Rehnquist denying it; however, they released an oral transcript of the proceedings at the end of the day and the Court is doing more of that, which is a step forward.

The Congress has the authority to make decisions on the administration of the Court. For example, the Congress decides how many Supreme Court Justices there will be. We established the number at nine. Remember, in the Roosevelt era there was an effort to pack the Court and increase the number to 15. That is a constitutional judgment. We decide when the Court starts to function: The third Monday in October. We decide what is a quorum of the Court: Six. We legislate on speedy trial rules. It is within the purview of the Congress to legislate, to call for television of proceedings, and to scrutinize the ultimate decision would rest with the Court if they decided to declare our act unconstitutional. Under separation of powers, that is their prerogative. I respect it. We ought to speak to the subject.

On the subject of television, again, Judge Alito did not give the answer I liked to hear—that he is for television in the Court—but he said he had an open mind and would consider it. Again, that is about as far as he could go.

One panel of particularly impressive witnesses was seven judges from the Court of Appeals from the Third Circuit who had worked with Judge Alito. There is precedence for judges testifying. Retired Chief Justice Warren Burger came in to testify in the nomination proceedings for Judge Bork. That is something for which there is precedent. These judges have unique knowledge of Alito because they have worked with him in many cases.

Judge Becker, for example, former Chief Judge of the Third Circuit, now on senior status, sat with Judge Alito on more than 1,000 cases. Judge Becker has a national reputation as an outstanding jurist. Recently, he received the award as the outstanding Federal judge in the country. He testified about Judge Alito not having an agenda, not being an ideologue and having an open mind.

Judge Becker is regarded very much as a judge’s judge, a centrist judge, and pointed out he and Judge Alito have disagreed very few times—about 25 times—during the course of considering more than 1,000 cases.

After the arguments are concluded, the three judges who sit on the panel retire and discuss the case among themselves; no clerks present, no secretaries present, just a candid discussion about what went on. That is where the judges really let their hair down and talk about the cases and get to know what a judge thinks. It is a high testimonial to Judge Alito that these judges sang his praises, in terms of openness and in terms of studiousness and in terms of not having an agenda.

One of the witnesses, former Judge Tim Lewis of the Third Circuit, an African American, testified about his own role in the litigation. He made his own right to choose, his own dedication to civil rights, civil liberties, and testified very forcefully on Judge Alito’s behalf. He said very bluntly he would not be there if he did not have total confidence in Judge Alito.

One further comment: That is on the party-line vote which we seem to be coming to. He was voted out of committee, 10 to 8; 10 Republicans voting for Judge Alito; 8 Democrats voting against Judge Alito. It is unfortunate our Senate is so polarized today. I believe this Senate and this body would benefit greatly by more independence in the Senate.

I have not voted in favor of Judge Alito as a matter of party loyalty. If I thought he would not have the qualifications to fill that seat, I would vote no, as I have in the past on nominees of my own party from Presidents of my own party.

But we need to move away from the kind of partisanship, which has ripped this Senate to shreds. It is not important the American people have confidence in what the Senate does on the merits and that we avoid projecting the appearance of rank politics. I believe it is important for Judge Alito to have competitors who favor a woman’s right to choose so he does not feel in any way beholden to or confirmed by people who have one or another idea on some of these questions. Without naming names and identifying people, we have more than six Republicans who are pro-choice, who support a woman’s right to choose. So the balance of power will be, if confirmed, not only on one side of that issue or another.

But I think we would do well to reexamine the procedures which we utilize in the confirmation process to try to move away from partisanship and towards getting an idea of the judge’s temperament, his background, his jurisprudence, where he stands, without pressuring him to the wall as to how he stands on any particular issue.

When we had the nomination of White House Counsel Harriet Miers, she was opposed by some because, as apk, she had one or another agenda. That is a woman’s right to choose. Again and again and again, I have said that women have a right to choose, subject to some limitations. Justice Anthony Kennedy spoke very disparagingly about abortion rights before coming to the Court, and he has supported Roe v. Wade. Justice David Souter, as attorney general for New Hampshire, opposed repealing New Hampshire’s law banning abortions, even after it had been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. The National Organization for Women (NOW) had a rally on the Hill when David Souter was up for confirmation, in 1991—I remember it well; I was there—with big placards “Stop Souter or Women Will Die.” Justice Souter, too, has supported Roe v. Wade.

So no one knows what will happen. President Truman was disappointed by his nominees in the famous steel seizure case. Again and again and again, there have been surprises. The rule is, there is no rule. So on the committee and in the Senate we are left to our best judgment as to qualifications without guarantees. The separation of powers entrusts to the President the role of making the nominations. It is up to the Senate to make the decision, to confirm or not confirm. After that, it is up to the Justices to make decisions on the Court. The separation of powers has served us well.

Those are the facts which have led me to vote Judge Alito out of committee affirmatively. And my vote will be cast when the roll is called later in this floor debate.

EXHIBIT 1

ALITO FLOOR STATEMENT

Mr. President, today the Senate begins the debate on the confirmation of Judge Samuel A. Alito to be an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. It has been 86 days—over three months, since President Bush announced his choice of Judge Samuel Alito to fill the seat being vacated by Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor. During this time, my staff and I have undertaken an extensive review of Judge Alito’s record, including an examination of his 238 major decisions while serving on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, a review of 49 of the cases Judge Alito handled during his tenure as a United States Attorney, analyses of 43 speeches and articles Judge Alito authored, and evaluations of the 39 formal opinions, petitions, and Supreme Court briefs which Judge Alito wrote while serving as United States Solicitor General. Additionally, the Judiciary Committee held 30 hours and 29 minutes of hearings, which included 17 hours and 45 minutes of questioning of Judge Alito and testimony from 33 outside witnesses.

Based on my thorough review of his record, I intend to vote to confirm Judge Alito as the 110th Justice of the United States Supreme Court. I did not reach this decision lightly. As I have said before, except for a declaration of war or its virtual equivalent, a resolution for the use of force, no Senate vote is as important as the confirmation of a Supreme Court justice. And this vote is one that requires Senators to free themselves from the straight-jacket of party and exercise independent judgment. Under separation of powers, Senators are separate from...
the executive branch and have a full, independent role in staffing the Third Branch of government. I have long adhered to this view, which led me to vote against Judge Bork’s nomination even though I had been nominated by a President of my own party. If I thought Judge Alito should not be confirmed, I would vote no again.

Judge Alito has an impressive academic background, having excelled at Princeton University and the Yale Law School. Judge Alito began his government service with a prestigious clerkship for Judge Leon I. Garth of the United States Court of Appeals of the Third Circuit. For the next 20 years, Judge Alito served in New Jersey as an Assistant to the U.S. Solicitor General, a Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Counsel, and as both an Assistant Attorney General for New Jersey and an assistant United States Attorney in that same office. When Judge Alito was appointed to his current position on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, the ABA unanimously voted to award Judge Alito its highest possible rating, and Judge Alito enjoyed broad bipartisan support, as reflected by the fact that he was confirmed by unanimous consent.

Judge Alito’s achievements are all the more impressive given that he was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth. Judge Alito’s father was brought to this country from Italy as an infant at age three months. Although Judge Alito graduated at the top of his high school class, he had no money for college, and he was set to work in a factory. It was only because at the last minute, a kind person arranged for him to receive a $50 scholarship, that he was able to attend college. Despite the discrimination he faced as an Italian immigrant, Judge Alito’s father eventually graduated from New Jersey, and an assistant United States Attorney in that same office. When Judge Alito was appointed to his current position on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, he was confirmed by unanimous consent.

Judge Alito’s record confirms that he is a man of his word. He has always kept his agreements, even with his former colleagues. In the past, Senator Breaux remarked, “you have been very gracious. I appreciate you being responsive.” By one reckoning, Judge Alito was asked 677 questions and answered some 659—97%. That is far more than any other Justice Ginsburg, who answered only 397 out of 381 questions, or 80%, or Justice Breyer, who answered only 307 out of 355 questions, or 86%. Judge Alito did not refuse to respond because a similar case might come before the Court. He ultimately stopped short of making any promises about how he would vote in the future, for example, when Senator Feinstein asked Judge Alito whether he agreed with the Supreme Court’s holding in Roe v. Wade. Judge Alito replied directly, “I do agree with the result in Eisenstadt.” When Senator Feinstein asked whether the Constitution guarantees a right to privacy, Judge Alito responded: “The 14th Amendment protects liberty. The Fifth Amendment protects liberty. And I think it is well accepted that this has a substantive component, and that this component includes aspects of privacy that have been protected by the Court. Judge Alito also discussed whether Roe v. Wade is so well established that it should not be overruled. He noted that in every case in which there is a prior precedent, the first issue is the issue of stare decisis, and the presumption is that the Court and judges should follow the precedent. There needs to be a special justification for overruling a prior precedent.”

Some Members of the Judiciary Committee asked Judge Alito whether the Constitution creates a right to privacy. I asked Judge Alito whether he agreed with Judge Alito’s statement in his reconformation hearing. Justice O’Connor testified that she personally viewed abortion with “abhorrence” and stated, “my own view in the area of abortion is that there is no right as a matter of birth control or otherwise.” Yet, roughly 10 years later, she voted to uphold Roe v. Wade and has done so ever since. Judge Alito was also questioned extensively on Executive power and whether the resolution for the authorization of use of force gave the President authority to engage in a limited war without a vote of Congress. Judge Alito voted to strike down both laws in favor of a woman’s right to choose. This is not the behavior of someone bent on chip- ping away at Roe v. Wade. While I have been a friend of a moderate jurist who understands the importance of precedent.

The fact is that, notwithstanding Senators’ concerted efforts, it is not possible to predict how Judge Alito will rule on the issue of abortion. If there is a rule on expecta-tions, it is probably one of surprise. Two or three decades ago, no one would have predicted that Justices O’Connor, Kennedy, or Souter would have voted to uphold a wom- en’s right to choose. In his reconformation hearing, Justice O’Connor testified that she personally viewed abortion with “abhorrence” and stated, “my own view in the area of abortion is that there is no right as a matter of birth control or otherwise.” Yet, roughly 10 years later, she voted to uphold Roe v. Wade and has done so ever since. Judge Alito also questioned extensively on Executive power and whether the resolution for the authorization of use of force gave the President authority to engage in a limited war without a vote of Congress. Judge Alito voted to strike down both laws in favor of a woman’s right to choose. This is not the behavior of someone bent on chip- ping away at Roe v. Wade. While I have been a friend of a moderate jurist who understands the importance of precedent.

The fact is that, notwithstanding Senators’ concerted efforts, it is not possible to predict how Judge Alito will rule on the issue of abortion. If there is a rule on expectations, it is probably one of surprise. Two or three decades ago, no one would have predicted that Justices O’Connor, Kennedy, or Souter would have voted to uphold a wom- en’s right to choose. In his reconformation hearing, Justice O’Connor testified that she personally viewed abortion with “abhorrence” and stated, “my own view in the area of abortion is that there is no right as a matter of birth control or otherwise.” Yet, roughly 10 years later, she voted to uphold Roe v. Wade and has done so ever since. Judge Alito was also questioned extensively on Executive power and whether the resolution for the authorization of use of force gave the President authority to engage in a limited war without a vote of Congress. Judge Alito voted to strike down both laws in favor of a woman’s right to choose. This is not the behavior of someone bent on chip- ping away at Roe v. Wade. While I have been a friend of a moderate jurist who understands the importance of precedent.

The fact is that, notwithstanding Senators’ concerted efforts, it is not possible to predict how Judge Alito will rule on the issue of abortion. If there is a rule on expecta-tions, it is probably one of surprise. Two or three decades ago, no one would have predicted that Justices O’Connor, Kennedy, or Souter would have voted to uphold a wom- en’s right to choose. In his reconformation hearing, Justice O’Connor testified that she personally viewed abortion with “abhorrence” and stated, “my own view in the area of abortion is that there is no right as a matter of birth control or otherwise.” Yet, roughly 10 years later, she voted to uphold Roe v. Wade and has done so ever since. Judge Alito was also questioned extensively on Executive power and whether the resolution for the authorization of use of force gave the President authority to engage in a limited war without a vote of Congress. Judge Alito voted to strike down both laws in favor of a woman’s right to choose. This is not the behavior of someone bent on chip- ping away at Roe v. Wade. While I have been a friend of a moderate jurist who understands the importance of precedent.

The fact is that, notwithstanding Senators’ concerted efforts, it is not possible to predict how Judge Alito will rule on the issue of abortion. If there is a rule on expecta-tions, it is probably one of surprise. Two or three decades ago, no one would have predicted that Justices O’Connor, Kennedy, or Souter would have voted to uphold a wom- en’s right to choose. In his reconformation hearing, Justice O’Connor testified that she personally viewed abortion with “abhorrence” and stated, “my own view in the area of abortion is that there is no right as a matter of birth control or otherwise.” Yet, roughly 10 years later, she voted to uphold Roe v. Wade and has done so ever since. Judge Alito was also questioned extensively on Executive power and whether the resolution for the authorization of use of force gave the President authority to engage in a limited war without a vote of Congress. Judge Alito voted to strike down both laws in favor of a woman’s right to choose. This is not the behavior of someone bent on chip- ping away at Roe v. Wade. While I have been a friend of a moderate jurist who understands the importance of precedent.

The fact is that, notwithstanding Senators’ concerted efforts, it is not possible to predict how Judge Alito will rule on the issue of abortion. If there is a rule on expecta-tions, it is probably one of surprise. Two or three decades ago, no one would have predicted that Justices O’Connor, Kennedy, or Souter would have voted to uphold a wom- en’s right to choose. In his reconformation hearing, Justice O’Connor testified that she personally viewed abortion with “abhorrence” and stated, “my own view in the area of abortion is that there is no right as a matter of birth control or otherwise.” Yet, roughly 10 years later, she voted to uphold Roe v. Wade and has done so ever since. Judge Alito was also questioned extensively on Executive power and whether the resolution for the authorization of use of force gave the President authority to engage in a limited war without a vote of Congress. Judge Alito voted to strike down both laws in favor of a woman’s right to choose. This is not the behavior of someone bent on chip- ping away at Roe v. Wade. While I have been a friend of a moderate jurist who understands the importance of precedent.

The fact is that, notwithstanding Senators’ concerted efforts, it is not possible to predict how Judge Alito will rule on the issue of abortion. If there is a rule on expecta-tions, it is probably one of surprise. Two or three decades ago, no one would have predicted that Justices O’Connor, Kennedy, or Souter would have voted to uphold a wom- en’s right to choose. In his reconformation hearing, Justice O’Connor testified that she personally viewed abortion with “abhorrence” and stated, “my own view in the area of abortion is that there is no right as a matter of birth control or otherwise.” Yet, roughly 10 years later, she voted to uphold Roe v. Wade and has done so ever since. Judge Alito was also questioned extensively on Executive power and whether the resolution for the authorization of use of force gave the President authority to engage in a limited war without a vote of Congress. Judge Alito voted to strike down both laws in favor of a woman’s right to choose. This is not the behavior of someone bent on chip- ping away at Roe v. Wade. While I have been a friend of a moderate jurist who understands the importance of precedent.
 Senators about how he would decide questions dealing with the limits of executive power, he responded that he would apply Justice Jackson’s framework from the Youngstown Steel case.

 “[I]f I had the opportunity to vote in a case like Youngstown Steel, I would probably...”

 “[A]s I said, the President has to follow the Constitution and the laws and, in fact, one of the most solemn responsibilities of the President is to see that the laws are faithfully executed.”

 “[T]he Constitution— that is the President is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed, and that means the Constitution, it means the laws of the United States.”

 ”But what I am saying is that sometimes there are powers—actual powers—that have to be analyzed under the framework that Justice Jackson set out. And there are cases placed on removal, the precedents—the leading precedent is Humphrey’s Executor and that is reinforced, and I would say very dramatically, by the decision in the article—which did not involve such an agency. It involved an officer who was carrying out what I think everyone would agree is a core function of the branch that he is in. It involved the enforcement of the law, taking care that the laws are faithfully executed.”

 “[W]hat I have tried to say is that I regard this as a line of precedent that is very well developed and I have no quarrel with it and it culminates in Morrison, in which the Supreme Court—myself even as a judge—spoke enthusiastically in his favor. He said: ‘Having worked with him, I came to respect Judge Alito’s position, his power, his knowledge, his judgment, the kind of judge Judge Alito is, Judge Lewis thought that Judge Alito was particularly influential, given his background, he is an African American, who described himself as the hearer as ‘unapologetically pro-choice’ and as ‘a committed human rights and civil rights activist.’”

 ”I would never think that judges have superior reasoning power than does Congress. The majority opinion in that case involved an officer who was carrying out the core executive function of taking care that the laws are faithfully executed, it is permissible for Congress to place restrictions on the ability of the President to remove such an officer, provided that in doing so, there is no interference with the President’s authority, and they found no interference with that authority there. That is an expression of the Supreme Court’s view on an issue where the claim for—where the claim that there should be no limitations imposed is stronger than it is with respect to an independent agency like the one involved in Humphrey’s Executor.”

 ”I have expressed this concern, for some time now, about the case of United States v. Morrison, where the Supreme Court declared part of the Violence Against Women Act unconstitutional. The majority opinion in that case dismissed lengthy Congressional findings because five justices disagreed with our ‘method of reasoning.’ The inference was that they believed the Court has a superior method of reasoning to the Congress. I believe that the Constitutional separation of powers rejects that kind of view and I know that many of my colleagues share this concern.”

 I asked Chief Justice Roberts about this during his confirmation hearings and I raised it again with Judge Alito. Judge Alito said that: ‘I would never suggest that judges have superior reasoning power than does Congress. I think that Congress’s framework to reason is fully equal to that of the judiciary.”

 The Judiciary Committee had the rare, but not unprecedented, opportunity to interview seven of Judge Alito’s current and former colleagues on the Third Circuit. These men and women, Democrat and Republican appointed, have worked to craft opinions with him, they have worked to craft opinions...
Thomas is only one example of Judge Alito's strong record on disability rights. He has ruled in favor of numerous workers, students, customers, and disability advocacy groups that suffered from related claims. On multiple occasions, he has reversed the rulings of lower courts to do so. Other examples include:

Shapiro v. Township of Lakewood, where Judge Alito reversed a decision of a lower court in favor of an EMT technician who became disabled on the job and was denied an interdepartmental transfer to a position as a police dispatcher.

Piscus v. Walmart Stores, Inc., where Judge Alito ruled in favor of a meat cutter who became injured on the job and could no longer lift heavy objects. He overturned the decision of a lower court that refused to consider his disability in light of his low education and skill level. Judge Alito held that the impact of a disability had an individual opinion of work must take into account his particular background and skills.

Shore Regional High School Board of Education v. P.S., where Judge Alito reversed a lower court to find in favor of a plaintiff with disabilities. The plaintiff in that case was a child with disabilities who had suffered severe harassment from bullies at his school. Because an Administrative Law Judge had found that the student could not graduate with education in a normal environment, Judge Alito ruled that the plaintiff's parents should be reimbursed for tuition at a neighboring public school.

Pennsylvania Protection & Advocacy, Inc. v. Houston, where Judge Alito sided with a group advocating for the rights of the mentally ill and ordered a state hospital to release internal reports on the death of a patient who attempted suicide and later died under hospital care. He rejected the state of Pennsylvania's arguments that these documents were protected from release under state law.

Judge Alito has authored a number of other important, progressive opinions that dramatically change the so-called "little guy". For example, in Fatin v. INS, Judge Alito held that an Iranian woman could establish a basis for asylum if she showed that compliance with Iran's gender specific laws would be deeply abhorrent to her or that the Iranian government would persecute her because of her gender. This is a landmark case that established gender-based discrimination as possible grounds for asylum.

In Alexander v. University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Judge Alito remanded the case from the court's ruling in favor of a hospital in a medical malpractice case. A young woman had been hospitalized for a rare illness of the liver. Based on advice from several doctors, her parents waited for one and one-half months before ordering a liver transplant. The young girl died, and the parents sued. The judge ruled for the parents that awarded substantial damages. The majority of the Third Circuit reversed the jury's verdict against the doctors, explaining that the trial court had made factual errors that required reversal. Judge Alito dissented, concluding that the fault should lie with the hospital rather than the defendant doctors, not the parents. Judge Alito wrote: "Except perhaps in truly extreme cases, it is not negligent for a patient such as Alyssa or her parents to follow the advice of primary care physicians." In Cort v. Director, Judge Alito wrote an opinion granting benefits to a former coal miner under the Black Lung Benefits Act. An Administrative Law Judge had denied the worker's claim, finding that since he was able to obtain work as a wire cutter, he wasn't disabled. Judge Alito found that the statute and associated regulations established a presumption of total disability due to Black Lung worked for more than 10 years as a miner and met one of four medical requirements—which the plaintiff satisfied. He reasoned that the statute focused on the source of disability, not its degree.

These cases are just a few examples from Judge Alito's lengthy record. My staff has identified and analyzed scores of cases where Judge Alito has ruled for minorities, immigrants, people with disabilities, prisoners, and other disadvantaged plaintiffs. It is this record that has won him the enthusiastic support of his fellow judges on the Third Circuit.

Judge Alito is anything but a "stealth" candidate. Those who opposed Chief Justice Roberts' nomination asked for a nominee with a deeper record to analyze. In Judge Alito's book, Alito, he wrote: "The Senate Committee had the opportunity to review literally thousands of decisions and some 461 written opinions. It also had the opportunity to hear directly from Judge Alito as he gave lengthy testimony. In three days of intense questioning in which he spent over 18 hours in the witness chair, Judge Alito was asked roughly 677 questions. Justice Ginsbury was asked 384 questions and Justice Breyer was asked only 355 questions. Clearly, Judge Alito's record has been vetted as thoroughly as any nominee's possibly could be.

It is on the basis of this record that I reached my conclusion to vote aye on the nomination of Judge Alito to be an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

I thank the Chair and I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator Specter for his excellent leadership of the Judiciary Committee during both the Roberts and Alito hearings. He squarely addressed the tough issues in the first questioning. He made sure every member of the committee had full and ample opportunity to ask any question they wanted. We had 30-minute rounds. We had opening statements. We had the opportunity to have multiple rounds. Basically, I think the people who have asked questioned these nominees for as long as they wanted.

Of course, both Roberts and Alito were magnificent in their testimony, superb in their knowledge of the Constitution and the rule of a judge in every part of the issues they have been favorably received by the American public which is why Chief Justice Roberts was confirmed, and why Alito will be confirmed.

We have the greatest legal system in the world. It is the foundation of our liberties and the foundation of our economic prosperity. But the focus and the key ingredient of our legal system is an independent judge who makes decisions every day based on the law and the facts, not on their personal, political, religious, moral or social views. If we descend to that level, if we allow those social, political views to affect or infect the decision-making process, justice has been eroded. That is contrary to every ideal of the American rule of law.

What is important today is Judge Alito's legal philosophy. It is not his political philosophy that is important. What is his legal philosophy? The core of this belief is that Judge Alito should be careful, fair, restrained, and honest in analyzing the facts of the case and applying the relevant law to those facts. For what purpose? To decide that dispute, that discrete issue that is before the Court at that time and not to indulge, as he indicated, in great theories. That is not what a judge is about.

So this is what American judges must do for our entire legal system to work. That is why I am so proud that President Bush has given us two nominees who can explain, articulate that role of a judge in a way every American can understand, relate to, and affirm.

My colleagues, I am afraid, lack a proper understanding of this concept. It goes to the core of our differences over judges. They want judges, I am afraid, who will impose their own views, their personal views, on political issues in the guise of deciding discrete cases before them. Oftentimes, these are views that cannot be passed in the political, legislative process but can only be imposed by a judge who simply redefines or reinterprets the meaning of words in our Constitution, and they declare that the Constitution says that same-sex marriage must be the law of the land. They just declare that to be so. It only takes five unelected, lifetime-appointed judges to set that kind of new standard for America.

Where any wronged people are worried about that? It erodes democracy at its most fundamental level when political decisions are being set by judges with lifetime appointments, accountable to the public.

That is what we are worried about in so many different ways. There has been a trend in that regard, no doubt about it, by our courts. I think they have abused their authority by taking an extremely hostile view toward the expression of religious conviction in public life.

They have struck down Christmas displays. Our courts have declared our Pledge of Allegiance to the Government unconstitutional because it has "under God." By the way, for those of you who can see the words over this door, "In God We Trust," it is part of our heritage, written right on the wall of this Chamber.

This is an extreme interpretation of the separation of church and state. It is not consistent with our classical understanding of law in America. We had the Supreme Court, in this past year,
leader, Senator HARRY REID, has urged 19th of January, that our Democratic nominee. It does appear, according to Judge Alito. He is such a fabulous by the people through the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. that the courts maintain their role as a neutral umpire to decide cases based on what they declare to be evolving standards of decency. That is a fair standard. It is a legitimate issue for the American people to decide. He talked about it in almost every speech he made. That is what he promised to do, and that is what he has done.

If we were to name judges, there is a legitimate concern that we would appoint judges who would promote some conservative agenda. I don’t favor that; I oppose that. We don’t want a judge to promote a liberal or a conservative agenda, although the plain fact is, if anybody looks at it squarely, they will see that the Court has actually been promoting a more liberal agenda. But we ask that a conservative agenda be promoted. We are asking that the courts maintain their role as a neutral umpire to decide cases based on the law passed by the legislative branch or State legislatures or passed by the people through the adoption of the U.S. Constitution.

I don’t understand the opposition to Judge Alito. He is such a fabulous nominee. It does appear, according to the New York Times last week, the 19th of January, that our Democratic leader, Senator HARRY REID, has urged his colleagues to vote no so they can, for political reasons, make it a political issue. We need to be careful about that. I am afraid there has been an attempt to change the ground rules of confirmations, to set standards we have never set before for nominees. That knife cuts both ways. If this is affirmed, then there will be more difficulty in the future for Democratic Presidents to have their nominees confirmed.

Judge Alito has a remarkable record. He is the son of immigrants in New Jersey. His father was an immigrant to this country. He gets his degrees with honors from the Army Reserve for 8 years, and was offended that Princeton would kick the ROTC from their campus. I am sure he was not pleased when the rioters bombed the ROTC building at Princeton.

He is an American. He believes in his country. He was prepared to serve his country, go where he was asked to go, if called upon in that fashion.

He was chosen to clerk for the Third Circuit after he graduated, the court on which he now sits with Judge Garth. That is quite an honor. For 3 years he served as assistant U.S. attorney in that great large New Jersey law office for the U.S. attorney where he argued appellate cases. He did the appellate work. That is what he will be as a Supreme Court judge, an appellate judge, not a trial judge. That is what he did when he started out his practice. Then he went to the Solicitor General’s Office of the Office of Justice, which is often referred to as the greatest job for an attorney in the world, to be able to stand up in the courts of the United States of America, particularly the Supreme Court, and to represent the United States in that court. He argued 12 cases before the Supreme Court. Not one-half of 1 percent of the lawyers in America have probably argued any case before the Supreme Court. He argued 12. That is a reflection of his strength and capability.

Then he became in New Jersey, which is one of the largest U.S. attorney offices in America, where he prosecuted the Mafia and drug organizations and was highly successful in that office and won great plaudits for his performance. He then was placed, 15 years ago, on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. He has served as a circuit judge in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals for 15 years, writing some 350 opinions and participating in many others.

He has had his record exposed to the world. What does it look like? Without question, it is a record of fairness and decency. Some of us on the conservative side have questioned the bar association. They are pro-abortion in their positions. They take liberal positions on a lot of issues, and some people have criticized them for that. They declare their ratings of judges and then base on that. It appears that they have been accused of allowing their personal views to infect that rating process.

How did the American Bar Association rate Judge Alito? They gave him their highest possible rating. They said that he was particularly unani- mously, by the 15-member committee that meets to decide that issue. They interviewed 300 people, people who have litigated against Judge Alito as a private lawyer, people who have been his supervisors, people who have worked for him, people who had their cases decided by him.

They go out and talk to these people. They will share with the American Bar Association privately what they might not say publicly. So they interviewed 300 people, and contacted over 3,200. They concluded that Judge Alito has established a record of both proper judicial conduct and evenhanded application in seeking to do what is fundamentally fair.

They declare that Judge Alito was held in incredibly high regard.” That was said by attorney John Payton, an African American who argued the University of Michigan quota case before the U.S. Supreme Court, not a right-winger. He said they forgot about the people they interviewed who held Judge Alito in incredibly high regard. I asked him if he chose that word carefully. He said: I did; yes, sir.

Judge Alito represents that neutral magistrate that we look for in our judges in America. His academic record is superb. His proven intelligence is unsurpassed. The experience he brings to the U.S. Supreme Court is extraordinary, including 15 years as an appellate judge doing in a lower court basically the same thing he would do at the Supreme Court level.

This is what he said at the hearing: The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Graham). The majority’s time has expired. Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to wrap up.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I understand our side will also get an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SESSIONS. This is what he said: I had the good fortune to begin my legal career as a law clerk for a judge who really epitomized openmindedness and fairness. He read the record in detail in every single case. He insisted on following precedent, both the precedents of the Supreme Court and the deci- sions of his own court. He taught all of his law clerks that every case had to be decided on an individual basis. He really didn’t have much for grand theory.

That is what we need on the bench today. I think it would restore the public confidence. I am proud to support this nomination.
Mr. President, I respect Senator Leahy. He is an excellent advocate for the Democratic side. I was pleased he supported Judge Roberts, and I am not as thrilled he is not supporting Judge Alito. It was a process that was a bit rough at times, but fundamentally I think the Senate was able to have his day in court.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may go a couple of minutes beyond 12 o'clock.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the compliment of the Senator from Alabama. I have spent 31 years in the Senate, I take my role in the Senate very seriously. I believe we should be the conscience of the Nation. As I have said many times, only 18 people get to publicly ask questions of the Supreme Court nominees. They are the 18 Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. We are asking those questions on behalf of almost 300 million Americans, and then 100 of us get a chance to vote on it.

While the Senator from Alabama is still on the floor, I note that there seem to be talking points going around that the Democratic leader, Senator Reid, has been lobbying to make this a party-line vote. I don't know where those talking points came from. I have heard them in different places. The Democratic leader was asked aloud that yesterday by the press in open session. He said it is absolutely not so. I am the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Just as nobody from leadership has lobbied me on now-Chief Justice Roberts when I voted for him, nobody has lobbied me on Judge Alito; nor have I lobbied anybody else, and nor have I heard of anybody who has been lobbied.

What the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, the Democratic leader, has said over and over again is that this is a vote of conscience. Every Senator has to search his or her own conscience. In fact, I was also concerned when the distinguished Republican Senator from Alabama, the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said yesterday that here we have somebody who we know how he will vote, so he is fine.

Democratic Senators are taking their confirmation hearings of the same judge very seriously. We have a single fundamental question: Will the Senate serve its constitutional role and preserve the Supreme Court as a constitutional check on the expansion of presidential power?

A nominee's views on Executive power and the checks and balances built by the Founders into our constitutional framework should always weigh heavily in hearings for those nominated to the Supreme Court. Executive power issues were the first issues I raised with Chief Justice Roberts at his confirmation hearing, and they were the first issues I raised with Judge Alito.

The reason presidential power issues have come to dominate this confirmation process is that we have clearly arrived now at a crucial juncture in our Nation, and on our highest court, over the question of whether a President of the United States is above the law. The Framers knew that unchecked power leads to abuses and corruption, and the Supreme Court is the ultimate check and balance in our system. Vibrant checks and balances are instruments in protecting both the security and the liberty of the American people.

This is a time when there has been a threat to the fundamental rights and liberties of all Americans, now and for generations to come. One need only look to the White House to see the practical effects of such an erosion of those rights and liberties. This President is prone to unilateralism and assertion of Executive power that extend all the way to illegal spying on Americans.

This President is in the midst of a radical realignment of the powers of the Government and its intrusiveness into the private lives of all Americans, Republicans and Democrats. Frankly, this nomination is part of that plan for the intrusion into our private lives. I am concerned that if we confirm this nominee, it will further erode checks and balances that have protected our constitutional rights for more than 200 years. It is not overstating the case to say that this is a critical constitutional moment.

This past week, I introduced a resolution to clarify what we all know, that the congressional authorization for the use of military force against Osama bin Laden did not authorize warrantless spying on Americans, as the administration has now claimed. I thought—we all thought—that when we as Democrats joined in the bipartisan authorization of military action against Osama bin Laden more than 4 years ago, our action would have been more effective and that the damage by this administration has now succeeded in ridding the world of that terrorist leader. We gave the President all the authority he needed to go after Osama bin Laden, and we thought with the great power of this country, he would simply say sorry and caught him. He didn't. They averted our special forces out of Afghanistan and into Iraq before we even announced we were going to go to war against Iraq. We lost the opportunity to catch Osama bin Laden, the man who did our the attacks on 9-11.

Now we find the administration, instead of saying sorry we didn't catch Osama bin Laden, even though you gave us the authority, we now want to use that authority as legal justification for a covert, illegal spying program on Americans.

As Justice O'Connor underscored very recently, even war "is not a blank check for the President when it comes to the rights of the citizens."

Now that the illegal spying on Americans has become public, the Bush administration's lawyers are contending that Congress authorized it. The September 2001 authorization to use military force did no such thing. It did not authorize illegal spying on Americans. Republican Senators know it, and some have been courageous to say so publicly. The fact is, we all know it. The liberties and rights that define us as Americans and the checks and balances that serve to preserve them should not be sacrificed to threats of terrorism or to the expanding power of the Government. Security and liberty are not mutually exclusive values in America. We should have both, and we can have both, so long as we have adequate checks and balances and with the extra effort it takes to chart the right course to preserve our liberties as we preserve our security.

This President is obviously reminded of what Benjamin Franklin said: People who give up their liberties for security deserve neither. The terrorists win if they frighten us into sacrificing our
freedoms—something I said in the days following 9/11, and I believe it just as strongly today.

Just after 9/11, I joined with Republicans and Democrats—I was at that time chairman of the Judiciary Committee—in round-the-clock efforts to update and adapt our law enforcement powers, and we did. The law became known as the USA PATRIOT Act. It is obvious they missed a lot of the signals that we didn’t, and it is obvious that they had ignored the evidence that was before them that might have stopped the terrorists from striking us, but we didn’t make those accusations, we didn’t say then—let’s find out all the things that allowed us to be hit on your watch. Instead, during those days, we asked the Bush administration, what do you need, tell us what you need so it doesn’t happen again, whether it is on your watch or anyone else’s.

In answering that question, they never asked us to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to accommodate spying on Americans they now admitted undertaking, even though the law doesn’t allow it. The law does contain an expressed reservation for the 15 days following a declaration of war. But neither Attorney General Ashcroft nor anyone else in the Bush administration at that time or any time afterward sought congressional authorization for this illegal NSA spying program.

Actually, Attorney General Gonzales admitted in a recent press conference that they did admit that all along even though the law doesn’t allow it. The law does contain an expressed reservation for the 15 days following a declaration of war. But neither Attorney General Ashcroft nor anyone else in the Bush administration at that time or any time afterward sought congressional authorization for this illegal NSA spying program.

In both Doe v. Groody and Baker v. Monroe, the court’s opinion, rejecting the rationale of Judge Alito’s dissent, Judge Chertoff wrote: “This is not an arcane technical one. Repeatedly when pressed about this case, Judge Alito insisted that the issue was merely ‘technical.’ The illegal strip search was not ‘technical’ for the 10-year-old girl. Then-Judge Chertoff understood that this issue is far from technical, but, rather, embedded in the core protections of our individual privacy and dignity from governmental intrusion. In the court’s opinion, rejecting the rationale of Judge Alito’s dissent, Judge Chertoff wrote: ‘This is not an arcane or legalistic distinction, but a discrimination against the constitutional requirement that judges, and not police, authorize warrants.”
Judge Alito tried to find “technical” ways to excuse the illegality. Judge Alito’s dissent relied on the affidavit accompanying the warrant. To the extent the affidavit had requested a search of “all occupants” of the home, it did not concern about the concealment of drugs by “frequent visitors that purchase [drugs]” or by “persons who do not actually reside or own/rent the premises”—not by a 10-year-old girl living in the home. Judge Alito ignored the language in the affidavit. In order to misconstrue the affidavit more broadly and to then substitute it for the magistrate’s warrant.

Judge Alito’s rationale was that because the officers’ initial request was broad, it could be assumed that the magistrate intended to grant broader search authority than that set forth in the warrant. The Supreme Court had specifically rejected this type of reasoning in the case of Ramirez v. Groh, which was decided a month before Judge Alito’s dissent. In Ramirez v. Groh, the Supreme Court held a search warrant invalid, citing the sharp distinction the law draws between what is authorized in a warrant, and what was requested. Judge Alito went to great lengths and hyper-technical an attempt to distinguish the Supreme Court’s decision in Groh.

Similarly, in Baker v. Monroe Township, Judge Alito saw the facts in the light most favorable to the Government when considering this nomination to our highest court. He erred in his dissent when he argued that there were no constitutional problems with a police officer shooting and killing an unarmed teenager who was fleeing after apparently stealing $10 from a home. A year later, the Supreme Court ruled 6–3 against Judge Alito’s position in that case and determined that the law was intended “to authorize a search of ‘any persons’ who do not actually reside or own/rent the premises.”

Unfortunately, Doe and Baker are outliers in Judge Alito’s record. As troubling as his dissents are in those two cases, they are only part of a broader pattern of deference to the Government that shows far too little concern for individual liberties and rights, which find their ultimate protection in the Supreme Court. Judge Alito’s record on the use of excessive force is also troubling. It goes back at least as far as his time in the Meese Justice Department. I find particularly troubling a 1984 memorandum he wrote to Generalino Regor regarding a case called Tennessee & Memphis Police Department v. Garner. In a long memo in which he repeatedly invoked his own beliefs, Samuel Alito argued that there were no constitutional problems with a police officer shooting and killing an unarmed teenager who was fleeing after apparently stealing $10 from a home. A year later, the Supreme Court ruled 6–3 against Judge Alito’s position in that case and determined that the law was intended “to authorize a search of ‘any persons’ who do not actually reside or own/rent the premises.”

The Stakes in this nomination could not be higher. This is the vote of a generation. If confirmed, Judge Alito will be the ninth justice on the Supreme Court. As Justice Bush’s nominee of Justice Anthony Kennedy, for President Bush’s nomination of Justice Souter, and for this President’s recent nomination of Justice Roberts, I cannot vote for this nomination.

At a time when the President is seized of unprecedented power, the Supreme Court needs to act as a check and to provide balance. Based on the hearing and record, I have serious doubts that Judge Alito would provide that crucial check and balance.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts in the Chamber, I am prepared at this point to yield the floor to the distinguished former chairman of the Judiciary Committee and one whose protection of the civil liberties of all of us is unparalleled in the history of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague, the Senator from Vermont. Again, we do many important things in the Judiciary Committee, but none are more important than the selection of our Supreme Court Justices. I again thank the Senator from Vermont for his leadership in ensuring we’re going to have a fair, open, appropriate, and a probing, probing hearing and for the leadership he provides for our committee on so many different matters of importance to the American people.
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Each of us in the Senate has a constitutional duty to ensure that anyone confirmed to the Court will uphold that clear ideal.

Contrary to what a number of my Republican colleagues have argued, the Senate’s role is limited to ensuring that the nominee is ethical and possesses a certain level of legal skill and professional experience. To end the inquiry there would be a shameful abdication of our historic responsibility. The Senate’s role in the confirmation process is of great importance to every man and woman in America because the decisions rendered by the Court affect their lives every day. Because of the enormous authority a successful nominee to the High Court will have for decades to come, it is the responsibility of the Senate to determine what constitutional values the nominee holds before he or she is confirmed.

Has the nominee learned the great lessons of our Nation’s history? Will the nominee be fair and openminded or will his judgments be tainted by rigid ideology? Is he genuinely committed to the principles of equal justice under law? The American people will have no second chance to decide whether this person should be trusted with such awesome responsibility. As their representatives, it is our responsibility to ask the tough questions and demand meaningful answers.

For the Senate to become a rubberstamp for the judicial nominees of any President would be a betrayal of our sworn duty to the American people. Taking our responsibility seriously and doing the job we were sent here to do is not being partisan, as some Republicans have charged. In fact, it is those Republicans who are being partisan by defending a nominee’s right to remain silent when Senators ask him highly relevant questions about his constitutional values. To ask a candidate for a candid statement of his current belief about what a provision of the Constitution means is not asking for a guarantee of how he will rule in the future. It is every bit as appropriate as reading a Law Review article or a case he wrote last year or a speech he gave as a judge.

Unfortunately, on issue after issue, instead of answering candidly, Judge Alito merely recited the existing law without his view of major constitutional issues. That is a disservice to the American people, and Senators on both sides of the aisle should find his evasiveness unacceptable. The confirmation process should not be reduced to a game of hide the ball. The stakes for our country are too high.

One of the most important of all responsibilities of the Supreme Court is to enforce constitutional limitations on Presidential power. A Justice must have the courage and the wisdom to speak truth to power, to tell even the President he has gone too far. Chief Justice John Marshall was that kind of Justice when he told President Jefferson he had exceeded his war-making powers under the Constitution. Justice Robert Jackson was that kind of Justice when he told President Truman he could not misuse the Korean war as an excuse to take over the Nation’s steel mills. Chief Justice Burger was that kind of Justice when he told President Nixon to turn over the White House tapes on Watergate. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor was that kind of Justice when she told President Bush that “a state with a ink check for the President when it comes to the rights of the Nation’s citizens.”

We need that kind of Justice on the Court more than ever. It is our duty to ensure that only that kind of Justice is confirmed.

Today, we have a President who believes torture can be an acceptable practice despite laws and treaties that explicitly prohibit it. We have a President who claims the power to arrest American citizens on American soil and jail them for years without access to counsel or the courts. We have a President who claims he has the authority to spy on Americans without the court order required by law. The record does not even count on Judge Alito to blow the whistle when the President is out of bounds. He is a longstanding advocate of expanding Executive power even at the expense of core individual liberties.

One of Judge Alito’s views of the balance of powers is inconsistent with the Supreme Court’s historic role of enforcing constitutional limits on Presidential power.

His consistent advocacy of what he calls the gospel of the unitary executive is troubling. As Steven Calabresi, one of the originators of the unitary executive theory, has said, “The practical consequence of this theory is dramatic: It renders unconstitutional independent agencies and counsels to the extent that they exercise discretionary executive power.”

But this bizarre theory goes much further. Its supporters concede that without the unitary executive as a foundation, the Bush administration cannot even hope to justify its constitutional abuses in the name of fighting terrorism.

Judge Alito refused to discuss his current view of the constitutional limits of presidential power in his speech Judge Alito gave in 2004 to the Federalist Society, he stated that he believed “the theory of the unitary executive best captures the meaning of the Constitution’s text and structure.” Under this radical view, all current independent agencies would be subject to the President’s control. This would destroy the independence of agencies such as the Federal Election Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Federal Reserve Board.

He strongly criticized the Supreme Court’s ruling rejecting the theory of unitary executive and outlined a strategy for bypassing it.

When Judge Alito made that speech, he had already been serving as appellate judge for 10 years, and he was describing his own view of the Constitution.

Similarly, Judge Alito had written earlier that “the President’s understanding of a bill should be just as important as that of Congress,” and that Presidents should be free to announce their own legal interpretations in the hope of influencing the way the courts would construe the law.

On Executive power, “Protective of the Executive Branch, the issuance of interpretative signing statements would have two chief advantages. First, it would increase the power of the executive to shape the law.”

This is his view. But as Justice Hugo Black wrote in the steel seizure case, “the President’s power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad.”

This is not just a theoretical case. As we all now know, President Bush issued such signing statements on a bill that contained Senator McCain’s ban on torture. In that statement, the President reserved the right to ignore the McCain requirements and even asserted that in certain circumstances his actions are beyond the reach of the courts.

I think many of us remember that meeting Senator McCain had with the President down in the White House, and the Senator from Arizona thanked the President for working out the language in the Defense appropriations bill and Senator McCain’s ban on torture.

Four or five days later, the President signed the bill and, he issued an executive signing statement that said he continued to retain all of his constitutional power, and that he was effectively taking any question of his Executive power out of the hands of any courts in this country. That is a complete reversal to what was agreed to, a complete reversal to what was said, a complete reversal to the understanding of the Senator from Arizona. The Senator from Arizona has spoken about it. That is Executive power.

We learned in high school there are two branches of Government, the House and the Senate. They pass the laws. The President administers the law. If he vetoes it, it is not the law. That is not Judge Alito’s view. He believes the President, by signing it, has an independent voice and that voice is a voice that should be listened to and respected by both the Legislative and Executive authority and Executive power.

In cases involving claims of privacy and freedom from unjustified searches
and seizures under the Bill of Rights. Judge Alito has consistently deferred to the Government at the expense of core individual rights. In the Doe v. Groody case, Judge Alito issued a dissent defending the strip search of a 10-year-old diabetic inmate. The man or woman whom we serve—nothing more serious than this decision. The man or woman whom we serve—nothing more serious than this decision. The man or woman whom we serve has diabetes. We know the dangers. We know the strength of the Government was responsible for a systematic failure in terms of providing for that. They thought it should go to the jury. Was it or was it not a factual issue? The lower court said they ought to be able to go, but not Judge Alito. He reached a different conclusion.

In case after case, Judge Alito's decisions demonstrate a systematic tilt toward powerful institutions and against individuals attempting to vindicate their rights. He cites instances where he has decided for the little guy, but they are few and far between. We have an independent duty to evaluate Supreme Court nominees to determine whether their confirmation is in the public interest. That is the test. It is a test with which Judge Alito himself seems to agree. He said we should look at his record and decide whether he should be confirmed. I have done so. I have compared the challenger to the current Court. I have compared the future with Judge Alito's record and I cannot support his nomination.

In this new century, the Court will undoubtedly consider sweeping new claims to expand Executive power at the expense of individual rights, including detention of Americans on American soil without access to counsel or the court, and eavesdropping on Americans in violation of Federal law. The Court will decide new issues in America's struggle against prejudice and discrimination. It must remain a fair and impartial decisionmaker for ordinary Americans seeking justice. Justice Alito's record shows he should not be entrusted with these important decisions.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who is considered to be a very progressive figure on the Court, Judge Bork, a conservative figure who was proposed for the court, agreed 91 percent of the time. It is in the dissent that we understand whether an individual and individual rights are protected. Those are the indicators. As we have seen from studies—not just from the members of the Judiciary Committee but by independent sources—Knight Ridder, Yale Law School Study Group, even the Washington Post, distinguished authority and thoughtful individual about constitutional law—all have reached a very similar conclusion that I have outlined here. We will hear on the other side: Well, they are only finding a few cases. We have suggested that the future Supreme Court, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing Judge Alito's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my colleague from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for his statement.

Those who are following this debate—my colleagues and those in the exhibit hall—this is a historic moment in the Senate. It is rare that Members of the Senate are given an opportunity to review a Justice to the Supreme Court. It has been 11 years. Recently, we have had two. Chief Justice John Roberts came before the Senate, and today individual rights were at the nomination of Judge Sam Alito to fill the vacancy of Sandra Day O'Connor on the Supreme Court.

I take this very seriously. As Senator KENNEDY said yesterday in another debate: Next to a vote on war, there is nothing more serious than this decision. The man or woman whom we choose to serve on the Supreme Court
is there for the rest of their natural life. For 10, 20, or 30 years, that person will be making critical decisions on the highest Court in the land, the Court which is the refuge for our freedoms and our liberties.

The Court, across the street from this Capitol Building, has made momentous and historic decisions which have literally changed America. In the 1950s, nine members of the Supreme Court made the decision that we would no longer have segregated public education in America. It was not the leadership of a President or the Congress, but it was the Court.

Similarly, that same Court, in the 1960s, established a new right under our Constitution, a word which you cannot find within the confines of that document, the right of privacy. That Court—nine Justices across the street—said that when it came to the most personal and basic decisions in our lives, they were reserved to us as individuals, not the Government. That was not a finding by a President. It was not a law passed by Congress. It was a decision of the Supreme Court.

And time and again, whether we are speaking of the rights of minorities in America, the rights of women in America, the rights of those who are disabled, that Court and the nine Justices who sit on the bench make decisions which change America for generations to come. That is why the selection of a nominee to the Supreme Court is so important and so historic. It is made even more so by the fact that the vacancy we are filling on the Supreme Court is not another run-of-the-mill vacancy. It is the vacancy of Sandra Day O'Connor, the first woman ever appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

As important as her gender is, the fact is, she brought unique leadership to the Court. You see, over the last 10 years, there have been 193 decisions in that Court that were decided 5 to 4. One Justice's vote made the difference. If one Justice had voted the other way, the decision would have been the opposite—193 times in 10 years. And in 148 of 193 cases, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was the deciding vote.

So we are not only faced with a historic and constitutional challenge in filling this vacancy, we have a special responsibility because the vacancy that is being filled is a vacancy that will be sitting on the Supreme Court in America one way or the other way.

What kind of cases did Sandra Day O'Connor provide the decisive vote on? Cases which safeguarded Americans' right to privacy in the area of reproductive freedom, the rights of women; cases that required courtrooms to be accessible to people with disabilities, decided 5 to 4; preserving the rights of universities to use affirmative action programs, decided 5 to 4; affirming the right of State legislatures to protect the right to privacy of Americans, decided 5 to 4; upholding State laws giving individuals the right to a second doctor's opinion if their HMO denied them treatment, decided 5 to 4; reaffirming the Federal Government's authority to protect the environment that we live in, a 5-to-4 case; and reaffirming America's time-honored principle of the separation of church and State, 5 to 4.

In every case that required the fifth vote was Sandra Day O'Connor. And now she leaves, after many years of service to America, with an extraordinary record of public service. Many of us are listening, and analyzing, and wondering—what certain the person replacing her can rise to the challenge, and not only the challenge of serving in the Court but the challenge of fighting for the same values she fought for. Sandra Day O'Connor came to the Supreme Court with the support of Barry Goldwater, the preeminent conservative in American politics in the 1960s and beyond. Many expected her to be of the same stripe, that she would follow his basic philosophy. In many ways, she did believe that the Goldwater-Southwest's contribution to American politics, you will find him starting in a very conservative position and, over the years, moving to a more libertarian position, a position that valued personal freedom more.

The same thing happened to Sandra Day O'Connor. Starting as a conservative, over the years she moved toward a more libertarian position, a position which, in many instances, was critical for protecting our civil rights. It has been said she was the most important woman in America. And it is easy to see why. Time and again, Sandra Day O'Connor was the crucial fifth vote on civil rights, human rights, women's rights, and workers' rights. That is why we have looked so closely and so carefully at Judge Samuel Alito.

And there is more. His was not the first name to be suggested by the President for this vacancy. The first name to be suggested by the President was personal attorney in the White House, Harriet Miers, a person he obviously respects very much. Do you recall what happened to her nomination? Her name was brought forward, and there was a firestorm of criticism about Harriet Miers' nomination. Did it come from the Democrats? Did it come from liberals? No. It came from the other side. Time and again, the most rightwing on the American political scene said Harriet Miers was not acceptable, and they raised questions whether she could be trusted to be on the Supreme Court to advance their rightwing agenda.

Their opposition to her nomination grew to levels and reached a point people did not think would happen. President Bush withdrew Harriet Miers' name as a nominee. In the wake of withdrawing Harriet Miers' name, in sailed Judge Sam Alito—not the best circumstance for someone who is coming to the Court having argued they have no political agenda.

Well, we looked carefully to see what the same rightwing organizations would say about Sam Alito. They had rejected Harriet Miers. They gave Harriet Miers the back of a hand. They gave Sam Alito their blessing. They said: He is fine. We support him. He is the right person for the job.

And then, during the course of his nomination, there emerged a document that the President himself had personally written. In 1985, Sam Alito wrote a document to the Justice Department of the Reagan administration, then headed by Attorney General Ed Meese, looking for a job. In the course of that document he was supposed to lay out why he, Sam Alito, was in step with the Reagan administration's thinking and philosophy. And, in 1985, that document has been published by the Federalist Society and the Concerned Alumni of the United States.

Some have said: Wait a minute, that was 20 years ago, People change. And it is certainly true that the President has changed his views on some issues. It is well known and documented. It happens. But to say it was a document given without conviction overlooks the obvious, Sam Alito, at that moment in 1985, was 10 years out of Yale Law School. He had served in the military. He served a year as a clerk to a Federal judge. He had served 4 years as an assistant U.S. attorney, prosecuting cases, and 4 years as an assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States.

So rather than suggesting that document reflected the casual observations of someone looking for a job at a very early age, I think that document told us much more.

As told us was that he questioned some very fundamental things about law in America. In his essay, he wrote that 'the Constitution does not protect a right to an abortion.' He said he was proud of his work in the Justice Department fighting abortion rights and affirmative action. He wrote that he was skeptical of Warren court decisions which embraced the principle of 'one person, one vote' and the separation of church and state. And he pointed to his help in creating two very conservative organizations: The Federalist Society and the Concerned Alumni of Princeton.

His listing of the Concerned Alumni of Princeton, of which he was a graduate, was troubling because that organization was once dedicated to establishing a quota at Princeton that each year they would accept no fewer than 800 men, and the Concerned Alumni of Princeton wanted to stop what they considered to be the infiltration of the student body by women and minorities. Some of the things they wrote and said were outrageous. In fairness, Judge Alito at the hearing
said he would not associate himself with their remarks, but it is interesting that he would identify this organization as one of his memberships that would qualify him to serve in the Justice Department.

As an examination of Judge Alito’s 15-year track record on the U.S. Court of Appeals evidences, there are other elements that suggest a very conservative judge. University of Chicago law professor Cass Sunstein examined his dissenting opinions over 15 years and concluded:

When they touch on issues that split people along political lines, Alito’s dissent show a remarkable pattern: They are almost uniformly conservative.

People say to me: If he was found “well qualified” by the American Bar Association, what is wrong with that? Why don’t you just go ahead and approve the man? The bar association is an important part of this process, but they only look to three main things. They ask who he is. He has legal skills. That is important. They look to whether he is an honest person. That is equally important. And they look to his temperament. They said he is well qualified by those three standards. But the American Bar Association doesn’t look to his values. It doesn’t look to his philosophy, how he is likely to rule in critical cases for America.

I wanted to ask Judge Alito at the hearing: Where is your heart? What do you feel about the power you will have as a Supreme Court Justice? I asked him an obvious question in the lead-up to my inquiry: I asked if he was a fan of Bruce Springsteen. You might wonder why that would come up in this case. Judge Alito is from New Jersey, as is Bruce Springsteen. He said to me in his answer:

I am — to some degree.

That is a qualified answer, but I took it and went on. The reason I raised it was this: Many people have asked Bruce Springsteen. Where do you come up with the stories in your songs? How do you talk about all these people who are suffering in America? He answered: I have a familiarity with the crushing hand of fate.

The reason I asked that question was to go to some specific cases Judge Alito had decided and ask him about the crushing hand of fate. Senator KENNY just mentioned one of them.

An African American, charged with murder, facing the possibility of the death penalty, argues on appeal that his verdict was unfair because the prosecutor had done nothing to exclude every African American from the jury so that it was an all-White jury judging a Black man. He presented his evidence that in three other murder trials, one involving an African American, the other two White defendants, the prosecutor had done exactly the same thing — the Blacks off the jury systematically. The Third Circuit Court on which Judge Alito served said that defendant was right; that is not something we accept in America; we are going to send this case back to be retried by a jury of this defendant’s peers. They saw the importance of a justice system that is blind to race.

But Bill Nedy just mentioned one of them.

Of course, Judge Alito. He said establishing the fact that four murder trials came before the same prosecutor with all White juries is like establishing that five out of six of the last Presidents were left handed. I thought that was a rather casual dismissal of an important fact. It is an important principle. When I asked Judge Alito about it, he seemed more committed to the principles of statistics than the principles of racial justice which the majority in his court applied.

Another case involved an individual who was the subject of harassment in the workplace. This person had been assaulted by fellow employees. He was a mentally retarded individual. He was so brutally assaulted in a physical manner that it was obvious to the record of the hearing, nor will I today, the details. Trust me, they are gruesome and grisly. His case was dismissed by a trial court, and it came before Judge Alito to decide whether to give him a chance to go to the Supreme Court. Judge Alito said no, the man should not have a day in court. Why? Not because he didn’t have a case to argue, but Judge Alito believed that his attorney had written a poorly prepared legal document. What was the justice in that decision? Did the crushing hand of fate come down on an individual who was looking for a day in court who happened to have an attorney without the appropriate skills? When it came to health and safety questions involving coal mines, a topic we see in the news every day, Judge Alito was the sole dissenter in a case as to whether a coal mining operation would be subject to Federal mine and safety inspection. Why? The record made no sense. Why would you have a hearing on a standard.

What we find in all these cases is a consistent pattern. Time and again, it is the poor person, the dispossessed person, the one who is powerless who has finally made it to his court, who is shown the door. That troubles me. It troubles me because what we are looking for in a Justice is wisdom.

If you are a student of the Bible—and I am—I am preparing myself. For in the Bible, the Lord came to Solomon and said: I will give you a gift. What gift would you have? And Solomon said: I want a caring heart. He didn’t ask for riches or knowledge; he asked for a caring heart. This wise man wanted that as part of who he was.

That is what I looked for with Judge Alito. Sadly, in case after case, I couldn’t find it. I worry that if Judge Alito goes to the Highest Court in the land for a lifetime appointment, he will tip the balance of the scales of justice. He will tip the balance against protecting our basic privacy and personal freedoms. He will tip the balance in favor of Presidential power, even when it violates the law. He will tip the balance when it comes to recognizing the rights of the powerful over the powerless. He will tip the balance on workers’ rights and civil rights and human rights and women’s rights and protecting the environment. That is why I cannot support his nomination.

I call on the President to send to us a nominee as creative as Sandra Day O’Connor. She was a woman who demonstrated, in a lifetime of service, that she understands the values of this country and committed her life to protecting them. I am sorry that Judge Sam Alito does not live up to her standard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, before I make the remarks I have prepared about Judge Alito, I extend my gratitude to members of my staff who, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, have been so instrumental in my ability to prepare for this confirmation process.

In particular, I note the contribution of Brian Fitzpatrick, who has been a member of my staff and worked on both the Roberts and Alito Supreme Court nominations. He is leaving next week after Judge Alito was confirmed to the U.S. Supreme Court, as he will be, to go teach at NYU, New York University. NYU’s gain is our loss. I certainly wish Brian well in his new career. I put him on notice that the next vacancy that President Bush gets to the U.S. Supreme Court, I am going to be calling him and asking him to come back for another gig.

Madam President, I rise today to explain why I intend to vote to confirm Judge Alito to the Supreme Court. Those who were just listening to the eloquent words of the distinguished Democratic whip might wonder how in the world anybody could ever vote for this nominee; how Judge Alito survived for the last 15 years as a member of the circuit court of appeals in Philadelphia without getting impeached; how in the world his former law clerks, the people who have worked most closely with the judge, and who happened to be Democrats and have a different political world view, a different set of qualifications and temperament of this fine public servant and this fine human being, how possibly, in listening to the criticisms we have heard of this nominee and of the President for having the temerity to nominate him, you can reconcile that impression with the fact that we heard on the Senate Judiciary Committee virtually all of the descriptions of Judge Alito that are consistent with the term of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals who have worked closely with Judge Alito day in and day out, who to a person...
came in and said this is exactly the kind of judge we would want and we think the American people would have a right to expect, and urged us to favorably vote on his confirmation.

It is clear to me, though, during the course of the confirmation process, that the reason I support Judge Alito his philosophy of judicial restraint is exactly the reason his detractors oppose his nomination. The sad fact is that there are some in this country who think judges who respect the legislative choices made by the American people. Rather, they want judges who will substitute their own personal ideological or political agenda for those choices made in the Halls of Congress by the elected representatives of the American people. There are some in this country who have views that are so out of the mainstream that they don’t have any chance to persuade the American people to accept them. For example, there are some who want to end traditional marriage between one man and one woman. There are some who want to continue the barbaric practice of partial-birth abortion. Some even want to abolish the Pledge of Allegiance. But they have been brought to bear on those issues to the floor of the Senate and to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, these are not the views that would be expressed through the elected representatives of the American people because the American people themselves don’t agree with these far left, out-of-the-mainstream views.

For these advocates of these out-of-the-mainstream views, the only way they will ever see their views enacted into law is to circumvent the American people and pack the courts with judges who will impose their agenda on the American people. They believe in judicial activism because judicial activism is all they have.

Of course, Judge Alito’s detractors will never say they believe in judicial activism. They know the American people don’t favor it. They know the American people believe fervently in democracy and self-determination, and they don’t want unelected judges making the laws of this country. So Judge Alito’s detractors are forced to oppose his nomination on the basis of certain pretenses. They are forced to grasp for any motto to try to defeat his nomination. As one of Judge Alito’s detractors put it, “you name it, we will do it” to defeat Judge Alito.

One of their favorite pretenses—and we have heard some of it this morning—is that Judge Alito embraces this view of an omnipotent executive branch; that he believes the President’s powers are without limitation. This pretext is a complete canard. It is based on the claim that Judge Alito once endorsed an academic theory called unitary executive. But the unitary executive is not the same as an all-powerful executive. It is, after all, a theory that says there are three co-equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. And each official within that branch is accountable to the people for the power they exercise and is delegated to them by the Constitution and laws of the country.

But to show how misplaced this criticism is, according to Judge Alito’s opponents, the father of the unitary executive theory is Justice Scalia on the U.S. Supreme Court. The problem they have is that the facts show that Justice Scalia does not favor an all-powerful President. No one does. We know this in particular from the decision he wrote in the Hamdi case 2 years ago. This was a case where the detention status of some of the terrorists who are kept at Guantanamo Bay was being reviewed by the Supreme Court. In that case, in the opinion written by Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, the Supreme Court held that the President had the power as Chief, during a time of war, to indefinitely detain even American citizens who were suspected of terrorism without filing criminal charges against them. Justice Scalia, perhaps one of the most conservative members of the Court, dissented from the decision. He said that if the President’s powers are unlimited any more than Justice Scalia does.

Now, one of the witnesses we had during the course of the hearing—I mentioned several former and current members of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. One of them who testified interestingly and relevant to the point was Judge John Gibbons who has since left the judiciary and has a law practice where he represents the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. He said:

The committee members should not think for a moment that I support Judge Alito’s nomination because I am a dedicated defendant of the Bush administration. On the contrary, I and my firm have been litigating with that administration over its treatment of detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.

He said:

I am confident that as an able legal scholar and a fair-minded justice, Judge Alito will give the arguments, legal and factual, that prove his nomination is that as a replacement for Justice O’Connor, this nominee, Judge Alito, will shift the Supreme Court radically to the right. But in order to believe this or support this supposed theory, they have to radically rewrite history. It requires them to paint Justice O’Connor as some sort of liberal. That is not the truth. That is not the truth. For example, according to the Harvard Law Review, over the last decade, the Justice on the Court with whom Justice O’Connor agreed most frequently—over 80 percent of the time—was former Chief Justice William Rehnquist. And we think we will all agree that Chief Justice Rehnquist was not liberal. Yet Sandra Day O’Connor and Chief Justice William Rehnquist agreed with each other more than 80 percent of the time.

Instead, in subject matter after subject matter, Justice O’Connor sees eye to eye with what Judge Alito has demonstrated on the bench and said how he will approach his job on the Supreme Court. Both believe in federalism, that Congress is not above the law and its powers are not unlimited but, rather, they are, under the Constitution, limited and enumerated, and that some powers are still reserved to the States and to the people.

This is not an out-of-the-mainstream view. Justice O’Connor shares that view. The Founders of this country shared that view, and I believe the American people believe that the people have retained some rights and the States have retained some rights against an all-powerful Federal Government. Judge Alito happens to believe that as well.

Justice O’Connor and Judge Alito both struck down some affirmative action programs that resulted in reverse discrimination based on strict numerical quotas. And yes, both have even criticized Roe v. Wade. The truth is that if Justice O’Connor were the nominee today, she would meet with just as much opposition as Judge Alito has. The confirmation process has simply become a no-win situation.

Another favorite pretext of the opponents of this nominee is that he is somehow biased against the mythical little guy. That he always rules against the little guy in favor of the big guy. The basis for this pretext is a litany of cases his opponents cite where Judge Alito has sided against a sympathetic plaintiff. This pretext suffers from a number of flaws.

The first flaw is a selective reading of Judge Alito’s record. Judge Alito has been a judge for 15 years. He has decided plenty of cases in favor of consumers, medical malpractice victims, employment discrimination victims, and other plaintiffs. In other words, he has decided plenty of cases for the little guy. But his opponents ignore all of these cases and focus only on the cases where he has decided against a sympathetic plaintiff. Anyone who has looked at Judge Alito’s record will not agree with the claim of bias to be completely without merit, indeed, including the Washington Post. The Washington Post did an analysis of
Judge Alito’s entire record and found he is no more likely than the average appeals court judge to rule for businesses, for example, over individuals. And, yes, I said the Washington Post and not the Wall Street Journal.

Moreover, any notion that Judge Alito has an agenda against victims of racial discrimination is as false as it is demeaning. The people who know Judge Alito best testified at length that he applies the law in a fair and evenhanded manner without fear or favor. The personal animosity that is the evidence from the late Judge Leon Higginbotham. He has passed on, but his comments are part of the record.

Judge Higginbotham was something of a civil rights hero, as many people know. He was president of the Philadelphia chapter of the NAACP, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and was appointed to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission by President Clinton. This is what he had to say about Judge Alito:

Sam Alito is my favorite judge to sit with on this court. He is a wonderful judge and a terrific human being. Sam Alito is my kind of conservative. He is intellectually honest. He doesn’t have an agenda. He is not an ideologue.

Judge Higginbotham, a hero to the civil rights movement in this country, would never have made such glowing remarks if he believed for an instant that Sam Alito was guilty of some of the false charges being made against him.

More fundamentally, however, the claims that Judge Alito is biased against the little guy are based on a misconception of how judges are supposed to behave. Judges are not supposed to decide cases on sympathy. Just as we ask jurors when they come into our courthouses all across this great country to set aside their sympathies, biases, and prejudices and decide the cases based on the evidence they hear in court and the law as given to them by the judges—and they do it, day in and day out, faithfully and to really an exceptional degree—of course, we expect judges not to decide cases on sympathy. The kind of arguments we are hearing suggest that judges ought to pick out the party they like best, the most sympathetic, and rule in their favor without regard to the facts and without regard to the law.

One would not know by listening to some of Judge Alito’s opponents that he is a fairminded judge. In the America of his opponents, no plaintiff ever wins a case no matter how frivolous the claim of employment discrimination; police departments never win a case no matter how desperate the claim of a criminal defendant; Government agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the Social Security Administration, could never win a case no matter how laundered the request for Government benefits. In their utopia, the economy is wrecked by frivolous litigation, criminals run free on technicalities, and the public Treasury is plundered.

This admittedly, and thankfully, is not Judge Alito’s America. He believes that not the President, not the Congress, not even the little guy. That is why Lady Justice has always been blindfolded.

America is a nation of laws, not of men and women, not of little guys, not of big guys, but a nation of laws. It is not what you are; it is what you do. How do you pronounce your last name, what your country of origin is, your race, or any other extraneous consideration when you enter the halls of justice. We are all guaranteed, under the words that are etched over the marble leading into the Supreme Court, “equal justice under the law.”

Everything in his record shows that these extraneous considerations don’t matter to Judge Alito. This is why people and faith from all across the political spectrum have testified and given testimonials in support of his work as a judge and on behalf of his nomination to the Supreme Court. This is also why I believe he will be confirmed by the Senate.

Madam President, I could not be happier to throw my support behind this good man, this good judge, and this public servant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam President, I rise to echo and add to the remarks of the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN. On this first day of debate, I wish to express my strong support for the confirmation of Judge Samuel Alito to be a Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

There has been much discussion, advertising on the radio, in newspapers, and on television, and certainly comment about Judge Alito, and that is fine. That is the way it should be. Federal judges are appointed for life. This is the only time that the people’s representatives—those of us in the Senate—have an opportunity to scrutinize an individual who has been nominated for the Federal bench in a lifetime appointment. So that scrutiny is appropriate. I am hopeful that this scrutiny and this discussion will be of a civil nature. Sometimes it has not been, over the last several years in this body.

I do believe, though, that all nominees who are reported out of a committee, whether the Judiciary Committee—for that matter, any committee—Foreign Relations, or other committees, ought to be accorded the fairness of an up-or-down vote at the end of this gauntlet. If you are going to make someone go through all of this, have all these slings and arrows, some relevant, some tangential, and some irrelevant. If they are going to go through all of this, they ought to be accorded the fairness of an up-or-down vote.

I believe if the approaches taken over the last several years for certain nominees continue, as a threat or as an actual practical impediment to someone receiving a vote, it will make it much more difficult for any President to be able to recruit from the private sector qualified men and women who have the experience, the personality, the insight, the leadership, and the ability to serve our Government. That might be in a variety of different fields. That is why I think it is important that we as Members of Congress and Senators ask Senators to come here when the nomination is called forth to get off these cushy seats, stand up straight, and vote yes or vote no. That is a matter of fairness. It is also our constitutional responsibility in advice and consent.

When analyzing or determining whether I am going to support a particular judicial nominee, what matters most to me for these lifetime appointments is trying to discern that nominee’s judicial philosophy. Trying to determine whether they believe what they are saying as to what they think the proper role of a judge will be.

We have seen through the years that certain individuals get appointed for a lifetime appointment with their philosophy being completely different than what they have said in the hearings, in interviews with the President, or interviews with the Senators. Past performance is, in my view, usually a reliable indicator of future action.

In my view, regarding this particular nomination of Judge Alito, the best way to determine what kind of Justice Samuel Alito will be on the Supreme Court is to look at his 15 years of services as a circuit court judge. In his year on the bench, he has embodied the philosophy I like to see in judges. I believe the proper role of a judge is to apply the law, not invent the law. Judges are to uphold the Constitution, not amend it by judicial decree.

The proper role of a judge is to protect and indeed defend our God-given rights, not to create or deny rights out of thin air. They are not to act as a legislator.

In Judge Alito's case, no matter the issue, whether or not they are politically charged issues in the realm of electoral politics, he seems, from my reading and review, to have followed a
consistent, thoughtful, deliberative process to decide cases. This is what judges are supposed to do. They are not supposed to be issuing cases based on predetermined ideology, or an eye toward future confirmation hearings. They should faithfully apply the law to decide the evidence before the court to the law in that particular case before the court.

As he stated in his opening statement before the Judiciary Committee, Judge Alito knew he was not judging a case, but he had to be sure of his decision to the rule of law. And in every single case, the judge has to do what the law requires. In my opinion, that is the essence of the fair adjudication of disputes. There is credibility, there is reliability, and there is integrity in that approach. Judge Alito has exemplary, scholarly, and experienced qualifications—and especially the proper judicial philosophy—to serve honorably as a Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States.

In his opening statement, he said, "I don't view, genuinely respects the rule of law in our representative democracy. In recognition of Judge Alito's outstanding service on the Federal bench, the American Bar Association has given him their highest rating of well qualified. The American Bar Association's criteria for their evaluation are integrity, professionalism, competence, and judicial temperament. We let me share with my colleagues what I think about the nominee's qualifications during his confirmation hearing.

In this view, genuinely respects the rule of law in our representative democracy. In recognition of Judge Alito's outstanding service on the Federal bench, the American Bar Association has given him their highest rating of well qualified. The American Bar Association's criteria for their evaluation are integrity, professionalism, competence, and judicial temperament.

Let me share with my colleagues what I think about the nominee's qualifications during his confirmation hearing.

He said:

On The Federal Judiciary: "Needless to say, to merit an evaluation of well-qualified, the nominee must possess professional qualifications and achievements of the highest standing. . . . We are ultimately persuaded that Judge Alito has, throughout his 15 years on the bench, established a record of both proper judicial conduct and even-handed application in seeking to do what is fundamentally fair. . . . His integrity, his professionalism, and his judicial temperament are, indeed, found to be of the highest standard."

That came from Chairman Tober on January 12 of this year.

Judge Alito was even forced to defend the statements of others when he was questioned about the Concerned Alumni of Princeton. That is a group that apparently Judge Alito joined when he was a member of the Armed Services because he didn't agree with the way the military was treated on the Princeton campus. As a result, some of the Democratic Senators tried to diminish Judge Alito. The Wall Street Journal had an editorial on January 12 of this year where they said they are trying to find him guilty of "ancient association." That is a quote from the Wall Street Journal editorial page of that date.

They can't touch him on credentials or his mastery of jurisprudence, so they're trying to get him guilty by ancient association. Senators Ted Kennedy and Chuck Schumer did their best yesterday to imply that Judge Alito was racist and sexist by linking the nominee with some of the Concerned Alumni of Princeton. The Wall Street Journal editorial page of that date.

They can't touch him on credentials or his mastery of jurisprudence, so they're trying to get him guilty by ancient association. Senators Ted Kennedy and Chuck Schumer did their best yesterday to imply that Judge Alito was racist and sexist by linking the nominee with some of the Concerned Alumni of Princeton. In fact, his thought processes, judicial philosophy, and the attitude of the Senate Committee, had to say.

The American Bar Association Stand-
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States thought, if an unwed minor daughter is going through the surgery, the trauma of an abortion, and is 17 years old or younger, a parent ought to be involved. After all, if a child is going to get a tattoo or their ears pierced, there is parental consent. If the laws are passed by various States, there is one in contention dealing with New Hampshire. Federal judges, ignoring the will of the people in various States, strike down and allow those laws to be overturned.

Last year, in the summer, the Supreme Court got involved in a case that created a great deal of concern because the city of New London, CT, the city council, acting akin to commissars, decided they were going to take people’s homes, the American dream, and condemn those homes, take them not for a school, not for a road or any such public purpose, but rather they wanted to derive more tax revenue off of that property. This is part of the Bill of Rights, the Constitution—Bill of Rights is the most important part of all the Constitution—by judicial decree. That is wrong. This is why it is important we have men and women serving on the Federal bench that will understand their role is to apply the law and not take away our God-given rights enshrined in the Bill of Rights and in our Constitution.

I met with Judge Alito in my office and discussed with him my concerns about this troubling trend of judges who ignore the will of the people and start inventing laws themselves. I was actually very encouraged by his scholarship, his knowledge, and what I felt was a very genuine, sincere understanding that we need a respectful, restrained judiciary. And also his ability to cite examples from his very distinguished career of cases where he was presented with decisions where he put aside his personal view and followed the law.

I asked: What do you do if you do not like a law? He said: You have to apply the law, but it may be inappropriate after the decision is made, for a judge or perhaps the court to make a decision that is contrary to the will of the people. So, therefore, let me conclude in this statement to my colleagues that if you look at Judge Alito’s 15 years of exemplary judicial experience, his intellectual, reason-based answers in the confirmation hearings, if you look at this individual, who has the qualifications, the judicial philosophy, the knowledge of the law, the respect for the law and, indeed, the respect for the people, the owners of this Government, and those on the Senate and the House of Representatives, and other bodies, Judge Alito is a perfect person to be an Associate Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States. I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote affirmatively for Judge Alito to serve this country on the Supreme Court.

I thank you for your attention, Madam President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam President, I also rise today to express my support for the confirmation of Judge Samuel Alito as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Constitution demands that the President’s nominees to the Supreme Court receive the advice and consent of a majority of Senators. The standard to be used is not spelled out in the Constitution, but 200 years of tradition offers a guide. That guide, that standard, as the Constitution has been interpreted throughout our history, is the very same standard we should apply today to Judge Samuel Alito. By that standard, Judge Alito is well qualified.

Since graduating from Yale Law School in 1975, Judge Alito has had an exemplary legal career, serving as U.S. attorney, Assistant U.S. Solicitor General, and 15 years as a member of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. During that lengthy tenure in court, we have witnessed the benefit of Alito’s commitment to the rule of law and his commitment to an impartial review of the law and the facts of any given case.

As Alexander Hamilton noted in Federalist No. 78, if the courts are to be truly independent, judges cannot substitute their own preferences to the “constitutional intentions of the [legislative branch].”

Judge Alito clearly expressed during his confirmation hearings, and his judicial answers support his commitment to a impartial review, he would not impose his personal views over the demands of the law and precedent. I find that refreshing, I find that encouraging, and I find that a strong reason for supporting the nomination of Judge Alito.

I take great comfort in the fact that Judge Alito has received the unanimous approval of the American Bar Association’s committee that reviews judicial candidates. This is a committee that is greatly respected by the legal profession, as well as the general public, for their impartiality and demand and insistence on and careful watch over a quality judiciary. The American
Bar Association’s committee that reviews judicial candidates is interested and committed to a quality judiciary. Judge Alito not only received their unanimous approval, but he received their most qualified rating. That means that 6 of the 8 members of that committee gave Judge Alito their highest, most qualified rating. This should weigh heavily in favor of the confirmation of Judge Alito.

What we know—after the confirmation vote and interaction with Members of the Senate, after 3 days of testimony before the Judiciary Committee, and responses to a wide range of written questions by Senators after the hearings—is that Judge Alito is a humble and dispassionate judge, with a deep understanding and modest view of his judicial role in the governance of our Nation and respect for the limitations of precedent.

He has an awareness of the dangers of looking to foreign jurisdictions for governing our law, and a commitment to respecting the proper role of the courts in the interpretation of the law.

I am persuaded that Judge Alito will look to establish precedent he respect of stare decisis, and will use the Constitution and the law as his guideposts as opposed to any personal whim or political agenda.

There are those who say they are troubled by my perception that Judge Alito would not side with the "little guy" when deciding cases. Let me tell you, I am someone who, for 25 years, took clients’ matters to court, more often than not representing the little guy. But even with that experience, I am more committed than ever to the belief I had when I took a client to court, whether a little guy or a big guy. My hope, my prayer, was that my client would find an impartial judge.

It is not thinkable to me to suggest this standard today should be that we look for whether a judge will purposely lean in favor of one side of the litigation or another before selecting who our judges ought to be. Our judges must be impartial. Our judges must not be there for the little guy or the big guy. Judges need to take the facts and the law, interpret them and utilize them to reach a fair and just verdict, as dictated by the laws of our Nation, not because they favor a little guy, not because they favor a big guy. If the law and the facts happen to be on the side of the little guy, the little guy should prevail. If the law and the facts happen to be on the side of the big guy, then our system of justice demands that the big guy should prevail.

I love the analogy that Chief Justice Roberts used during the course of his confirmation. In selecting a Justice to the Supreme Court, he said we are looking for an umpire. We are not looking for a batter. We are looking for the umpire—the guy who will call the balls and the strikes fairly and impartially to all litigants before the Court.

Our long-held traditions in our system of justice demand fairness, demand integrity, demand judicial tempera-

J ustice Alito fulfills all of those requirements, and, if I am satisfied, he will make an exceptional Justice of the Supreme Court.

Judge Alito has made it abundantly clear that his personal views have absolutely no place in determining his judicial role in our constitutional structure. Rather, the Constitution, statutes, and controlling prior decisions, as applied to the facts of the case at hand, are the sole basis for his judicial determinations. I find that, as it should be, the correct standard to apply to a judicial nominee for determining his fitness for this high office.

At the end of the day, we know that elections have consequences. The fact that President Bush in the office of President now for a second term has also been an indication that President Bush deserves and should be allowed to have his pick for the Court.

It is our tradition that Presidents nominate, select, and fill vacancies to the Court, while the Senate’s role is one of advice and consent. We simply do not have the prerogative of deciding who it is we would prefer to see on the Court or who it is we might find more philosophically suitable to us or more to our liking. Our role as Senators is to provide the President with the advice and consent on the qualifications of those he seeks to put in this high office.

I see an evolving new standard before us. I heard from the members of the Judiciary Committee who did not support this nominee the setting of a brand new standard, and it is President Bush in the office of President now for a second term has also been an indication that President Bush deserves and should be allowed to have his pick for the Court.
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Let me say that this U.S. Senator and the West Virginia delegation in the House and in the Senate will do all that we can to prevent that. There is blame to be assessed in the wake of these tragedies and plenty of it to go around.

Let us begin with the coal company that operated the Sago mine, which had been issued 276 safety and health violations in 2004 and 2005. Let me try to put that into perspective. Could any automobile driver or any truckdriver rack up 276 tickets for reckless driving and still keep a license? What if someone had 276 mistakes on a tax return? One can bet that taxpayer would be looking at serious penalties and possibly time in a Federal prison. But here was a coal company with 276 Federal mine safety violations still operating. While some of these were minor transgressions, too many of them were "significant and substantial" or, simply put, very serious, and yet business went on as usual. It is quite probable that not one of these specific violations contributed to the explosion at Sago. But 276 violations is certainly indicative of a company's sloppy attention toward the well-being of its employees.

What about the agency that is responsible for making sure that coal operators comply with the spirit and the letter of the law—the Mine Safety and Health Administration. Let me be clear that I am not saying MSHA did not praise for the brave rescue teams that went into the Sago and Alma mines. Anybody who has been around a mine explosion knows the dangers that still lurk not just hours but days after such an accident. To go into a mine after a disaster, after an explosion, and to risk one's own life in an effort to save other lives, as these rescuers do, takes guts. It takes a love for one's fellow man.

Coal miners are a special breed. I have known miners go into a mine after an explosion, risking their own lives, realizing that another explosion might occur and another tragedy would follow in the wake of the first tragedy. Yes, MSHA is filled with good, well-intentioned, and dedicated professionals, but something is terribly wrong with the leadership at MSHA.

Consider that for 4 straight years, President Bush has proposed to cut the budget for coal safety enforcement below the level spent in 2000, the previous year, and for 4 straight years the Congress has had to struggle to partially restore those cuts. Some 190 coal enforcement personnel have been lost over the last 4 years through attrition, and they have not been replaced. The prior budget reflected by the Bush administration through MSHA's budget certainly are not indicative of a proper concern for the health and safety of miners.

On the day of the Sago disaster, 2 hours, perhaps—2 hours, with 60 golden minutes each, went by—before MSHA even knew about the explosion. It took another 2 hours before MSHA personnel arrived at the scene. It took 1½ hours before the rescue teams arrived. Another 5 hours passed before the first team entered the mine. The Mine Act requires that rescue teams be available to mines in the event of an emergency, and yet it took 10½ hours before the West Virginia rescue team began its effort at Sago.

A short 2 weeks later, similar horrors emerged from a second tragedy at the Aracoma Alma mine and, again, MSHA did not begin rescue efforts for 2½ hours. Something is incredibly wrong. It is obvious something is very, very wrong at MSHA. The rescue procedures for miners are woefully inadequate.

The Sago mine had been cited for 276 violations over the past 2 years, and yet the mine operator never paid a fine larger than $410 and often only paid a minimal $50 fine. Few people realize that even when a fine is assessed, the coal operator can negotiate the fine to a piddling amount.

Congress recognized a long time ago that mine safety and health depends on financial penalties that "make it more economical for an operator to comply" with the law "than it is to pay the penalties assessed and continue to operate." Why was it that only 17 of the 276 penalties assessed—whatever the amount of the fine—were enough to convince this company to take a hard look at safety for its employees.

The Sago mine was a habitual violator—a habitual violator. The Sago mine was being assessed only the minimum penalties allowed by the law. The maximum penalty could be $220,000 or $1 million, but it makes no difference unless MSHA is willing to impose and collect that maximum amount. Habitual violators must be brought to a state of fearing the consequences of a heavy fine to be paid when assessed. We have to get tough about enforcing the law.

At MSHA, complacent attitudes and arrogant rule at the top. At the Senate Appropriations Labor-HHS Subcommittee hearing on Monday, Acting MSHA Secretary David Dye was asked directly about the issue of communications technology: Why are the miners trapped underground not able to communicate with the rescue teams, and can rescue teams better locate trapped miners? Dye was asked directly if technology exists to correct these problems, and he stated for the record that such technology did not exist.

Now get that. Let me say that again. At this hearing, conducted by one of the finest Senators on either side of the aisle here, Republican Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania, at that record hearing, Acting MSHA Secretary David Dye was asked directly about the issue of communications technology: Why are the miners trapped underground not able to communicate with the rescue teams, and can rescue teams better locate trapped miners? Dye was asked directly if technology exists to correct these problems, and he stated for the record that such technology did not exist.

How about that. That statement proved to be utterly, utterly, utterly false. Minutes later, after Dye was asked if such technology existed, the subcommittee heard from a former MSHA Secretary, Davitt McAteer, who testified that such communications technologies were certified, and Mr. McAteer put tracking and communications devices on the table—on the table—right in front of the subcommittee.

Now, let me ask you that do say about the people leading this agency when they don't even know about the existence of lifesaving technology that ought to be in the mines? What does that say? Shame, shame on them. I am talking about the people leading the agency when they testified that they don't even know about the existence of lifesaving technology that ought to be in the mines. Why is the Acting Administrator of MSHA, charged with protecting the health and safety of coal miners, so abysmally ignorant of these technologies? The families of these miners and the Members of this Congress are owed an explanation.

In this day and age of cell phones, BlackBerrys, and text messaging, it is abysmally ignorant of these tele-communications technology was not available to the Sago and Alma miners. These weaknesses in mine emergency preparedness are unacceptable. Where is MSHA? Repeating the first question was ever asked in the history of mankind when God sought Adam in the Garden of Eden in the cool of the day. God said: Adam, where art thou? Well, where was MSHA? Where was MSHA? What is that agency waiting for?

Ask the leadership at MSHA. At Sago and Alma, we have seen the disastrous results of complacent attitudes at the top—at the top. A quick look at the list of rules approved and scuttled at MSHA in recent years—from regulation overweening mine emergency preparedness to improve mine rescue technology and communications. Perhaps one of the most important was to address the dwindling number of mine rescue teams. MSHA has ignored the report and its recommendations. The House and Senate Appropriations Labor-Help MSHA protect the safety and health of the miners. What happened? MSHA ignored the recommendations. Shame, shame on them.

Our Nation's coal miners are vital to our national economy. During World War I, coal miners put in long, brutal
hours to make sure that the Nation had coal to heat our homes, power our factories, and fuel our battleships. In World War II, American coal miners again provided the energy to replace the oil that was lost with the outbreak of that global conflict. During the oil boycotts and crises of the 1970s, our Nation once again called upon—yes, our Nation once again turned, yes, to the coal miners to bail the Nation out of trouble, and the coal miners did.

Coal produces over half of the electricity we use every day in these United States. Here is an example of it all round the ceiling here, the lights that are burning making it bright as day right here in this Chamber. That is coal. That is energy that comes from coal, burning coal—coal that is produced by hard, backbreaking labor in the dangerous mines. Coal is dug out, scratched out by the coal miner.

So today America’s coal miners provide electricity—the electricity right here—the electricity that lights the streets of Washington, New York City, Sacramento, and all over this country, and it heats our homes in winter, lights our homes in summer.

There could provide the key to our Nation’s future energy security. You can bet on those coal miners—and they are of a different breed, a special breed. If we made better use of this abundant natural resource, coal, we could reduce our country’s dangerous dependency on foreign oil.

We could make ourselves less dependent on the rule of despots, and less of a target for the fanatics and the terrorists of the Middle East.

God blessed our country. Yes, the Almighty who was there at the beginning blessed our Nation, especially West Virginia with an abundance of coal, and God provided us with the good, the brave, the hard-working coal miners to dig that coal and bring it from the bowels, the dark, the black, the darkness. The coal miners have never failed our Nation.

I know. I grew up in a coal miner’s home. I married a coal miner’s daughter. Her brother-in-law died from black lung. His father was killed under a slate fall.

We have lived—my family has lived—with coal miners. We have coal miners in our families. We have lost loved ones.

The test of a great country such as ours is how serious we are about protecting those among us who are most at risk, whether it be innocent children who need guarding from hunger and disease or our elderly and sick who cannot afford medication. Those men and women who bravely labor in such dangerous occupations as coal mining to provide our country with critical energy should be protected from exploitation by private companies with callous attitudes about health and safety.

That is why MSHA exists. That is why we created MSHA. That is why I was here when that agency was created.

But MSHA is just a paper tiger without aggressive leadership. If we are truly a moral nation, and I believe that we should, moral values must be reflected in government agencies that are charged with protecting the lives of our citizens. The last thing that we need is more arrogant attitudes from this administration and its officials. Such calumny abuses the public trust and results in the kind of loss of life that so grieves families today in Upshur and Logan Counties and all across my home State of West Virginia.

Madam President, in memory of the Sago and Alma Miners, and all those who labor and have labored in our nation’s coal mines, I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy of Homer Hickam, from the Sago Memorial Service on January 15, 2006, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Families of the Sago miners, Governor Manchin, Mrs. Manchin, Senator Byrd, Senator Rockefeller, West Virginians, friends, neighbors, all who have come here today to remember what has gone on before us, who ventured into the darkness but instead showed us the light, a light that shines on all West Virginians and the nation today:

It is a great honor to be here. I am accompanied by three men I grew up with, the rocket boys of Coalwood: Roy Lee Cooke, Emmett Strickland, and my wife Linda, an Alabama girl, is here with me as well.

As this tragedy unfolded, the national media kept asking me: Who are these men? And why are they coal miners? And what kind of men would still mine the deep coal?

One answer came early after the miners were recovered. It was revealed that, as his wife Linda said, he preferred to be shot in the head. He was killed under the very job he loved, but death can never destroy how they lived their lives, or why.

How and why these men died will be studied now and in the future. Many lessons will be learned. And many healing things will happen because of what is learned. This is right and proper.
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But how and why these men lived, that is perhaps the more important thing to be studied. We know this much for certain: They were men who loved their families. They were men who worked hard. They were men of integrity, and honor. And they were also men who laughed and knew how to tell a good story. Of course they could. They were West Virginians!

And so we come together on this day to recall these men, and to glory in their presence among us. Only a few short while. We also come in hope that this service will help the families with their great loss and to know the honor we wish to accord them.

No one might be said or done concerning these events, let us forever be reminded of who these men really were and what they believed, and who their families are, and who West Virginians are, and what we believe, too.

There are those now in the world who would turn our nation into a land of fear and the frightened. It’s laughable, really. How little they understand who we are, that we are still the home of the brave. They need look no further than right here in this state for proof.

For in this place, this old place, this ancient and glorious and sometimes fearsome place of mountains and mines, there still lives a people like the miners of Sago and their families, people who yet honor the old ways, the old virtues, the old truths; who still lift their heads from the darkness to the light, and say for the nation and all the world to hear:

We are the people of God. We are the people of faith. We stand together. We trust in God. We do what needs to be done. We are not afraid.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, could we have an agreement on the time? I apologize, I was supposed to have the time between 1:30 and 2. Since the Senator from Kentucky is waiting—I wanted, obviously, to be able to complete my statement—we have agreed to switch times. He will speak for 15 minutes, with the agreement that I would then speak after.

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

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of Samuel Alito’s nomination to the United States Supreme Court.

Judge Alito is supremely qualified. He is a model of fairness and judicial restraint. He will do a fine job on the Supreme Court.

I will vote for his nomination and any procedural measures necessary to confirm him on the Senate floor.

Confirmation of a Supreme Court Justice is one of the most important jobs we have as Senators.

This will be the second Supreme Court nominee I will have considered since coming to the Senate.

I take this responsibility very seriously.

I have spent time with Judge Alito and I have studied his background and record.

I closely followed his confirmation hearings in the Judiciary Committee. I can say without question that he should be confirmed.

I don’t buy the Judge Alito’s opponents argument that if he had not agreed with the Washington Post or the Louisville Courier-Journal newspapers very often. But even those papers agree that Judge Alito should be confirmed.

I first met Judge Alito this past fall. I did not know much about him when his nomination was announced by President Bush.

I reserved judgment about his nomination until I had a chance to meet with him.

From that meeting it became clear that I could support his nomination. And his performance at his confirmation hearing further solidified my support for his nomination.

We are all familiar with the basics of Judge Alito’s background.

He has been on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals for 15 years.

He has participated in several thousand cases and written several hundred opinions.

He attended top schools for both college and law school—Princeton and Yale.

I gather all of my colleagues would agree that those things are important and impressive—but they do not alone qualify him for the job.

There is a lot more to being qualified for the Supreme Court than pedigree and judicial experience.

Judicial philosophy and one’s approach to judging and the law are most important.

All these factors and more must be looked at and weighed before deciding if a nominee is fit for the job.

I have done so and it is clear to me that Judge Alito should be confirmed.
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They are also insulated from the political process to prevent undue influence from Congress or the President.

Does anyone here actually believe the framers of our Constitution insulated judges so they could enact policies without any political consequence?

Instead, the framers rejected proposals to give the courts any policymaking powers.

But that is not good enough for some who oppose Judge Alito. They are deficit Democrats who will make broad policy decrees from the bench.

They want liberal judges who will rule by dictating policies that fail at the ballot box.

They want activist judges. And Judge Alito is not an activist judge.

Judge Alito will stand up to the activists on the Supreme Court and help make sure the Court follows its proper and vital role.

The confidence of the citizens in the courts is harmed when the courts overstep their bounds.

Like Chief Justice Roberts, I am confident Judge Alito will only act within the Senate’s proper role.

And I am confident he will help restore the American people’s faith in our court system.

I press upon my colleagues to support this nomination.

I will vote for Judge Alito and whatever measures and procedures necessary to ensure he gets a final vote up or down.

I am proud to support him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to support Judge Samuel Alito’s confirmation to the Supreme Court of the United States. Judge Alito’s 15 years of experience on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals and his 15 years serving the Justice Department, including his position as U.S. attorney for the District of New Jersey, make him well prepared to be an Associate Justice on our Highest Court.

One of the best insights into Judge Alito’s judicial ability is gained from listening to his colleagues on the Third Circuit. Colleagues from both sides of the political aisle praise him for his judicial excellence. Judge Aldisert, a nominee of President Lyndon Johnson, stated before the committee:

“...I have to say that anyone who watched Judge Alito at his Senate hearing would agree that his professional competence and judicial temperament were certainly on display. I believe that showed very well why he will be confirmed as a Supreme Court Justice.”

The American Bar Association gave Judge Alito its highest rating. Most important, Judge Alito has a firm belief in the rule of law upon which our country is based. As he stated on the first day of his hearings, “No person in this country, no matter how high or how powerful, is above the law, and no person is beneath the law.” Judge Alito recognizes that, in our system, judges interpret the law, but should not create policy. He should not decide what they would like to have the law be; rather, they simply should determine what the law states.

He said on his second day of hearings: “...it is not our job to try to produce particular policy outcomes. We are not policymakers and we shouldn’t be implementing any sort of policy agenda or policy preferences that we have.

During the 2004 Presidential campaign, President Bush made it clear that he planned to nominate to the bench judges who would respect the rule of law, judges who would interpret but not legislate. In particular, he drew attention to his desire to nominate people who would strictly interpret the Constitution. Knowing Supreme Court nominations were on the horizon and knowing the President’s views, the American people re-elected President Bush.

With the previous nomination of Chief Justice John Roberts and now with the nomination of Judge Alito, the President is fulfilling his promise to the American people. Now it is time for the Senate to play its constitutional role in the nomination process to ensure the President’s nominee meets the high standards we set for members of the Supreme Court of our land. Judge Alito is extremely capable, he is highly qualified, and he deserves the support of this body.

I wish to also rebut one statement that was made earlier today. I believe Judge Alito was unfairly criticized for his opinion in Piroli v. World Flavors, Inc. This was a case involving a mentally disabled man who claimed he was sexually harassed at work. They have alleged that by ruling against the plaintiff in the appellate court, Judge Alito showed he is “results-oriented.” Their criticisms are unfair and misleading. Judge Alito was not even able to form an opinion on the merits of the case because the plaintiff’s lawyer presented an incomplete brief.

Judge Alito made clear in his dissent that had the plaintiff’s lawyer raised the argument in a minimally adequate fashion, he might well agree and join the majority in voting to reverse. He continued to say:

I would overlook many technical violations of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, our local rules, but I do not think it is too much to insist that Piroli’s brief at least state the ground on which reversal is sought.

It is very important to understand that an appellate judge cannot create the facts. The appellate judge cannot argue the lawyer’s case when he is not equipped with the facts or the reason for the request for a reversal. So I believe it is important that we set the record straight on that.

Judge Alito has shown by his manner during the hearing and his 15 years on the bench that he is fully qualified under the constitutional requirements and from every neutral observer with whom I have talked for this position. I hope there will not be further delay.

I am so hopeful that the people who would vote against him would at least let us have the vote. He has been thoroughly vetted. He has been thoroughly questioned. The Senate has fulfilled its constitutional role and I think by the end of this week we should allow Judge Alito to be able to start preparing for the very important cases that are going to come before the Court right away. Let him have the chance to be fully prepared and do his job. It is the least we should expect of the Senate. It is the responsible approach for the U.S. Senate. The Supreme Court and the people of America deserve no less.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for her remarks and her strong support of this very important American constitutional process, and the continued leadership she exercises in our party and in our caucus.

We know that elections have consequences. When President Bush ran for reelection, he stated plainly and often that if given the opportunity, he would nominate judges to the U.S. Supreme Court who strictly interpret the Constitution of the United States. True to his promise, the President nominated John Roberts to become the 18th Chief Justice of the United States. Just as true to his promise, he nominated Samuel Alito to serve as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

I was pleased that President Bush nominated Judge Alito, as were many other Members of this body. I reserved final judgment, as most of us did, until we saw the confirmation process proceed. I don’t take the Senate’s advice and consent role lightly. I didn’t want to encourage a rush to judgment.

The hearings have occurred, and I believe Judge Alito has served admirably. There were 18 hours and 700 questions, and there probably would have been a lot more questions if there
had not been the length of the questions, sometimes lasting as long as a half hour.

Anyway, I believe he is worthy of our support. As has been stated time after time on the floor, he earned the highest ratings of the American Bar Association.

Let me tell you what impresses me. Mr. President, probably as much as anything else. It is the strong endorsement Judge Alito got from the people who know him best. There is no body who knows people better than those who work for you. There is a very impressive list of former law clerks of Judge Alito writing to urge the Senate to confirm him. As they state in their letter:

Our party affiliations and views on policy matters span the political spectrum. We have worked for Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle and have actively supported and worked on behalf of all of the candidates.

And they go on to say in their letter:

That unites us is our strong support for Judge Alito and our deep belief that he will be an outstanding Supreme Court Justice.

That impresses me, as does the work the people who clerk alongside these judges every single day—and it is a very long list; it looks to me like there are 60 to 75 names on there—all supporting him. As they state, they are of all beliefs and party affiliations. There is no person or group of persons who know a judge better than those who clerked for him.

Finally, they go on to say:

It never occurred to us that Judge Alito had prejudged a case or ruled based on political ideology. To the contrary, Judge Alito meticulously and diligently applied controlling legal authority to the facts of each case after a full and careful consideration of all relevant legal arguments. It is our uniform experience that Judge Alito was guided by his profound respect for the Constitution and the limited role of the judicial branch.

That is what Judge Alito is all about from the people who know him best, other than his family. Frankly, that has a significant effect on my view of him. I will make one other comment. We are dragging out this process for no good reason. We all know what the outcome of the vote is going to be. We have other pressing business, including lobbying reform, which needs to be taken care of by this body. We have pending the issue of the PATRIOT Act. There are many issues we should be addressing and at least beginning to work on, rather than dragging out this process. I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle the side the aisle would see fit to bring this process to a close and let us vote on Judge Alito and move on to other pressing issues.

The fact that there will probably be a large number of votes on that side of the aisle against Judge Alito doesn’t upset me. It suddenly was it suddenly was it sudden for me. I didn’t agree with the judicial philosophy of Justice Breyer or Justice Ginsburg. I knew that Justice Ginsburg worked for the ACLU and held liberal views. But I also believe that elections have consequences. The President of the United States—at that time, President Clinton—nominated them as his selection. There were very few—a handful of votes against either Justice Breyer or Justice Ginsburg.

When there is a large number of votes against a highly qualified individual, it is a symptom of the rather bitter partisanship that exists in this body today, and I regret that very much. Some of these issues, such as Iran and their rapid acquisition of nuclear weapons, which spring to mind. We have to sit down in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect and work on these things. I will be very sad when I see this large vote against this good and decent American, but, more importantly, I will be upset because we continue to engage in the kind of partisanship which has even been ratcheted up lately on lobbying reform, when we should work to come up with a common approach and a common cure for a significant illness that afflicts this body and the Capitol today.

I hope we can finish this debate as soon as possible, vote on Judge Alito, and then move forward.

I thank my colleagues, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I suggest the unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to pick up where Senator McCain left off about the Alito nomination and what has changed between the Clinton administration and the President Bush 2 administration regarding judges.

The question I ask the body and really the country is, have the qualifications changed or are the people President Bush has chosen to nominate for the Supreme Court more inferior in terms of qualifications, temperament, and character than the people President Clinton did not choose? As individuals, is there a material difference in their legal experience? Are there any character flaws with these two nominees that did not exist with President Clinton’s nominees? If you can find an answer to the question other than no, I would like to hear about it. I would like someone to come to the floor and talk about how Justice Roberts and Judge Alito are not in the ball park as to qualifications, character, and disposition with Justice Breyer and Justice Ginsburg.

It is clear to me that President Bush picked two very well qualified people to serve on the Supreme Court when it came his time to choose a Supreme Court nominee. You don’t have to take my word for it. Seven judges testified before the committee who served on the Third Circuit with Judge Alito. They were nominated by Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, really a hodgepodge of nominees in terms of their source. These judges had a universal belief regarding Judge Alito, and that belief was that he is a great colleague, a good man, a judge’s judge, a great colleague before our committee to his defense.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD excerpts of these judges’ comments.

even try to proselytize. Rather, he expresses his views in measured and temperate tones.”

Judge Becker on working with Judge Alito up close: “There is an aspect of appellate judging that no one gets to see—no one but the judges themselves: how they behave in conference after oral argument, at which point the case is decided, and which, I submit, is the most critically important phase of the appellate judicial process. Hundreds of conferences, I had never once heard Sam raise his voice, express anger or sarcasm, or even try to proselytize. Rather, he expresses his views in measured and temperate tones.”

Judge Becker on Judge Alito’s intellect and open-mindedness: “Judge Alito’s intellect is of a very high order. He’s brilliant, he’s highly analytical and meticulous and careful in his comments and his written work. He’s a wonderful partner in dialogue. I think of things that my colleagues have missed. He’s not doctrinaire, but rather is open to differing views and will often change his mind in light of the views of a colleague.”

Judge Becker on whether Judge Alito is an ideologue: “The Sam Alito that I have sat with for 15 years is not an ideologue. He’s not a movement person. He’s a real judge deciding each case on the facts and the law, not on his personal views, whatever they may be. He scrupulously adheres to precedents. I have never seen him exhibit a bias against any class of litigation or litigants.

His credo has always been fairness.”

Chief Judge Scirica on Judge Alito’s personal character: “Despite his extraordinary talents and accomplishments, Judge Alito is modest and unassuming. His thoughtful and inquiring mind, so evident in his opinions, is equally evident in his personal relationships. He is concerned and interested in the lives of those around him. He has an impeccable work ethic, but he takes the time to be a thoughtful friend to his colleagues. He treats everyone on our court, and everyone on our court staff, with respect, with dignity, and with compassion. He’s known to his country and to his profession. But he is equally committed to his family, his friends, and his community. He is an admirable judge and an admirable person.”

Chief Judge Scirica on Judge Alito’s open-mindedness: “Like a good judge, he considers
and deliberates before drawing a conclusion. I have never seen signs of a predetermined outcome or view, nor have I seen him express impatience with litigants or with colleagues with whom he disagrees. I never saw him trimly dispose of an issue. He is attentive and respectful of all views and is keenly aware that judicial decisions are not academic exercises but have far-reaching consequences to the lives of Americans.

Judge Barry on Judge Alito’s service as U.S. Attorney: “The tone of a United States Attorney’s Office comes from the top. The standard of excellence is set at the top. Samuel Alito set a standard of excellence that was contagious—his commitment to doing the right thing, never playing fast and loose with the law, never taking a shortcut in service of the commonwealth’s interests. The emphasis on first-rate work, his fundamental decency.”

Judge Alisard on Judge Alito’s judicial independence: “Judicial independence is simply incompatible with political loyalties, and Judge Alito’s judicial record on our court bears witness to this fundamental truth.”

Judge Alisard on working with Judge Alito for 15 years: “We who have heard his probing oral arguments from those who have been privy to his wise and insightful comments in our private decisional conferences, we who have observed at first hand his impartial approach to decision-making, and his thoughtful judicial temperament and know his carefully crafted opinions, we who are his colleagues are convinced that he will also be a great Justice.”

Judge Garth on Judge Alito’s lack of an agenda: “I can tell you with confidence that at no time during the 15 years that Judge Alito has served with me and with our colleagues on the court and the countless number of times that we have sat together in private conference after hearing oral argument, has he ever told me anything that could be described as an agenda. Nor has he ever expressed any personal predilections about a case or an issue or a principle that would affect his decisions.”

Judge Garth on Judge Alito’s personality: “Sam is always and has been reserved, soft spoken and thoughtful. He is also modest, and I would even say self-effacing. And these are the characteristics I think of when I think of Sam’s personality. It is rare to find humility as high as his in someone of such extraordinary ability.”

Judge Gibbons on Judge Alito’s independence from the executive: “The committee members who are responsible for the recommendation that I support Judge Alito’s nomination because I’m a dedicated defender of the constitution and I think it was; some amazing amount of interviews conducted—a temperament beyond question; that he approaches each case without a bias, but he tries to find the best he can, looking through his philosophy of judging, to the right answer. This man who worked with him as a prosecutor, who have been his clerks, all have nothing but admiration for this man. So why will he get, at best, five or six Democratic votes? Why did Justice Ginsburg get 96 votes? I would argue she deserved 96 votes, but she was no better qualified than Judge Alito. The same things that were said about Justice Ginsburg, in terms of her temperament and her legal abilities, are being said about Judge Alito. Therefore, why do some members of our committee openly said things are different now than they were then. This is replacing Justice O’Connor. The
country is more divided. All I can say is, don’t start down a road that you will regret because Justice Ginsburg replaced Justice White, and if we are going to base our vote on Roe v. Wade, what somebody might do, then a pro-life Senator would have a very difficult time casting a vote for Justice Ginsburg because she openly embraced a constitutional right to abortion and supported public funding of abortion. That is a view held by many Americans. It is a legitimate view to have. But the point of view is clear that she was going to probably be different than Justice White because Justice White dissented in Roe v. Wade.

If that is the only reason you were voting for Justice Ginsburg, you knew with a high degree of certainty the balance of power on the Court would change when it came to that one issue.

Somehow back then people of a pro-life persuasion set aside and looked at the qualifications. She was never attacked, that I can find in the RECORD, for being the general counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, a left of center organization, from a conservative’s point of view, that embraced with which I personally disagree. But people understood there was a difference between lawyering and judging. I would argue forcefully that the unpopular cause needs the best lawyer. Instead of holding it against her for representing politically unpopular causes, causes with which I completely disagree, I would give her credit as a lawyer because the unpopular cause needs the best lawyers in the country. The more popular it is, the worse lawyer you can have because you are likely to win.

Something has changed, and I would argue that change is being driven by the political moment, not by the record and it has huge consequences for this country.

The Presidency is a political office. To become President, you have to go through a lot—a lot of commercials are run and a lot of scrutiny. To become a Senator, you have to go through a lot—a lot of commercials are run against you, and you go through a lot of scrutiny. We sign up for the process knowing what we are getting into.

Traditionally, judges who come before the Senate, the President to the body, do not have to mount political campaigns and have traditionally not been subject to political campaigns. The reason being there has to be one place in America where politics is parked at the door. How many people want their case decided by politics? I don’t; even if they agree with me I don’t because that is dangerous. We are running with warp speed toward a day when the judiciary is politics in another form. There is plenty of evidence. shouting the Republican Party is blameless, but when it comes to evaluating Supreme Court nominees, I would argue there has been a change from President Clinton’s term to the current time and that the model that Senator HATCH used with Justices Breyer and Ginsburg would be a good model for your vote on qualifications and where you do not use political attacks as the way to try to undermine the nominee.

I honestly challenge anyone in this body to say that in terms of legal ability, legal knowledge and personal character, there is a dime’s worth of difference between Roberts, Alito, Ginsburg, and Breyer. There is not. The record in Judge Alito’s case and in Judge Roberts’ cases shows beyond any doubt they are well-qualified lawyers who have practiced before the Supreme Court, who have the admiration of their colleagues, their associates, and those they have opposed in court, and that they are without any doubt historically the best lawyers.

You can take a record and make it what you want it to be for political reasons. You can take anyone’s life and snap and cut and cut and paste and make that life anything you want it to be in a political campaign. It can happen to me, it can happen to you, Mr. President, it can happen to any American because if you have been involved in the law as long as Judge Alito, you can cut and paste his life as a lawyer, as a judge, and as a person. I just ask that we reject the politics of cut and paste and we look at the entire record and the complete person.

If we look at the complete person, we find a good man who comes from a humble background and who has ascended to the highest levels of the law known in our country. If we look at him as a judge, we will find someone respected by his colleagues who is serious as a judge, who is analytical in his thought process, who is, by no means, an ideologue. If we step back, we see in Judge Alito one of the most qualified conservative judges in the land.

I end with this. Elections do matter. President Clinton earned the right from the American people to make two selections. He picked people of known liberal philosophies and inclinations to be on the Court. These are legitimate philosophies to embrace and to have. He picked extremely well-qualified people to be on the Court. They are on the Court now with an overwhelming vote.

President Bush and his nominees have been treated differently. I worry more about the future of the judiciary than I worry about President Bush because his time will come and it will go. He may have another pick. But what we are saying is we are going to forever change the way the Senate relates to the judicial confirmation process if we don’t watch it.

For someone such as Judge Alito to be rejected by 80 percent of the Democratic Senate, it is not healthy for the country because, quite frankly, he has earned a better showing than that. He has lived his life well.

He has been a good judge. He is a good man. His record, his colleagues, his associates, and everything he has done as a lawyer, judge, and person needs to be considered in its entirety—not for political ends for the moment.

This vote we are about to take in the next 20 minutes is going to determine the way the Senate works for a long time to come. My belief is it is going to change it for the worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today as the ranking member of the Democratic leader. I ask unanimous consent that the hour of Democratic time be controlled as follows: MIKULSKI, CLINTON, and KERRY up to 20 minutes each, and Senator NELSON of Florida up to 5 minutes.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to voice my opinion on the nomination of Judge Alito. I view this process with enormous seriousness. It is not like a political campaign. It is a Supreme Court.

Senators are called upon to make two decisions that are irrevocable and irretrievable. One is the decision to go to war and put our troops in harm’s way. A very serious decision. You can’t say the next day, Whoops, I made a mistake. The other is the confirmation of a Justice of the Supreme Court.

This vote will have an immense impact on future generations. Judge Alito is 55 years old. We can presume that he will be blessed with good health and will serve if confirmed for at least another 20 years. He will rule on thousands of cases, which themselves will be fought for decades to come in the courts. His decisions will affect the lives of virtually all Americans for generations.

This vote will have an immense impact because of who the judge is replacing. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, the first woman every appointed to the Supreme Court. Wow. She has been a terrific Justice of the Supreme Court, a historical figure indeed. She broke the glass ceiling of the highest Court in our land to become the first female Justice on the United States Supreme Court. Wow.

This vote will have an immense impact because of who the judge is replacing. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, the very first female ever appointed to the Supreme Court. Wow.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today as the ranking member of the Democratic leader. I ask unanimous consent that the hour of Democratic time be controlled as follows: MIKULSKI, CLINTON, and KERRY up to 20 minutes each, and Senator NELSON of Florida up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
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I word to the Court—not ego but intellectual rigor and integrity and independence. That is why she was such a key vote, and often her vote determined whether fundamental rights were protected or not often depended on Justice O'Connor’s vote.

When we pick the nominee to replace Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, I hope the President would have picked another woman. When he nominated Harriet Miers, I was shocked, stunned, and even repulsed by the vitriolic, vicious attack on Harriet Miers.

After Harriet Miers was withdrawn, who did they give us? Certainly, I think in all of the United States of America there was a qualified woman who could have been nominated to serve on the Court. It would have been nice if we had taken the time to find one, but I don’t know if they were really looking because if you seek you shall find.

Who did the President nominate? Judge Alito.

I want to be very clear at the outset: I am going to vote to oppose the confirmation of Judge Alito, and I do so for a variety of reasons.

One, I don’t know who the real Judge Alito is. Is this the Judge Alito who, when he applied for a job at the Reagan Justice Department, pandered to every right-wing cliche, message-driven focus group identified cause, attack affirmative action, one person, one vote, and all of the other things that the Justice Department will have serving on the Supreme Court? He says, No, I wrote that because I was applying for a job. Hey, what is he doing here right now in the confirmation process? He is applying for a job.

The process has occurred in the public and transparent arena.

But who is he? Is he a so-called new, moderate, mainstream, “Gee, I have always been in the middle” kind of guy or is he the person who applied to work at the Reagan Justice Department whose writings validate his pattern of thinking?

Judge Alito failed to answer too many questions during the confirmation hearing. Judge Alito refused to clarify his views and his philosophy. He has written many, many decisions as a Circuit Court Judge which are clearly out of the mainstream. He failed to clarify his positions on the constitutionally protected rights and settled law. It is also unclear if he will be able to keep his strong personal views from influencing his decisions on the highest court of the land. In the end, Judge Alito failed to answer too many questions; he appears to be out of the mainstream.

Let me tell you my criteria for deciding on a Justice—actually on any judge.

First, is the nominee competent? Judge Alito is competent. He has the highest rating of the American Bar Association. I listen to them very carefully because we consider them an important advisory group that weighs in to the Senate. I hope that same standard of looking to the American Bar is applied to other nominees in the future.

Second, does he have the highest personal and professional integrity? Perhaps he has this fairminded person; his doors are open, doesn’t believe in discrimination. I am troubled by his past membership in that very conservative Concerned Alumni for Princeton which Senator Frist and other prominent Princeton alumni repudiated. But Alito didn’t. He boasted about his membership when he applied with the Reagan administration. That was the same group that didn’t want women in Princeton; women weren’t their kind. There are a lot of other decisions he ruled on as a judge against people who “just weren’t our kind.” He claims he doesn’t remember that he was a member of this group, but he used it to get a job. Now he doesn’t want to use it to get this job.

The third criterion I have is will the nominee protect core constitutional values and guarantees that are central to our system of government?

Based on his own statements and testimony at the hearings, I have serious doubts about safeguarding civil rights, the right to privacy, and equal protection of the law for all Americans. That is the bedrock of our democracy. We are left to wonder if he will protect fundamental rights—the right to be free from unnecessary Government intrusion. In the hearings, he had many opportunities to let us know whether he would secure those rights.

Then he didn’t clear up uncertainties. He couldn’t clarify his record. He didn’t candidly and completely answer the key questions that would tell the American people where he stands on critical issues. With the hearings over I am still asking who is the real Judge Alito?

First, let’s take the issue of civil rights. One of the most important civil rights is the right to vote. Yet Alito left me with serious doubts on what his true views are. When applying for a job at the Justice Department, Alito said he strongly disagreed with the Warren Court on legislative reapportionment which became the bedrock principle of one person, one vote. That Supreme Court decision changed the face of America. It changed the face of how decisions were drawn up, and made sure, therefore, that people truly could be represented in legislative bodies.

He later said in the judiciary hearings that the one person, one vote doctrine is settled law. But he couldn’t explain why he wrote the other statement on his job application or why his opposition to the Warren Court’s decisions inspired him to go to law school.

Another fundamental principle is the ability for an individual to go to court when his or her rights are violated. An open courthouse door is fundamental to our democracy. Yet Judge Alito’s record is troubling. In one case involving race discrimination, a woman sued her employer for racial discrimination. Yet Judge Alito argued that the woman shouldn’t be allowed to present her case to the jury. The majority disagreed with Alito and allowed the woman to have her trial. In fact, the majority stated if they had applied Alito’s analysis Title VII of the Civil Rights Act would have been eviscerated.

There are many other cases in the area of civil rights and race relations I find troubling, that show Judge Alito is not a moderate or a mainstream judge as he seems to suggest he was at his hearings.

Then there is this issue of unchecked Executive power. The Supreme Court is the critical check on the other branches of government by making sure that the checks and balances in the Constitution are maintained. Increasing Presidential power has been a hallmark of this administration—not just the recent discovery about spying on Americans without warrants but also secret meetings with energy company CEOs, preventing disclosure of how executive decisions are made and so on.

When asked about whether or not this President could ignore laws passed by Congress, Alito would only say no one is above the law. That was not an answer—that is an empty slogan. We want to know how he would interpret the scope of executive branch power.

During his time on the bench, Judge Alito has been very deferential to the executive branch. His answers suggest he will continue to be. We need a member of the Supreme Court who is part of the Court and not part of the executive branch. We can’t afford to have the Supreme Court dupe us. We can’t afford to have the Supreme Court duck responsibility to check the executive branch.

So I am troubled about his position. We are at a benchmark in our society and this is the time when we have to be very clear on the executive powers and prerogatives.

Then there is the right to privacy. In the area of the constitutionally protected right of privacy, it is unclear what Judge Alito believes the Constitution protects. Again, I go back to the statements he made when he applied to work in the Reagan administration. He was 35 years old, so he wasn’t some kid who wasn’t sure about himself. He was exploring big theories and big ideas. He was exploring big theories. He was exploring big ideas. He was applying for a job at the Justice Department. You have to be a pretty experienced professional to even think you are qualified to apply for a job at the Justice Department. He was seasoned, and he was experienced, but he also wrote in that application that he was proud he would have argued that the Constitution does not protect the right to an abortion.
Let me say these are his words, not Senator Mikulski’s. Not only did he take the position to eliminate the rights in Roe v. Wade, he thought it was important that he emphasized it in his job application. Now let’s look at the things he presents a different view. The key question for Judge Alito on the constitutionally protected right to privacy was whether he considered Roe as being settled law.

Judge Roberts at his confirmation hearing debriefed Roe as being settled law. Repeatedly, Alito was also asked at the hearings if he considered Roe to be settled law and if he agreed with Judge Roberts. Alito refused to say. He repeatedly refused to answer how he would protect the fundamental and explicit right of privacy—implicit right of privacy—in our Constitution. He himself refused to clarify his previous dismissal of Roe v. Wade.

He refused to clarify also his position on why a woman should have to notify her husband in order to get an abortion. A requirement Justice O’Connor ruled was clearly unconstitutional. Nor would he elaborate on what the right of privacy actually includes over and above reproductive rights.

What is in it for general? Our Constitution is a living and breathing document. Twenty years ago when we talked about the rights of privacy, we didn’t know about the Internet, we didn’t know about data mining. We didn’t know the fact that we would have to have a national debate on national security and the right to privacy. Was it overreaching? Whendoes the U.S. Government become the Grim Reaper, or what do they need to do to protect us? These are real issues. They require real debate. They require independence in the judiciary to help set the boundaries and the parameters on what other branches of government can and can’t do.

Does every citizen want to be protected, when going to a library to borrow a book, from somebody snooping on you? If a citizen checks out a paper or a book because you want to know what the enemies of the United States think about our way of life or philosophy, for example, you check out books like ‘Mein Kampf’ or ‘Das Kapital’ because you want to know what our enemies thought, so you could be prepared to refute them with your own ideas on democracy, you don’t want the government watching on you. Yet, what happens if something gets triggered and something is sent over to the peepers at a Government agency about what you are reading.

Sure, we have to look out for terrorists, but should every book checked out of a library trigger the government spying on you? Do you want them listening while you talk to your girlfriend? Do you want them monitoring you and what church you go to? That is the position we are facing as a nation. We need to have mindful judges who help set the appropriate parameters to protect citizens against the predators in our society, to be sure our Government itself does not become a predator on the ordinary citizen’s privacy. These are big issues.

So we are left to ask, Where was Alito on the right to privacy? We do not have an answer. His answers clearly suggest that he will not protect this fundamental right. Issue after issue leaves me with great concern.

One last area of concern I want to talk about is Judge Alito’s apparent predisposition to rule against ordinary Americans. I look at the seat Judge Alito has been nominated to replace. It is a seat of moderation. Justice O’Connor represented mainstream America. She understood as a justice for the highest court in the land that her decisions impacted real people and their lives. Her decisions were not made in the abstract. Judge Alito has stated he looks at the facts of each case. Yet time and time again his decisions show support for big business, for the executive lives, with the not so much for everyday Americans. A justice of the Supreme Court must be able see through abstractions and understand the role of the law in the lives of all Americans not just the powerful and influential. A justice must be able to see the impact of a judicial decision just as Chief Justice John Marshall did over the Supreme Court “Equal Justice Under the Law” a reality for all Americans. That is also an important role for every Supreme Court justice. Judge Alito’s opinions, writings and answers suggest to me that he does not understand this role either.

I have given careful consideration to this nomination. I have carefully watched the Judiciary Committee hearings. I may not be a member of the Judiciary Committee, but I have paid close attention to the hearings and watched them on C-SPAN. I went over his past writings, his decisions as a judge and the testimony of others.

In the end, I have too many doubts about Judge Alito’s ability to mean on the Supreme Court, what he will mean for civil rights, our civil liberties, checks and balances on executive power, caused by what he said—and even more by what he refused to say. I am concerned he is out of the main-stream, that he is willing to say what he needs to say to get a job, that he is an ideologue and that his personal views will influence his decisions. It is not acceptable that Judge Alito has ex- pressed some who have believed that he did not write something or that his early writings were simply for a job application. What he believes is what he is. It will shape the Supreme Court for the next 20 years.

After careful review of the record before the Senate, I have too many doubts, too many unanswered questions. Doubts about his commitment to providing access to courts for Americans, ensuring appropriate checks and balances among the three branches of government; his commitment to privacy. The Supreme Court nomination is too important a decision to roll the dice; I am afraid I will come up with snake eyes. Therefore, when my name is called in the United States Senate for his nomination, I will vote no.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

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

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the Senator from Maryland. Once again, she evidences the rare combination of high intellect, quick wit, and a savvy understanding of what is important to the people she represents.

The nomination of Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr., to the Supreme Court of the United States is a matter of great, monumental importance to all—that is to say, to our children and to future generations of Americans.

I have spent a lot of time in my State over the last 2 weeks. I have traveled from one end of it to the other, from Long Island to Buffalo. I have to say, Judge Alito’s name is not on the lips of most of my constituents. They want to talk to me about the complex and confusing Medicare prescription drug benefit. They want to ask about the culture of corruption that seems to have taken over Washington under the Republican leadership. They have questions about their health care which is at risk, even if you are employed, or the pensions which seem to disappear with regularity these days. They are concerned about the day-to-day, bread-and-butter, table-top issues that we all live with.

I say this vote we are going to take in the Senate will end up having a great deal to do with how they live their lives, with their values, with the quality of life and liberty and pursuit of happiness available to Americans.

The Constitution commands the Senate provide the President with meaningful advice and consent on judicial nominations. I take this constitutional charge very seriously. I have carefully reviewed the committee’s hearings and Judge Alito’s extensive record. I have met with the judge. I have spoken with citizens on both sides of this nomination. I have concluded I cannot give my consent to his nomination to the Supreme Court.

The way I read American history is that the key to American progress has been the ever-expanding circle of freedom and opportunities that has been the common thread through all periods of our history—greater rights and greater responsibilities of citizenship and equality.

I believe we have made strides forward there have been vocal voices of opposition. There have been those who have wanted to go back. At those moments of profound importance to our
country, the Federal courts have been the guardians of our liberties, have stood on the side of greater freedom and opportunity.

We all know the famous cases cited as representing this forward march of progress: Brown v. Board of Education, which struck down the notion of separate but equal; Baker v. Carr, which invalidated discriminatory State voting apportionment schemes and paved the way for the concept of one man, one vote; Wisconsin v. Yoder, which recognized a right to privacy in the Constitution; Roe v. Wade, which established that women have a right to choose.

When I ran for the Senate, I told New Yorkers that I would only vote for judges who would affirm constitutional precedents, such as Roe and Brown and other landmark achievements and expanding rights and the reach of equality for all Americans. This is about more than what is very real. The American people are counting on us not to be a rubberstamp but counting on us to make sure the President’s nominee will not take us backward.

Time and time again, when given the choice, he has voted to narrow the circle, to restrict the rights Americans hold dear. Now is not the time to go backward.

Without the progress we have made in the past 230 years, without that expansion of the circle of equality and freedom and opportunity, I certainly would not be standing here, nor would a number of my colleagues. There would be no opportunities for women in public life.

But mine is hardly the only example. Voting rights would be restricted. Equal opportunities in education and in the workplace would not exist. And none of us would have a constitutional right to privacy. Simply put, our Nation would not be what it is today.

Our greatest strength has always been our commitment, generation after generation, with some fits and starts, to enlarging the circle of rights and equality. That great American commitment has had as its beacon the freedom of the American soul and the world. This nomination could well be the tipping point against constitutionally based freedoms and protections we cherish as individuals and as a nation. I fear Judge Alito will roll back decades of progress and roll over when confronted with an administration too willing to flout the rules and looking for a rubberstamp. The stakes could not be higher.

To be sure, Roe v. Wade is at risk, the privacy of Americans is at risk, environmental safeguards, laws that protect workers from abuse or negligence, laws even that keep machine guns off the streets—all these and many others are in peril.

I don’t believe millions of Americans are aware of that yet. This debate is carried on in Washington. It is at a high level of legalisms and debates about jurisprudence and the meaning of the Constitution. But I am confident the Supreme Court will have a dramatic effect on our Nation and on what we believe America stands for.

When I ran for the Senate, I told New Yorkers that I would only vote for judges who would affirm constitutional precedents, such as Roe and Brown and other landmark achievements and expanding rights and the reach of equality for all Americans. This is about more than what is very real. The American people are counting on us not to be a rubberstamp but counting on us to make sure the President’s nominee will not take us backward.

Time and time again, when given the choice, he has voted to narrow the circle, to restrict the rights Americans hold dear. Now is not the time to go backward.

Without the progress we have made in the past 230 years, without that expansion of the circle of equality and freedom and opportunity, I certainly would not be standing here, nor would a number of my colleagues. There would be no opportunities for women in public life.

But mine is hardly the only example. Voting rights would be restricted. Equal opportunities in education and in the workplace would not exist. And none of us would have a constitutional right to privacy. Simply put, our Nation would not be what it is today.

Our greatest strength has always been our commitment, generation after generation, with some fits and starts, to enlarging the circle of rights and equality. That great American commitment has had as its beacon the freedom of the American soul and the world. This nomination could well be the tipping point against constitutionally based freedoms and protections we cherish as individuals and as a nation. I fear Judge Alito will roll back decades of progress and roll over when confronted with an administration too willing to flout the rules and looking for a rubberstamp. The stakes could not be higher.

To be sure, Roe v. Wade is at risk, the privacy of Americans is at risk, environmental safeguards, laws that protect workers from abuse or negligence, laws even that keep machine guns off the streets—all these and many others are in peril.

I don’t believe millions of Americans are aware of that yet. This debate is carried on in Washington. It is at a high level of legalisms and debates about jurisprudence and the meaning of the Constitution. But I am confident the Supreme Court will have a dramatic effect on our Nation and on what we believe America stands for.
Reagan administration, he made the argument that Cabinet officials who are charged with authorizing illegal wiretaps of Americans in this country should be entitled to absolute immunity. At a time when this President and his political party stand accused of politicizing and mishandling the war on terrorism, we must demand from our judiciary a respect for the proper role of each of our three branches of Government. But Judge Alito’s excessive deference to Presidential authority, coupled with his flawed understanding of congressional authority, tells me he does not have the proper reverence for separation of powers.

What is worse is in supporting the expansion of the reach of Presidential power, Judge Alito also holds a harshly limited view of what the Governor can or should do to help ordinary Americans. Judge Alito said it all in 1996, when he was a young lawyer with the Reagan administration. He wrote an opinion that it is not the role of the Federal Government to protect the “health, safety and welfare” of the American people. Well, I guess that explains the inept, slow, and dangerous response to Hurricane Katrina. If you are not responsible to protect the health, safety, and welfare, why should you be held accountable when people suffer, when their Government leaves them neglected without any help?

Judge Alito has long advocated a limited congressional authority view. Now, if that were adhered to, it would undermine a whole host of civil rights protections, health and safety regulations, standards for protecting our air and water, food and drug quality regulations, laws regulating firearms as well as vital programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Since his appointment to the Third Circuit, Judge Alito has aggressively sought to promote this theory of limited congressional power. In 2003, he voted to invalidate parts of our Federal gun laws, arguing there was no evidence in the record to determine that Congress had the power under the Constitution’s commerce clause to enact legislation that regulated the sale of machine guns. In another case, Judge Alito wrote an opinion striking down Congress’s right to make a State agency comply with the Family and Medical Leave Act. And just 3 years later, the Supreme Court, with a similar sort of facts, reached precisely the opposite conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CLINTON. In several criminal cases, Judge Alito has shown blatant disregard for a constitutional right to be tried by an impartial jury—what any one of us would want if we or a loved one were ever in this position—chosen free of racial or gender prejudice. He has also narrowly construed other constitutional criminal procedure protections, arguing often in favor of granting law enforcement officials the greatest of latitude to conduct unauthorized searches and seizures.

Judge Alito’s opinions on these and many other topics remind us that judicial activism comes in many guises. Adapting an unnecessarily narrow view of the Constitution or of our laws to reach a desired outcome is a form of judicial activism that is no less offensive than subscribing to an overboard interpretation of the law in order to reach a specific result.

Judge Alito, if confirmed, may hold a seat on the Supreme Court for a generation—long after this President has left office. Perhaps through 8 to 10 Presidential elections, decades of progress would fall prey to his radical vision of civil rights, civil liberties, health and safety and environmental protections, but also fundamental rights such as the right to privacy. Our Federal Government could be transformed into one where Congress is largely irrelevant and the rules are made up as he goes. I do not believe Judge Alito’s vision of that America is what our Founders intended for us. He would take us backward, when it has never been more important to move forward together.

I sincerely hope my concerns about Judge Alito are unfounded, but I suspect they are not, and our children and grandchildren will pay the price. He has not demonstrated a proper respect for the rule of law, our Constitution, and the principles, freedoms, rights, and privileges that Americans hold most dear. I, therefore, cannot give my consent to his confirmation.

Mr. President, I am former Senator Specter and Leahy opposite this nomination be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN, Washington, DC, December 13, 2005.

DEAR SENATOR, NOW is strongly opposed to the elevation of Judge Samuel Alito to the Supreme Court of the United States, and with every passing day more information appears that reconfirms our opposition. We urge you to review his record, writings and judicial philosophy and join us in opposing his nomination.

Not only is NOW disappointed that President Bush has proposed to replace Justice Sandra Day O’Connor with yet another white male ultra-conservative, but we are deeply disturbed by the twenty-year track record that places Judge Alito on the far right of the judicial spectrum, especially when it comes to women’s and civil rights. If Samuel Alito is confirmed by the U.S. Senate, many of our fundamental rights and freedoms will be at risk and could well be lost entirely.

A bedrock principle for NOW is full Constitutional rights for women and at the heart of that is equal protection under the law for women when they deal with their reproductive health care and childbearing decisions. When applying for a position in the Reagan administration in 1985, Alito stated he was “particularly proud” of his work on cases arguing “that the Constitution does not give a right to abortion.” A document released later shows that Alito told his boss that two pending cases provided an “opportunity to advance the goals of overruling Roe v. Wade and, in the meantime, mitigating its effects.” These are not the actions of someone simply trying to please his boss, but proud convictions that we have no reason to believe have altered in the past two decades.

Also troubling is his proud outing of his membership in a Princeton alumni group that complained about the admission of women and the number of minority students on the elite college campus. How will Judge Alito deal with educational opportunity and Title IX? How will Judge Alito deal with pay equity and workplace policies as well as affirmative action and job benefit issues that disproportionately affect women? How will Judge Alito deal with challenges to federal legislation guaranteeing disability rights, lesbian and gay rights, and environmental protections, health and safety and occupational safety and health rights, prisoners’ rights, and workers’ rights, and also fundamental rights such as the right to privacy. Our Federal Government could be transformed into one where Congress is largely irrelevant and the rules are made up as he goes. I do not believe Judge Alito’s vision of that America is what our Founders intended for us. He would take us backward, when it has never been more important to move forward together.

Sincerely,

KIM GANDY, President.
Alito often favors a restrictive reading of the law, which results in the narrower interpretation of civil rights. Thus, individuals may be unable to enjoy the full reach of these protections at times. Strengthening the need for judicial restraint and discouraging judges from legislating from the bench, he has used these themes as a means to limit access of individuals to their day in court. And, he frequently argues to constrain the power of the courts and the power of Congress, with regard to binding state institutions that is that individual rights, courts, and Congress have less ability to hold states accountable to ensure compliance with the Constitution.

Judge Alito has taken a very restrictive approach in employment discrimination cases, resulting in few successes for plaintiffs. In his record as a judge on the Third Circuit, he has consistently been on the losing end of cases that protect the rights of women. In Planned Parenthood v. Casey, arguing to uphold burdensome restrictions and hurdles aimed at women seeking an abortion. The Supreme Court ultimately struck down these regulations, but he once underscored a desire to place new limits on a woman’s ability to make her own reproductive health decisions.

Judge Samuel Alito’s rulings on American’s civil rights, in particular, have furthered his support for increased power for the executive branch. As a lawyer in the Solicitor General’s Office in 1981, Alito wrote a memo supporting immunity and civil liability for cabinet officials who authorized illegal wiretaps of Americans due to national security concerns. Later, he co-authored a brief in the Supreme Court in which the government argued for absolute immunity—an argument rejected by the Supreme Court. In contrast, Justice O’Connor, writing for an 8-1 majority in the case of American-born detainee Yaser Esam Hamdi (Hamdi v. Rumsfeld), in which the court ruled that an American citizen seized overseas as an “enemy combatant” must be allowed a meaningful challenge to the factual basis of his her or her detention, said the court has “made clear that a state of war is not a blank check for the president when it comes to the rights of the nation’s citizens.”

After becoming a judge, Alito wrote in several opinions that would have reached the Supreme Court. In a 1985 job discrimination case, he held that the ability of workers to access medical services when needed. Meanwhile, Justice Alito’s stance on affirmative action in employment discrimination cases. The Supreme Court serves as a Justice that is willing to consider the full circumstances of the case at hand, not deny plaintiffs their right to be heard.

While Congress has made efforts to protect workers who need time off work to care for a sick family member or to heal from a long-term illness, Alito would make it harder for workers to challenge state employers for violating the Family & Medical Leave Act. In Planned Parenthood v. Casey, as well as his views on civil rights, the majority included there were enough questions about the employer’s motives and conduct to allow the plaintiff her day in court. Moreover, the majority opinion’s analysis would effectively eviscerate the antidiscrimination purposes of the law, by accepting the employer’s reasoning without adequate review to determine whether racial bias influenced the hiring decision. They stressed that what mattered was not whether the company was seeking the “best” candidate, but “whether a reasonable factfinder could conclude that Bray was not deemed the best because she is Black.” In his fifteen years on the bench, Judge Alito has almost never ruled for African-American plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases. The Supreme Court serves as a Justice that is willing to consider the full circumstances of the case at hand, not deny plaintiffs their right to be heard.

While Congress has made efforts to protect workers who need time off work to care for a sick family member or to heal from a long-term illness, Alito would make it harder for workers to challenge state employers for violating the Family & Medical Leave Act. In Planned Parenthood v. Casey, as well as his views on affirmative action in employment discrimination cases. The Supreme Court serves as a Justice that is willing to consider the full circumstances of the case at hand, not deny plaintiffs their right to be heard.

While Congress has made efforts to protect workers who need time off work to care for a sick family member or to heal from a long-term illness, Alito would make it harder for workers to challenge state employers for violating the Family & Medical Leave Act. In Planned Parenthood v. Casey, as well as his views on civil rights, the majority included there were enough questions about the employer’s motives and conduct to allow the plaintiff her day in court. Moreover, the majority opinion’s analysis would effectively eviscerate the antidiscrimination purposes of the law, by accepting the employer’s reasoning without adequate review to determine whether racial bias influenced the hiring decision. They stressed that what mattered was not whether the company was seeking the “best” candidate, but “whether a reasonable factfinder could conclude that Bray was not deemed the best because she is Black.” In his fifteen years on the bench, Judge Alito has almost never ruled for African-American plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases. The Supreme Court serves as a Justice that is willing to consider the full circumstances of the case at hand, not deny plaintiffs their right to be heard.

While Congress has made efforts to protect workers who need time off work to care for a sick family member or to heal from a long-term illness, Alito would make it harder for workers to challenge state employers for violating the Family & Medical Leave Act. In Planned Parenthood v. Casey, as well as his views on civil rights, the majority included there were enough questions about the employer’s motives and conduct to allow the plaintiff her day in court. Moreover, the majority opinion’s analysis would effectively eviscerate the antidiscrimination purposes of the law, by accepting the employer’s reasoning without adequate review to determine whether racial bias influenced the hiring decision. They stressed that what mattered was not whether the company was seeking the “best” candidate, but “whether a reasonable factfinder could conclude that Bray was not deemed the best because she is Black.” In his fifteen years on the bench, Judge Alito has almost never ruled for African-American plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases. The Supreme Court serves as a Justice that is willing to consider the full circumstances of the case at hand, not deny plaintiffs their right to be heard.

While Congress has made efforts to protect workers who need time off work to care for a sick family member or to heal from a long-term illness, Alito would make it harder for workers to challenge state employers for violating the Family & Medical Leave Act. In Planned Parenthood v. Casey, as well as his views on civil rights, the majority included there were enough questions about the employer’s motives and conduct to allow the plaintiff her day in court. Moreover, the majority opinion’s analysis would effectively eviscerate the antidiscrimination purposes of the law, by accepting the employer’s reasoning without adequate review to determine whether racial bias influenced the hiring decision. They stressed that what mattered was not whether the company was seeking the “best” candidate, but “whether a reasonable factfinder could conclude that Bray was not deemed the best because she is Black.” In his fifteen years on the bench, Judge Alito has almost never ruled for African-American plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases. The Supreme Court serves as a Justice that is willing to consider the full circumstances of the case at hand, not deny plaintiffs their right to be heard.
affirmative action even in cases of intentional, on-going and "egregious racial discrimination." Alito signed a brief arguing the extraordinary theory that relief in Title VII cases is limited only to "victi-
able victims of discrimination," contra-
dicting an earlier view of the Equal Employ-
ment Opportunity Council (EEOC) itself. The Supreme Court rejected Alito’s argument, stating that affirmative action remedies should be ordered by a court as a remedy for past discrimination even though the beneficiaries may be non-victims." Furthermore, in the 1970s and 1980s Alito was a member of the so-called Alito's dissenting opinion in the case of Garrett v. Litton Systems, Inc., a case involving a suit by a non-victim, African-American woman against her employer. Alito argued that the court should not have granted relief to the non-victim, pointing out that the plaintiff had not suffered any injury because she was not employed by the defendant. Alito's argument was based on the principle that only those who have suffered a direct injury should be able to bring a lawsuit, and that non-victims should not be able to rely on the legal remedy of affirmative action.
In nominating Samuel Alito after Harriet Myers withdrew from consideration, President Bush chose to put political expediency ahead of the rights and well-being of this nation's women and girls. Mr. Bush's right-wing base clamored for rejection of Ms. Myers because, as conservative as she is, they felt she was not 100 percent sure about their issues. Samuel Alito, however, is apparently their man.

Judge Alito has a long record demonstrating hostility to women's reproductive rights. In the 1980's, he repeatedly advocated the overturning of Roe v. Wade. In the 1990's, as an assistant attorney general of the United States, he wrote a Pennsylvania statute requiring women to notify their husbands before having an abortion—a position rejected by Justice O'Connor in Planned Parenthood v. Casey. Nowhere in his writings, however, does he express any concern that the days of back-alley abortions could return if women do not have safe, legal means to terminate unwanted pregnancies. Nor have we been able to find any statement of concern, in any of his writings, for women's fundamental right to be in control of their own reproductive health decisions.

Indeed, Judge Alito has ever expressed hostility to contraception. In 1985, as a Justice Department attorney, he wrote that some forms of birth control are "abortionists," and saw no constitutional problem with a state law restricting women's access to contraceptive counseling. These organizations have long argued that the IUD and some birth control pills are "abortion promoters," to the same kinds of restrictions that may be placed on women's access to abortion—because they may prevent a fertilized egg from becoming implanted on the uterine wall. This view runs counter to accepted medical understanding, which is that pregnancy does not begin until after implantation. Yet it is the view embraced by Samuel Alito.

Judge Alito's opinions demonstrate an abiding deference to the powerful at the expense of ordinary people. He has argued, in cases such as Sheridan v. DuPont and Bray v. Marriot Hotels, for erecting higher and higher procedural hurdles that would prevent victims of employment discrimination from being able to present their case to a jury. He argued, in Doe v. Groody, to uphold a police strip search of a woman and her ten-year-old daughter even though they were not named in the search warrant and were simply at home when the house was searched. He ruled, on all but one issue, against a female police officer who was subjected to two years of harassment by her Third Circuit colleagues, and eight other circuit courts to date, have disagreed with him. In another case, Chittister v. Department of Community and Economic Development, Judge Alito wrote an opinion that barred state employees from suing for damages when their employers sought to take medical leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). A 6-3 majority of the Supreme Court, including even Justice Rehnquist, subsequently upheld applicable legal standards to urge overturning the judge verdict, inappropriately criticizing the employment for its actions, and, standing in for the jury, downplayed the plaintiff's evidence. Alito also dissented in Bray v. Marriott Hotels, a ruling of diminution of rights that would have prevented the plaintiff from bringing her case before a jury by giving the employer the benefit of the doubt. The majority said that, under his approach, "Title VII [of the Civil Rights Act of 1964] would be eviscerated."

Judge Alito's publicly available record does not reveal his views on the constitutional protection against sex discrimination under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. But in his 1985 job application he expressed support for at least some of the central legal tenets of the Reagan Administration, and the Justice Department under Attorney General Ed Meese favored the "originalist" approach to constitutional interpretation advocated by Robert Bork, which would permit almost any gender-based distinction to escape government policy. Judge Alito's views in this area must be carefully explored at his confirmation hearing.

Throughout his career, Judge Alito has taken positions and issued rulings detrimental to women in other areas of the law, including through his membership in an organization that was openly hostile to the admission of women and minorities to his alma mater, Princeton; his participation in cases where the Solicitor General argued against affirmative action policies; his vote to uphold a strip search of a woman and her ten-year-old daughter, even though they were not named in a search warrant; and his decision in a case brought by Iran's Groody, his opinion in Sabree v. Richman strongly suggesting that if he were to join the Supreme Court, he would change the law to limit, and potentially preclude, the ability of individuals to enforce federal rights such as rights to Medicaid, public housing, child support enforcement, and public assistance. In his decision in a case brought by an Iranian woman who asserted that if she returned to Iran she would be persecuted for her religious beliefs, Judge Alito has made it clear that he does not have the skills to serve on the Bench.

This is a watershed moment for women's legal rights. In recent years, the Supreme Court has decided cases affecting women's legal rights by a narrow margin. In Sandra Day O'Connor, the first woman on the Supreme Court, often has cast the decisive vote.
in these cases. With the retirement of Justice O'Connor, the Court will lose not only its first female Justice, but also the Justice whose vote often has been pivotal on issues critical to women. Judge Alito's record demonstrates that if he is confirmed to the Supreme Court, he is likely to eviscerate core rights that American women rely upon, and shift the ideological balance of the Court dramatically to the right. And we need to consider is the impact that a nominee whose views will undermine a woman's right to privacy; a man who has occupied the center of balance on the Supreme Court, he is likely to eviscerate core rights that American women rely upon, and shift the ideological balance of the Court dramatically to the right. And we need to consider is the impact that a nominee whose views will undermine a woman's right to privacy; a man who has occupied the center of balance on the Supreme Court, he is likely to eviscerate core rights that American women rely upon, and shift the ideological balance of the Court dramatically to the right. And we need to consider is the impact that a nominee whose views will undermine a woman's right to privacy; a man who has occupied the center of balance on the Court.

So this is the contrast. We are being asked to confirm a nominee who will shift the ideological balance of the Court dramatically to the right. And many people are cheering for that.

We are being asked to confirm a nominee whose views will undermine a balance of power that I believe, and many others believe, literally keeps our country strong, a balance of power that helps to bring people together rather than divide them, that helps to apply the Constitution to people in all walks of life, simply those with power and privilege.

For the reasons of this track record: the of his writings in the Justice De-
and Thomas.” Apparently, Mr. Buchanan believes that the Alito nomination demonstrates the President's change of heart. He heralded the nomination as one that would unite and rally the base, a nomination for the base of the country.

They say you can tell a lot by somebody's friends. These three individuals are consistently on the furthest edge of the ideological spectrum. Their positions rarely advance the interests of average working folk in America. So perhaps it comes as no surprise that these folks have jumped to support Judge Alito.

After reviewing more than 400 of Judge Alito's opinions, law school professors at Yale concluded:

In the area of civil rights law, Judge Alito consistently has used procedural and evidentiary standards to rule against female, minority, age, and disability claimants... Judge Alito seems relatively willing to defer to the claims of employers and the government over those of advancing civil rights claims.

Similarly, a Knight Ridder review of Judge Alito's opinions concluded that Judge Alito "has worked quietly but resolutely to create a conservative legal agenda into the fabric of the Nation's laws" and that he "seldom sided with a criminal defendant, a foreign national facing deportation, an employee alleging discrimination, or consumers trying to buy a business."

After reviewing 221 of Judge Alito's opinions in divided cases, the Washington Post concluded that Judge Alito is "clearly tough minded... having very little sympathy for those asserting rights against the government." The pattern is clear, and I think it is unacceptable.

I don't think you should put somebody on the Court who makes access to justice in the United States harder and more elusive for people who already face incredible obstacles when trying to have their voices heard in court. I don't think we should put somebody on the Court who will fail to serve as an effective check on excessive Executive power.

If this pattern is not enough, as has been described by others, then all we have to do is look at some individual cases. In Sheridan v. E.I. duPont De Nemours and Company, Judge Alito wrote a lone dissent opposed by all of the other judges on the court, eight of whom were Republicans. His opinion would have made it more difficult for victims of discrimination to sue their employers.

Applying a similarly high standard of proof, one that the majority believed would eviscerate the protections of title VII, Judge Alito dissented from a decision to allow a racial discrimination claim to go to trial in Bray v. Marriott Hotels.

These are just cases where people were trying to have their rights adjudicated, and disagreeing with his colleagues, including Republican-appointed judges, Judge Alito said no.

What is the practical impact of these decisions? Simple: They keep victims of discrimination from having their day in court.

If it is not enough to see this kind of insensitivy toward the victims of discrimination, evidenced in those judicial opinions, in his 1985 job application to President Reagan's Justice Department, Judge Alito wrote that his interest in constitutional law was driven in part by a disagreement with Warren Court decisions. He said:

[The] decisions which established the principle of one person, one vote. And he said that he was "particularly proud" of his work to end affirmative action programs.

Judge Alito's hostility to individual rights isn't limited to civil rights. He consistently excuses government intrusions into personal privacy, regardless of how egregious or excessive they are. In Doe v. Groody, for example, he dissented from an opinion written by then-Judge Michael Chertoff because he believed that the strip search of a 10-year-old was reasonable. He also thought the Government should not be held accountable for shooting an unarmed boy who was trying to escape without a stolen purse or even for forcibly evicting farmers from their land in a civil bankruptcy proceeding where there was no show of resistance from those farmers. He believed a show of force from the enforcers was reasonable.

This pattern of deference to power is reinforced by a speech he gave as a sitting judge to the Federalist Society just 5 years ago.

In that speech, Judge Alito "preached the gospel" of the Reagan administration's Justice Department, the theory of a unitary executive. And though in the hearings Judge Alito attempted to downplay the significance of this theory by saying it didn't address the theory of the executive branch but, rather, addressed the question of who controls the executive branch, don't be fooled. The unitary executive theory has everything to do with the scope of Executive power.

In fact, even Stephen Calabresi, one of the fathers of the theory, has stated that "[t]he practical consequences of the theory are dramatic. It renders unconstitutional independent agencies not just in the administrative sense, but before the Court, that Congress would lose the power to protect public safety by creating agencies like the Consumer Products Commission, which ensures the safety of products on the marketplace, or the Securities and Exchange Commission which protects Americans from corporations such as Enron. And who would gain the power? The Executive, the President.

Carried to its logical end, the theory goes much further than simply invalidating independent agencies. The Bush administration has already used this theory to justify its illegal domestic spying program and its ability to torture detainees. The administration seems to view this theory as a blank check for Executive overreaching.

Judge Alito's endorsement of the unitary executive theory is not the only cause for concern. In 1986, while working at the Justice Department, he endorsed the idea that signing statements could be used to influence judicial interpretation of legislation. His premise was that the President's understanding of legislation is just as important in determining legislative intent as Congress's, which is absolutely startling when you look at the history of legislative intent and of the legislative branch itself. President Bush has taken the practice of issuing signing statements to an extraordinarily new level. Most recently, he used a signing statement to reserve the right to ignore the ban on torture that Congress overwhelmingly passed. He also used signing statements to attempt to apply the law restricting habeas corpus review of enemy combatants, a very disturbing understanding in Congress that it would not affect cases pending before the Supreme Court at the time of passage.

The signing statements have been used to specifically negate or make an exception for Congress. Authorizing the Bush administration to ignore Congress's will is absolutely astounding. His administration is reserving the right to ignore those laws it doesn't like. Only one thing can hold this President accountable, and it is called the Supreme Court. Given Judge Alito's endorsement of the unitary executive and his consistent deference to government power, I don't think Judge Alito is prepared to be the kind of check we need.
hearings, Judge Alito stated these statements were accurate reflections of his views in 1985. But what is more disturbing is what he refused to say. He refused to say his views have changed, that he accepted Roe v. Wade as settled law. As Chief Justice John Roberts did during his confirmation hearings. In other words, Judge Alito refused to give any assurances that his concept of the Constitution’s protected liberty is consistent with mainstream America’s.

I received Judge Alito’s personal list of names he is going to keep an open mind, but I don’t think any of us can be reassured by those words. We heard those very same words before. Justice Thomas repeatedly told the Judiciary Committee he would keep an open mind on this issue. But we all know that once safe on the Supreme Court, Justice Thomas voted to overturn Roe v. Wade months later, writing a dissent in Casey that likened abortion to polygamy, sodomy, incest, and suicide. Given Justice Thomas’s record, you can almost imagine Karl Rove whispering to Judge Alito: Just say you have an open mind; say whatever it takes.

We cannot rely on these empty platitudes and we seriously cannot rely on any promises of openness or independence from the Judiciary Committee, particularly when they are absent an acknowledgment of what is or what is not a settled law, particularly when the nominee’s entire professional history suggests that his views differ, particularly when the past promises of that very nominee have already been rendered meaningless by his actions once safely on the bench. In Judge Alito’s 1990 Judiciary Committee hearings, he promised that he would recuse himself in any cases involving the Vanguard Company given his ownership of Vanguard mutual funds. In his Supreme Court hearings, he admitted he could not remember having put Vanguard on his permanent recusal list. We know it did not appear on his 1993, 1994, 1995, or 1996 list. So how do we know he kept his word to the Judiciary Committee? We don’t. How can we trust him now? We can’t.

I am deeply concerned about where we are heading with this ideological choice for the Court. I am deeply concerned about maintaining the integrity of our constitutional rights and liberties. I fear that the most disadvantaged by the political fray so their decisions will be fair and unbiased. They must judge cases with impartiality and open-mindedness, and ensuring our liberties. They are given the critical role that the Supreme Court plays in safeguarding the rights of minorities. Oftentimes it is the Court to which minorities must turn for protection from discriminatory laws and practices. It is therefore important that nominees are sent to the Senate who work hard to enact legislation and ensure equality within our society, we fear our work, and the contributions of our colleagues who served before us, will be dismantled with the confirmation of Judge Samuel Alito to the U.S. Supreme Court.

We believe that Judge Alito poses a direct threat to the rights of women in America. As the attached memorandum details, Judge Alito has a long record of extreme views on women’s reproductive health, sexual and workplace discrimination, the Family Medical Leave Act and civil rights. He has worked to thwart established precedent and has affiliated himself with radical organizations that have actively sought to keep women and minorities from advancing educationally and economically.

Under the scrutiny of the nomination process, it is not surprising that Judge Alito now disavows his positions on issues important to women and families in order to secure confirmation votes. But his record speaks to his true views and it speaks loudly. Rather than offering a balanced successor to the moderates on the Supreme Court Justices, Judge Alito’s nomination radically tips the scales of justice against women. As guardians of the Constitution, Supreme Court Justices play a key role in protecting and ensuring our liberties. They are given lifetime tenures and are expected to stay above the political fray so their decisions will be fair and unbiased. They must judge cases with impartiality and open-mindedness, and they must respect settled law.

You have a constitutional duty to provide advice and consent that the Court has on the lives of our citizens. We are equally confident that you understand the critical role that the Supreme Court has played in safeguarding the rights of minorities. Oftentimes it is the Court to which minorities must turn for protection from discriminatory laws and practices. It is therefore important that nominees are sent to the Senate who work hard to enact legislation and ensure equality within our society, we fear our work, and the contributions of our colleagues who served before us, will be dismantled with the confirmation of Judge Samuel Alito to the U.S. Supreme Court.

We believe that Judge Alito poses a direct threat to the rights of women in America. As the attached memorandum details, Judge Alito has a long record of extreme views on women’s reproductive health, sexual and workplace discrimination, the Family Medical Leave Act and civil rights. He has worked to thwart established precedent and has affiliated himself with radical organizations that have actively sought to keep women and minorities from advancing educationally and economically.

Under the scrutiny of the nomination process, it is not surprising that Judge Alito now disavows his positions on issues important to women and families in order to secure confirmation votes. But his record speaks to his true views and it speaks loudly. Rather than offering a balanced successor to the moderates on the Supreme Court Justices, Judge Alito’s nomination radically tips the scales of justice against women. As guardians of the Constitution, Supreme Court Justices play a key role in protecting and ensuring our liberties. They are given lifetime tenures and are expected to stay above the political fray so their decisions will be fair and unbiased. They must judge cases with impartiality and open-mindedness, and they must respect settled law.

You have a constitutional duty to ensure that the highest court is not stacked against the hard fought rights that protect women across the country. When you consider the nomination of Judge Alito to the U.S. Supreme Court, we hope you will reflect on the milestones in women’s rights and determine that America cannot afford to abandon these fundamental rights. We urge you to review the attached memorandum which details many of the disturbing examples of Judge Alito’s extreme views of women’s rights and consider that this lifetime appointment will have detrimental consequences for American women, and oppose the confirmation of Judge Alito as the next U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

Sincerely,


HON. ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

HON. PATRICK LEAHY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPECTER AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY: As women Members of Congress who work hard to enact legislation and promote policies that protect women and ensure equality within our society, we fear our work, and the contributions of our colleagues who served before us, will be dismantled with the confirmation of Judge Samuel Alito to the U.S. Supreme Court.

We believe that Judge Alito poses a direct threat to the rights of women in America. As the attached memorandum details, Judge Alito has a long record of extreme views on women’s reproductive health, sexual and workplace discrimination, the Family Medical Leave Act and civil rights. He has worked to thwart established precedent and has affiliated himself with radical organizations that have actively sought to keep women and minorities from advancing educationally and economically.

Under the scrutiny of the nomination process, it is not surprising that Judge Alito now disavows his positions on issues important to women and families in order to secure confirmation votes. But his record speaks to his true views and it speaks loudly. Rather than offering a balanced successor to the moderates on the Supreme Court Justices, Judge Alito’s nomination radically tips the scales of justice against women. As guardians of the Constitution, Supreme Court Justices play a key role in protecting and ensuring our liberties. They are given lifetime tenures and are expected to stay above the political fray so their decisions will be fair and unbiased. They must judge cases with impartiality and open-mindedness, and they must respect settled law.

You have a constitutional duty to ensure that the highest court is not stacked against the hard fought rights that protect women across the country. When you consider the nomination of Judge Alito to the U.S. Supreme Court, we hope you will reflect on the milestones in women’s rights and determine that America cannot afford to abandon these fundamental rights. We urge you to review the attached memorandum which details many of the disturbing examples of Judge Alito’s extreme views of women’s rights and consider that this lifetime appointment will have detrimental consequences for American women, and oppose the confirmation of Judge Alito as the next U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

Sincerely,
Grace F. Napolitano,
Chair, Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Charles A. Gonzalez,
Chair, CHC Civil Rights Task Force.
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Mr. KERRY. I yield the floor and I support the school admissions (Grutter v. Bollinger) and other cases where the Court has allowed race to be considered as a factor to rectify discrimination. As we approach re-election of the Voting Rights Act in 2007, the Congressional Black Caucus cannot afford to forget that the 5-4 cases also include redistricting cases such as Hunt v. Cromartie.

A critical election year of accountability for the Congress must begin with how members of the Senate vote on this nominee. All the evidence have shown how the Supreme Court has over the years and, candidly, is exactly the kind of Justice this country needs at this time and, candidly, is exactly the kind of Justice this country, for the most part, has had, in keeping with its constitutional traditions over the last 200-plus years.

Judge Alito is not from Pennsylvania, although he claims to be a Phillie fan, which is fine by me. I some-what prefer the Pirates, being from

civil rights complainants, Pittsburgh police officers who sued alleging reverse discrimination, and in another he ruled in favor of a mentally disabled employee. Alito’s hostility to the Voting Rights Act and other civil rights laws, evident in his efforts to restrict Congress from taking measures to protect voting rights, has been underscored by his role in the Nominees Committee to change our view that Judge Alito should not be confirmed.

If the Senate does work on fed-eral statutes in many areas of American life, it will find unacceptable Judge Alito’s record as a frequent dissenter in commerce clause and other cases involving federal legislation

does not follow the “peremptory challenges” by the prosecution of bilingual prospective jurors because of concerns that ability to understand Span-

The evidence is too clear to leave any doubt about where Judge Alito would, for example, on affirmative action as in which Justice O’Connor has been the deciding vote. Among these cases are the University of Michigan case upholding affirmative action in law school admissions (Grutter v. Bollinger) and other cases where the Court has allowed race to be considered as a factor to rectify discrimination. As we approach re-election of the Voting Rights Act in 2007, the Congressional Black Caucus cannot afford to forget that the 5-4 cases also include redistricting cases such as Hunt v. Cromartie.

A critical election year of accountability for the Congress must begin with how members of the Senate vote on this nominee. All the evidence have shown how the Supreme Court has over the years and, candidly, is exactly the kind of Justice this country needs at this time and, candidly, is exactly the kind of Justice this country, for the most part, has had, in keeping with its constitutional traditions over the last 200-plus years.

Judge Alito is not from Pennsylvania, although he claims to be a Phillie fan, which is fine by me. I some-what prefer the Pirates, being from
Pittsburgh. I certainly respect him. He comes from the Third Circuit, which includes the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I have had an opportunity to talk to many of his colleagues on the court, Republicans and Democrats. Both parties, Republicans and Democrats, say they are impressed with him. Everyone I have spoken to, and I have spoken to several—have praised him in the highest terms possible. Colleagues of his have stepped forward and have used terms of respect you don’t often hear. Unfortunately, you don’t often hear around this body—certainly not lately—but you certainly heard it from them both privately and publicly, saying how much integrity the man has, how much his legal acumen is right on, as are his demeanor, jurisprudence, and humility—all of the things one would want to see out of a judge, and they speak in glowing terms about him. So that was my introduction to him.

I had never met Judge Alito prior to his nomination when he was nominated, one of the first things I did was call some of his colleagues. I did it to get a sense of the kind of man he was. The response I received was overwhelming.

One of the things I want to cover is how I believe that his view of the role of a judge is very similar to John Roberts’ view of the role of a judge. In fact, his record, in my opinion, and the way he approaches the law is remarkably similar to the view of the man who is now a Justice confirmed here in the Senate by 70-plus votes. I am somewhat at a loss to see why Judge Alito is not receiving similar support, because their records and their approach to the law are remarkably similar, in my mind. He is a judge who, when I met him, used very much the same terms as Justice Roberts—terms such as humility and modesty in dealing with the matters before them; that he was not to be a judge who was to impose his views on the case but to observe the record.

Many have tried to claim that somehow or another he is ideological. I don’t think there is anything in the Record that would indicate Judge Alito applies his own personal viewpoints to the case at hand. He looks at the law, looks at the facts of the case and does his best on the narrowest grounds possible to decide the case before him. That is what a judge is supposed to do—never say, gee, here is my opinion, I change the law. He has that opportunity to right a wrong that I think Americans or a particular State or the Government has done that I disagree with; here is my opportunity to change the law by using the force of the Constitution to impose my values. That is not what he does. Again, what he also doesn’t do—and it strikes me as a very odd discussion when it comes to analyzing a judge’s rulings on who he rules for, does he rule for the little guy or the big guy, as if little guys are always right and big guys are always wrong, is to say we would want a Supreme Court with the same kind of temperament we would want of a Supreme Court Justice—of any judge. He is obviously highly intelligent, battling with some of the best minds in the Senate. During this process, both privately and publicly, he has been gracious. He is, again, someone I am very proud to support.

Both parties who say he rules for the big guys or the big corporations, or whoever it is, are you saying every action that comes before the Court where a little guy is in a case, he automatically should win? Is that what it is? I find it very disturbing that we are reducing this confirmation process to whose side he ruled on and whether he is a liberal judge or a conservative judge in a sense of the law. Is that somehow you don’t have a proper view of the law? This is a remarkable discussion I keep hearing. I heard over and over again in the Judiciary Committee about the result of these cases and who he sides with. Is that somehow a point which is legitimate when it comes to a judge? The question is, is he an apologist jurist who was following the law? Was he properly applying the law to the case? Is it not who won or lost the case? I find it very disturbing that we are moving towards a sense of reducing these confirmations to whose side he ruled on and whether he is a liberal judge or a conservative judge in a sense of the law. Is that somehow you don’t have a proper view of the law? Is that somehow you don’t have a proper view of the law?

That was my introduction to him.

If I can, for a moment, talk again about where we are in the context of the role of the judiciary in our democratic process. We often talk about the tyranny of the judiciary—many on our side of the aisle do—how the judiciary seeks to unilaterally impose an agenda to change the law, bypass the elected democratic bodies of our country and hobble it onto the backs of the Supreme Court or the courts in our country. That is a very dangerous precedent we have seen over the last 30 and 40 years in our courts, that increasingly decisions are being made by the judicial system and, in so doing, barring the House, the Senate, and the President from regulating or legislating in that area in the future.

This is a remarkable discussion as to how we should live our lives, how our economy will function, how our laws will be written across the street in an unelected body as opposed to how the democratic process works and how these substantive decisions as to how we should live our lives, how our economy will function, how our laws will be written.

One of the reasons I think these nominations are so important and maybe so contentious is because we are at a point right now where there has been movement from the campaign process, into a process of pass the democratic process, bypass the people’s Houses and go to the courts to get an extreme agenda passed and into law in this country.

The voices we have heard over the past couple of months during this nomination and which we heard I think more muted during the Roberts nomination were of those trying to hold onto power by holding onto a majority on the Supreme Court of the United States. We continue to have these far-left-of-center agenda on a variety of issues, using the Court as the place to silence the people in their collective judgments.

One of the reasons that I think is vitally important for putting a Judge Alito on this Court, and hopefully future Judge Alitos as other vacancies occur, is that we will have an opportunity to return a balance of power in this country away from nine unelected judges to continue to control the far-left-of-center agenda on a variety of issues, using the Court as the place to silence the people in their collective judgments.

So this is an important step. Do I believe that we are going to see, as a result of Judge Alito’s confirmation, which appears to be all but certain, a dramatic change in the precedents of the U.S. Supreme Court? I sort of doubt that we will see dramatic change, certainly not any time soon. But I think what we will see is a more
modest approach to dealing with the problems with which the Supreme Court is confronted. We will not see cases where the Court could decide a case on a narrow issue and settle the dispute at hand and instead of doing so take the opportunity to influence the "will" of the country. To overturn a majority of precedents they don't need to overturn and create new legislation, if you will, through their judicial opinions. We see that happen time and again. It threatens the very foundation of our country.

Thomas Jefferson understood that. Jefferson in 1821—this was after he was President, 5 years before he died, obviously a great student of our Constitution, obviously a great student of the powers of the Congress and the judiciary and obviously of the Presidency—he said, in reflecting on this very delicate system and the balance of power among the executive, the judicial, and the legislative branch:

"The creation of our Nation is in the power of the judiciary, an irresponsible body working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little to¬morrow, taking the power away from the people and ceding it to itself so that, to paraphrase Jefferson, they would be like the monarchs we left, ruling from their kings' benches."

"This is a true threat, in my opinion, to the democracy in America today. Jefferson, as he did with many issues, had it right here too. There have been times in American history where the pendulum has swung in favor of one branch or another. Of the three branches, I think this is such a time when we have seen that pendulum swing to the Supreme Court, and it is incumbent upon all of us to make sure that equilibrium is restored."

I know there are a lot of folks who are listening who say: I like the decisions the Supreme Court has made; that is why I am out here arguing, to persuade judges to impose upon the government from which we separated.

He saw the power of an immodest, a brash, a bold judiciary in its ability by using the ultimate law of the land, the Constitution, in grabbing power by day and by night—make no noises softly like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall render powerless the checks of one branch over the other and will become venal to the necessities of the government from which we separated.

I am very pleased the President understands that and that he has put forth judges who have understood that point of view as a matter of principle. I am hopeful that we will confirm Judge Alito and that we will continue this process of creating a better balance of powers among the Congress, the executive branch, and the judi¬cature. In my opinion, second step in that pro¬cess.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I enjoyed my colleague's remarks. We are in the final stretch of considering the nomination of Samuel Alito to the Supreme Court of the United States, and by any objective or traditional standard, Judge Alito deserves overwhelming confirmation, without question.

The first reason Judge Alito should be confirmed is that he is highly qualified to serve on the Supreme Court. It amazes me that some parties to this debate practically ignore his qualifications altogether. They are so intent on manufacturing a case against this nominee that they brush aside this seemingly minor detail of his qualifications. Justice, like any other system, has its standard. After serving in the Department of Justice and as a highly regarded Federal prosecutor, Judge Alito has served on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit since 1990, has participated in nearly 5,000 cases, and has written more than 360 opinions. He has more judicial experience than any Supreme Court nominee in the last three quarters of a century.

The American Bar Association, which conducts perhaps the most comprehensive and exhaustive evaluation of Supreme Court nominees, interviewed more than 300 people who know and have worked with Judge Alito. The American Bar Association, after all those interviews, unanimously gave Judge Alito its highest well-qualified rating. Here, too, it is amazing how some Senators and leftwing interest groups brush aside this ABA rating as if they were dusting the mantel. Which brings me to the second role in the judicial appointment process has been controversial at times, certainly no one has ever charged it with a conservative bias—no one. It was my Democratic colleagues and their leftwing interest groups that once lauded the ABA rating as the veritable gold standard for evaluating judicial nominees.

The criteria for the ABA's highest well-qualified rating includes Judge Alito's compassion, openmindedness, freedom from bias and commitment to equal justice. Judge Samuel Alito is eminently qualified to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States.

The second reason Judge Alito should be confirmed is that he is a man of character and integrity. Anybody watching those proceedings would have to conclude that I have been struck, throughout this process, at the level of respect and praise for Judge Alito's character and integrity. This is directly related to how well people know him, how closely they have worked with him. Without exception, those sounding the most dire warnings, creating the most negative caricatures, are those who do not know Judge Alito. The third reason Judge Alito should be confirmed is that he understands and is committed to the appropriately limited role of the judiciary. America's Founders established a system of limited Government containing three branches, each with its category of powers and authority that checks the others. The judicial branch is much a part of this system of Government and must remain as limited as the legislative and executive branches.

The fight over judicial appointments is a fight over whether we should stick with the system America's Founders established. Some want to change that system because, frankly, it does not give them everything they want.

Self-government, after all, can be a little messy and sometimes very frustrating. Letting the people and their elected representatives make the law and define the culture means that, on any given day, certain political interests win and others lose.

Some who lose in the political process pick themselves up and try again another day.

Others leave the political process behind and go to the courts, trying to persuade judges to impose upon the American people policies and priorities that the people would not choose for themselves, or they could never get through the elected representatives of the people.
The fight over judicial appointments is whether we should have judges willing to take such political bait. It is fashionable in some circles to put the Supreme Court on a pedestal, pretending that a few unelected judges are supposed to lead us to some kind of promised land.

During the debates about Chief Justice John Roberts’ nomination last fall and Judge Alito’s nomination now, we have heard all sorts of grand descriptions of the judiciary’s role and purpose. The judiciary, we are told, is the engine of social progress, the protector of all our rights and liberties, even the savior of the environment.

Yesterday, in the Judiciary Committee’s business meeting, the ranking Democratic member said that the very reason the Supreme Court exists is to be “a constitutional check on the expansion of presidential power.”

The Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Kennedy, said the very same thing yesterday, that the Supreme Court’s historic role is “enforcing constitutional limits on presidential power.”

These grand descriptions give the impression that the Supreme Court alone polices our system of separated power, hands down decrees about issues, opines on abstract theories, and decides how best to order the universe. It does no such thing. The last time I checked, most of the Supreme Court’s cases have nothing whatsoever to do with issues such as presidential power, abortion, religion, or the environment. The Supreme Court does not exist to run the country, right all wrongs, and usher in peace and domestic tranquility.

The judiciary is part of our system of limited government; it is not a system unto itself. It is that whole system of government, not anyone part of it, that protects our rights and liberties, checks excessive government power, provides for social progress, and all the rest.

As a part of that system, judges who exceed their proper role and power are no less a threat to liberty than legislators or the president who do so.

In the famous case of Marbury v. Madison, Chief Justice John Marshall wrote that the Constitution was designed for the government of courts as much as of legislatures. As Chief Justice Roberts put it last fall, judges are not politicians.

The tendency of some in this debate simply to look at the results judges deliver is, therefore, misguided because it suggests that judges, as politicians, are free to take whatever side they choose and the only thing that matters is whose side judges are on.

This politicized approach misleads our fellow citizens about the judiciary and its proper place in our system of government.

America’s founders had a very different view and, I am glad to say, Judge Alito sides with them. As the Constitution puts it, judges exercise judicial power in the context of cases and controversies. Judges do not make the law they apply. Judges are neither school boards nor inspectors general. Judges are neither legislative oversight commissions nor political prides. Furthermore, judges settle legal disputes by applying already established law to cases that come before them.

Because that is what they do, it is impossible for properly evaluate judges or judicial nominees the way we evaluate politicians, by the results they can be expected to deliver.

Yet that is exactly what we see in this judicial confirmation process. To hear some of my Democratic colleagues and their left-wing interest group friends talk, there is absolutely nothing that is not the judiciary’s job. That is ridiculous.

To hear them talk, everything is fair game for judges and the only thing that matters is who wins that game. America’s founders rejected that view, and Judge Alito should be confirmed because he rejects that view.

I hope we find more qualified men and women who believe there is something, anything, that is not a judge’s job and appoint them to the judiciary right away.

While scorecards are familiar in the political process, they have no place in the judicial process.

Again, I quote Judge Alito: “I don’t think a judge should be keeping a scorecard about how many times the judge votes for one category of litigant versus another in particular types of cases. That would be wrong. We are supposed to do justice on an individual basis in the cases that come before us.”

Who can disagree with that? Yet, they seem to on the other side.

I hope that my fellow citizens are watching this debate, either live right now or when it is replayed later. I ask my fellow citizens: Have you agreed with Judge Alito? Do your expect judges to do justice on an individual basis, to take each case on its own facts and its own merits, and to decide it solely according to the law? Or do you expect a judge to look at a case not as a legitimate dispute between real parties, but as a political issue, deciding it based on his opinion of the issue, practically before the case even comes before him?

Judge Alito rejects scorecards and tallies, he rejects percentages and patterns, and looks at each case based on its own facts and the law that applies.

I might add that at one time in the proceedings one of the Democratic Senators made an incredible statement. He said, “We immediately showed a number of cases where he did. You can find rulings by Judge Alito across the spectrum with respect to people who should have won those cases.”

Let me give you another revolutionary idea. Let me read it.

At his hearing, Judge Alito said that “although the judiciary has a very important role to play, it’s a limited role. . . . Judges don’t have the authority to change the Constitution. . . . The Constitution is an enduring document and the Constitution doesn’t change.”

Let me speak again to my fellow citizens. Those who are watching.

The first three words of the Constitution are “we the people.” The Constitution belongs to the people. It does not belong to judges.

The Constitution is your Constitution—I am speaking to the people out there—already has a specific process for changing it, and the only branch of government involved in that process is this one, the legislative branch, the one you directly elect.

If America’s founders explicitly excluded the judiciary from the process of changing the Constitution, do you think instead that judges should now be able to change the Constitution?

If you believe that the Constitution, your Constitution, is whatever judges say it is, it is the Constitution that ultimately protects our rights and liberties.

If the Constitution means whatever judges say it means, then our rights and liberties are whatever judges say they are. They are not elected. They are nominated, appointed and confirmed for life.

If that is what my Democratic colleagues and their left-wing interest group allies mean by the judiciary protects us, then do not sign me up for that protection package.

Our rights and liberties, and particularly the rights and liberties of the minority, are secure only when the constitution is solid.

Judge Alito is precisely the kind of judge who will protect our rights and liberties because he does not believe that he defines them.

So the case for Judge Alito’s confirmation is overwhelming. He is highly qualified, he is a man of character and integrity, and he understands and is committed to the properly limited role of judges in our system of government.

In the past, this would have been enough for confirmation by a wide bipartisan margin.

Perhaps because this case for confirmation is so strong, Judge Alito’s opponents have tried a host of attacks that not only have failed, they have degraded this process along the way.

One is the familiar guilt-by-association tactic, trying to smear Judge Alito by attacking a group of conservative Princeton alumni to which he once belonged. Membership in this group, mind you, was nothing more than a magazine subscription. Imagine if someone tried to attribute to each of you everything published in every magazine or newsletter you receive.

Some Democratic Senators used this very illegitimate tactic against Judge Alito, selecting the most salacious or controversial articles which Judge Alito never read. One Senator even tried to
pass a parody of such outrageous views off as the real thing. That is how denigrating this process became.

Our staff spent hours pouring through boxes of documents related to this group and the name Samuel Alto never appeared on a single scrap of paper.

The disinformation was even worse in the media.

The group in question, or at least some of its members, wanted to preserve Princeton's all-male tradition, and opposed affirmative action—in other words, affirmative action.

On January 6, a well-known pundit claimed on the FOX News Channel that Judge Alito himself was personally "trying to keep women and minorities out of Princeton."

I have been around for a long time, and I have seen a lot of bad journalism, but this goes beyond the pale. This goes beyond spin, beyond any reasonable characterization of the facts. In fact, it is ridiculous.

When I asked what the media characterized as a softball question, sarcastically asking it, are you really against having women or minorities in colleges, anybody listening to that had to conclude it was being sarcastic. He said, Of course not.

When I said I thought that was what he thinks, I couldn’t have been more sarcastic. But apparently I am so serious on most matters that people thought I was serious. But it is ridiculous, this guilt by association that went on, even in the committee, in something as important as the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Let me address a few of the other arguments by Judge Alto's opponents. Yesterday, at the Judiciary Committee markup, the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, tried once again to paint Judge Alito as an out-of-control judge, wantonly disregarding and seeking to disrupt his own court's past decisions.

The political rhetorical value of the tactic is obvious. If Judge Alito played fast and loose with his present court's precedence, the story goes he would certainly do so on the Supreme Court.

The problem is that this claim, this picture of Judge Alito as an activist judge out to remake precedent in his own image is patently wrong. It bears no relationship to reality.

At Judge Alto's hearing, the Senator from New York accused, a few selected quotes from poster board. Yet the Senator from New York did not ask any questions at all because he did not attend that portion of the hearing. That was his right.

I asked him about it. I referred to the claims by the Senator from New York and asked the judges whether Judge Alito disregards precedent, whether he has an agenda to disrupt the court's prior decisions. Judge Edward Becker, former Chief Judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, participated with us via teleconference from Arizona. That would have been a great opportunity to question the very judges on the side of the Senator from New York of evidence of Judge Alito's activism and disregard for precedent. Hearing it from them could be more meaningful than cutting and pasting a few selected quotes from poster board. Yet the Senator from New York did not ask any questions at all because he did not attend that portion of the hearing. That was his right.
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I asked him about it. I referred to the claims by the Senator from New York and asked the judges whether Judge Alito disregards precedent, whether he has an agenda to disrupt the court's prior decisions. Judge Edward Becker, former Chief Judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, participated with us via teleconference from Arizona. That would have been a great opportunity to question the very judges on the side of the Senator from New York of evidence of Judge Alito's activism and disregard for precedent. Hearing it from them could be more meaningful than cutting and pasting a few selected quotes from poster board. Yet the Senator from New York did not ask any questions at all because he did not attend that portion of the hearing. That was his right.
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fair shake in [Judge Alito's] courtroom." That is an outrageous claim, one that would not be at all justified even if the supposed evidence behind it were more legitimate.

Let us be honest about this. Saying a pattern of past decisions shows an ideolo-
gical bent or that a particular group of litigants will have a hard time getting a fair shake in the future is to accuse Judge Alito of bias.

Before the Senator from Massachusetts or anyone else using this tactic gets too carried away, it is worth noting that I have never accused Judge Alito of bias, there is simply no other meaning to what was said.

I again call into contention the testimon
y of those seven judges, all circuit court of appeals Federal judges from all across the spectrum, who said Judge Alito has never demonstrated any bias toward anybody. I would much rather have their confirmation than any law professors in this country, es-
pecially any liberal law professor in this country, or conservative law pro-

fessor. What else could the words "av-
erage Americans have a hard time get-
ting a fair shake" actually mean?

Another example last week, Thurs-

day, in the State of Massachusetts was claimed that while on the appeals court Judge Alito literally bent over backwards to "help the powerful."

He said:

The record is clear that the average person has a hard time getting a fair shake in Judge Alito's courtroom.

These are his words, not mine. Say-
ing that Judge Alito bends over back-
wards to help the powerful means only one thing. Saying that a category of litigants will have a hard time getting a fair shake before Judge Alito means only one thing. If Senators wish to ac-
cuse Judge Alito of bias, they should do so up front, not through innuendo or hiding behind statistics.

Even Judge Lewis, with a calculator is wrong, misguided, and misleads our fellow citizens about what judges do and the role they play in our system of government. Again, I call attention to the judges who appeared, all of whom spoke in favor of Judge Alito. In all honesty, let me choose the most liberal of those judges. He has some very inter-
esting things to say. That was Judge Lewis who is retired now. He said:

I am openly and unapologetically pro-

choice and always have been. I am openly—and it's very well known—a committed human rights and civil rights activist and actively engaged in that process as my time permits.

I am very, very much involved in a number of endeavors that one who is familiar with Judge Alito's background and experience may wonder—"Well, why are you here today saying positive things about his prospects as a justice on the Supreme Court?"

And the reason is that having worked with him, I know the respect he has for human dignity, the value of human life, the value between the law and what the Constitution allows, and the value of a Constitution that is predicated on the rights of the individual and the rights of minorities.

He went on to say:

As Judge Becker and others have alluded to, it is in conference, after we have had oral argument and are not propped up by law clerks—we are alone as judges discussing the case—that one really gets to know, gets a sense of the thinking of our colleagues. I cannot recall one in which I was commenting on or doing any other experience that I had with Judge Alito, but in particular during conferences in which we were writing remotely resembling an ideological bent.

He endorsed Judge Alito in no uncer-
tain terms.

Let me close by noting a few things I find encouraging. First, I am encour-
gaged in a series of legal climate and mis-
leading claims about Judge Alito have not persuaded the American people. The leftwing interest groups have thrown everything they have against this nominee. It is shameful the way they act. One of their foes said at the beginning of this campaign: You name it, we will do it. That is the type of opposition this man has had to en-
dure.

They did it. We have seen millions of dollars spent week after week on peti-
dions, drives, television ads, rallies, phone banks, and grassroots lobbying. The net result of that barrage of propa-
ganda has been that support for Judge Alito's nomination has risen by about 10 percent since early December. This is particularly signifi-
cant because Judge Alito's opponents have issued all sorts of apocalyptic warnings and predictions. They have cast Judge Alito as a radical extremist, a threat to the environment and indi-
vidual rights.

The Senator from Vermont has re-
peatedly said that all by himself, Judge Alito is a threat to the rights and lib-
erties of all Americans literally for generations to come. The critics have said that Judge Alito would give the executive branch a blank check to in-
vade your privacy, strip search chil-
dren, and tap your phones.

According to the critics, if Judge Alito has his way, machine guns will flood our streets, big business will pol-
lute the air and water, and the poor and down trodden will be unable to find justice.

I am pleased to say despite all of this propaganda, as CBS News found, the percentage of Americans having a fa-
vorable impression of Judge Alito has risen 50 percent since the end of Octo-

ber. I am also encouraged that not all Democrat leaders have abandoned rea-
sonable, traditional, judicial confirma-
tion standards.

Pennsylvania governor Ed Rendell, a past general chairman of the Demo-

cratic National Committee, yesterday described a confirmation standard that I hope his fellow Democrats would once again embrace.

He said that if a nominee is qualified and passes the test of integrity, elec-
tions matter and disagreement with a nominee's positions or deci-
sions are not enough to deny the Presi-
dent his appointment.

That was the standard that allowed President Clinton to appoint two lib-
eral justices with minimal opposition.

My Democratic colleagues would follow Governor Rendell's lead.

Finally, Mr. President, I am encour-
gaged that Judge Alito will indeed be confirmed.

A highly qualified judge, a man of character and integrity, and someone who understands and is committed to the judiciary's properly limited role, will soon join the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judge Samuel Alito becomes Justice Samuel Alito, our system of limited government under the rule of law will be stronger and the freedoms that system makes possible will be more secure.

I urge my colleagues to vote to con-
firm Judge Samuel Alito to the Su-

preme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have se-
lected the distinguished senior Senator from Utah if he purports to quote me, to try to at least get within the ballpark of accuracy. I realize that is probably a failing and useless request after hearing him mis-
quote me again the last few minutes, but I renew the request, and I hope that he would do that.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEAHY. To suggest that I have said—I would like to find the quote where I said that Judge Alito, all by himself, would do away with all the lib-
erties of Americans.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, and I yield to the Sen-
ator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Presi-
dent, some things can get hot here, particularly when we get into personal-
ities. Well, the senior Senator from Florida came here not to speak about personalities but to talk about the sub-
stance of the issue in front of us.

In the Good Book, the Gospel prom-
ises all of us impartiality at judgment. And I would suggest impartiality—or justice for all—is a principle embedded deep in our constitutional democracy.

I believe in an America where courts address injustice and correct it. I be-
lieve in an America where our judges serve the people by interpreting the Constitution, not agenda. I may have no greater responsibility in the Senate than to be charged by our Consti-

on his picks for the U.S. Supreme Court. And in assuming this awesome responsibility, I rise to oppose Judge Alito’s confirmation to the Supreme Court.

Soon, the Supreme Court likely will hear cases about protecting our personal privacy from Government and corporate intrusion and about the sharing of power between Congress and the President. These decisions will have an important effect on each of our lives and on the future of our nation.

In the time I had over the holidays, I had numerous townhall meetings all over my State of Florida. The residents shared with me their thoughts about Judge Alito. So I took all of that information, and that is why, then, I carefully studied his record over the past 15 years as a judge on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

During his time on the bench, Judge Alito ruled on cases ranging from the rights of individuals to the stewardship of the natural environment, workers’ rights, and racketeering. He also addressed important cases pitting the Government against individuals, in the area of the civil rights of individuals to the stewardship of the natural environment, workers’ rights, and racketeering.

As the man who led these cases, Judge Alito’s record is consistent with his views, which I have already outlined. Unlike his predecessor, Judge Alito has offered no misgivings about the legal and constitutional reasoning that led to this outcome.

I am concerned about his rulings in other cases pitting the Government against individuals, in the area of the environment, workers’ rights, and racial discrimination.

In Public Interest Research Group of New Jersey v. Magnesium Elektron, he, Judge Alito, established high barriers to prevent individuals from being able to sue polluters for violations of the Clean Air Act. The U.S. Supreme Court later rejected this ruling by a vote of 7 to 2.

In Chittister v. Department of Community and Economic Development, he ruled that State employees could not sue for damages to enforce their rights under the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act. The Supreme Court later reversed this ruling by a vote of 6 to 3. I might say that both of those acts under consideration by the Court I had the privilege of voting for when I was a Member of the House of Representatives.

And then in Riley v. Taylor, he ruled there was no basis for appeal in a death penalty case in which prosecutors had used their preemptory challenges to exclude Black jurors from the jury pool. The full Third Circuit later heard the case and overturned Judge Alito’s ruling.

These cases highlight the broader concerns I have with Judge Alito’s record.

During my years in the Senate, I have voted for almost all of President Bush’s judicial nominees. All told, I have voted for President’s 266 judicial picks, including Chief Justice John Roberts. That is 96 percent.

I greeted Judge Alito’s nomination with an open mind. But his many legal writings, his judicial opinions and evaluations of those opinions and his willingness to sit in my private meeting with him, convinced me that he would tilt the scales of justice ever so slightly against the average Joe. I do not want that outcome.

And because he is not the voice I believe this Nation needs to replace the retiring Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, who fiercely defended the rights and liberties of all Americans—because of this—I am going to vote no on his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT: The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before I comment on the nomination, I would like to recognize and thank several people who have been very helpful in preparing my comments: Kara Stein, Justin Florencio, and Sharon Rapport.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of letters from national organizations with respect to issues of church and state separation and the nomination of Judge Alito.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, Washington, DC, January 10, 2006.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER, Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Russell Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPECTER AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY: Americans United for Separation of Church and State urges you to oppose the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito, Jr. to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Americans United for Separation of Church and State represents more than 75,000 individual members and 9,500 clergy nationwide, as well as cooperating houses of worship and other religious bodies committed to the preservation of religious liberty. We oppose the confirmation of Judge Alito to the Supreme Court because his record demonstrates that he would fundamentally alter First Amendment law and constitutional protections for religious minorities that the Supreme Court has recognized and consistently enforced over the past sixty years.

Legal scholars have understood the First Amendment’s religion clauses as striking a balance between the religious and political rights of individuals and groups within our society. There is a necessary tension between the Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause, which balances the sometimes competing interests of individuals’ freedom of conscience against the government’s power to use its authority to protect the wellbeing of its community and economic development, he stated.

In 2005, Judge Alito ruled on cases ranging from the rights of individuals to the stewardship of the natural environment, workers’ rights, and racketeering. He also addressed important cases pitting the Government against individuals, in the area of the civil rights of individuals to the stewardship of the natural environment, workers’ rights, and racketeering.

As the man who led these cases, Judge Alito’s record is consistent with his views, which I have already outlined. Unlike his predecessor, Judge Alito has offered no misgivings about the legal and constitutional reasoning that led to this outcome. I am concerned about his rulings in other cases pitting the Government against individuals, in the area of the environment, workers’ rights, and racial discrimination.

In Public Interest Research Group of New Jersey v. Magnesium Elektron, he, Judge Alito, established high barri...
Hon. PATRICK LEAHY, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: On behalf of B’nai B’rith International and our more than 110,000 members and supporters, we write to ask that you hear the hearing concerning Judge Samuel Alito deeply probe the nominee’s judicial philosophy with regard to issues of great concern to our organization. Founded in 1843, B’nai B’rith is America’s pioneering Jewish agency, with a wide range of domestic and international public policy priorities. Included in our agenda are several issues that we would like to ask the Judiciary Committee to raise with Judge Alito:

(1) Church-State Relations. We hope the Committee will ask Judge Alito which judicial test should be applied to determine whether a particular government action violates the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause. It might be helpful to ask if the nominee feels it is permissible for public school officials to lead students in prayer or scriptural readings, or whether he believes that public funds and public property may be used for religious displays. We also would be interested to learn whether Judge Alito believes that a statute or ordinance requiring schools to give “equal time” to instruction in creationism or intelligent design would violate constitutional principles.

(2) Asylum. B’nai B’rith hopes the Committee will ask to what standard his asylum claims by individuals facing persecution in their homelands. We would be interested to know what threshold of harm, or risk of harm, a person fleeing a repressive society must demonstrate before receiving asylum in the United States.

(3) Workplace Discrimination. B’nai B’rith would like to hear Judge Alito’s views on the standard that should be applied to cases of age, disability, or sexual discrimination in the workplace. He should be asked how he would view his position on the burden of proof an older worker must meet to demonstrate that he or she has been passed over on the basis of their age or disability. We would like to ask the nominee to explain how he would vote on whether to include student-led prayer at public school holiday displays, she has rejected efforts for secular alternatives (such as a religious display including a creche and menorah) were not unconstitutional during the holiday season (in this case a “Christmas tree”).

We are not alone. When the Unitarian Universalist Association, the Reform Movement, and the Reconstructionist Project, among others have expressed their concerns about Judge Alito’s rulings that would undermine the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause. The Supreme Court has overturned the provision in the Jehovah’s Witnesses case. We believe that Judge Alito’s philosophy does not sufficiently respect these fundamental rights, and we urge you to oppose his confirmation.

In Faith,
ROBERT C. KEITHAN, Director.
In 2002, the Union for Reform Judaism adopted a resolution that established our criteria for considering nominees to the federal courts. Under these criteria, which are not limited to personal or professional competence, we will oppose a nominee in those rare cases in which after consideration of what the nominee has said and written, and his or her voting record, we can be made to believe that the appointment would threaten protection of the most fundamental rights which our Movement supports. On these criteria, in November 2005 we resolved to oppose the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito Jr. to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judge Alito’s elevation to the Supreme Court would threaten protection of the most fundamental rights which our Movement supports, including reproductive freedom, the separation between church and state, protection of civil rights and civil liberties, and protection of the environment.

On choice, women’s rights, civil rights, and the scope of federal power (particularly as it relates to civil rights and environmental protection), Judge Alito’s elevation would shift the ideological balance of the Supreme Court so that the outcome of the nomination of a Justice may well depend on which Justice may well be the deciding vote in those cases. Judge Alito’s vote could be the crucial one on the Court in all areas and more, replacing the balance provided by Justice Sandra Day O’Connor with a marked shift that would endanger the civil liberties and civil rights of the people of the United States.

Committed to the precepts of our tradition and adhering to the words of Deuteronomy, which tell us to pursue justice (Deuteronomy 16:20), we believe the Supreme Court to protect the civil liberties and civil rights of all Americans. Based on his record, we are concerned that Judge Alito will be unable to put aside his personal views to dispense justice for all and oppose his confirmation.

Respectfully,

SHELLY LINDAUER, ROSANNE M. SOLON.


HON. ARLEN SPECTER
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER AND LEAHY: As you consider the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito Jr. to the Supreme Court of the United States, we write on behalf of the Union for Reform Judaism, encompassing 1.5 million Reform Jews in 900 congregations across North America to express our opposition to Judge Alito’s nomination. Our Movement believes that Judge Alito’s nomination was not taken lightly. During the debate on the nomination at our recent B’nai Israel General Assembly Reform Jews old enough to remember the significant role the Supreme Court played in extending basic human and civil rights to all Americans cautioned the delegates about the danger of a Court whose members have records in opposition to defending those rights. Our Movement’s youth spoke of cherished constitutional principles, and with one Supreme Court justice’s vote changing the balance of the court, could be undone, altering their lives and those of the generations to follow. The older generation did not want to hold on to this legacy, and the youth did not want to inherit it.

A longtime advocate for women’s rights and reproductive choice, the Reform Movement opposes Judge Alito’s views on reproductive rights. During his time as an attorney in the Solicitor General’s office, Judge Alito helped author the Amicus Brief in the case of Thornburgh v. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists which argued for overturning the Roe v. Wade decision. Judge Alito authored a letter to the Solicitor General on how to “advance the goals of bringing about the eventual overturning of Roe v. Wade . . .” Further, in his 1991 solicitor general’s office job application, Justice Department he wrote of his work in the Solicitor General’s office saying, “it has been a source of personal satisfaction to me . . . to help advance legal positions in which I personally believe very strongly. I am particularly proud of my contributions to recent cases in which the government has argued in the Supreme Court that . . . the Constitution does not protect a right to an abortion.” This dedication to the “advancement” of reversing Roe is also clearly illustrated by his dissent in Planned Parenthood v. Casey (1992). Judge Alito would uphold a provision of Pennsylvania’s restrictive anti-abortion law requiring a woman to notify her husband before abortion. His colleagues on the Third Circuit disagreed and the Supreme Court overturned the Pennsylvania provision (with Justice O’Connor casting the deciding vote). The Court’s majority opinion found that the provision Judge Alito would have upheld was overbalanced by the “great interest reposed in the protection of unborn life.”

So often our nation’s courts ensure civil rights and civil liberties that are otherwise unprotected by flawed systems and discriminatory actions. In order to continue administering justice and equality for all, individuals with grievances must have access to the courtroom. Here, too, the record suggests that Judge Alito does not share our commitment to this fundamental principle. In split decisions on the merits, Judge Alito has sided with those seeking to overturn constitutional protections in the civil rights of racial minorities, women, seniors, and people with disabilities, Judge Alito has consistently ruled with the defendant. In Turn-er v. Board of Education (1982), the Supreme Court overturned the Virginia school district to allow prayer at graduation ceremonies. In Turner, Justice Alito dissented, stating that his “position would immunize an employer from the reach of Title VII” where he “would not be a crime.” In Public Interest Research Group v. Magnesium Elektron, another case involving access to the courtroom, Judge Alito again voted to establish standing to sue, this time concerning toxic emissions that violate the Clean Water Act. Time after time, Judges, especially those selected to serve on the highest court in our land, must be submitted to upholding our foundational principles of liberty and equality. Judge Alito’s record leaves us with serious doubts as to his ability to safeguard these rights that we as a Movement, and a nation, hold so dear. Here, with the stakes so high—a life-time appointment to the Supreme Court, replacing a pivotal Justice who was often the “swing vote” in key areas—we cannot afford such doubts.

Therefore, we urge you to oppose the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito Jr. to the Supreme Court of the United States, and we
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPECTER: I am writing to you on behalf of 90,000 members and supporters of the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) to express our strong opposition to the nomination of Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr., to fill the seat of Justice Sandra Day O’Connor on the United States Supreme Court.

We have decided to oppose Judge Alito for many reasons, most notably because of his record concerning the right to privacy, his views on civil liberties and women’s equality, and his support for weakening the wall of separation between religion and state. In light of that record, NCJW believes that Judge Alito should not be confirmed for a lifetime position on the Supreme Court.

When Justice Sandra Day O’Connor announced her intention to retire from the Supreme Court, NCJW called upon President Bush to seek a mainstream consensus nominee that meets that essential qualification and therefor...
working in the Reagan administration, he argued in a memo that the Truth in Mileage Act of 1986 “violates the principles of freedom” and should be vetoed by the President. This federal law requires a seller to disclose the vehicle’s mileage on the title when ownership is transferred. Congress enacted the law to prohibit odometer tampering and to protect consumers from mileage fraud. Samuel Alito argued that it was the States, and “not the federal government,” that should protect American citizens.

Not only does Judge Alito have an unusually narrow view of the Commerce Clause, it also appears that he would restrict Congress’s ability to pass laws under section 5 of the 14th amendment. This clause states that “Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.” Those provisions include some of our most fundamental constitutional principles, including due process and the equal protection of the law.

Congress has acted under the authority of this clause to protect the rights of women and minorities, to ensure religious freedom, and to guarantee civil rights for the elderly and the disabled. But based upon his writings and rulings, Judge Alito would severely limit the meaning of this clause. In Chisister v. Department of Community and Economic Development, he found the sick leave provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act to be unconstitutional because he believed that 12 weeks of leave was “out of proportion” to the gender discrimination that Congress wished to remedy. Here again, Judge Alito relied on his own policy preferences to strike down the measured judgment of Congress.

In the case of Nevada Department of Human Resources v. Hibbs, the Supreme Court explicitly upheld the family leave provisions of the act by a 6-to-3 vote. Yet, Judge Alito had questioned the judgments of Congress, the Hibbs majority, including Justice Rehnquist and O’Connor, found that, in their words:

The [Family Medical Leave Act] is narrowly tailored at the fault line between work and family—precisely where sex-based overgeneralization has been and remains strongest.

The possible consequences of this tendency by Judge Alito to second-guess the policy judgments of Congress and to replace them with his own policy preferences are profound. They go beyond any single act of Congress or any single area of policy. As just one example, the Supreme Court will consider a pair of cases on the constitutionality of the Clean Water Act. These cases challenge whether Congress can protect wetlands and tributaries through its commerce clause power. If the Supreme Court, with a recently more restrictive view of the commerce clause and the 14th amendment, it could limit our ability to protect our country’s wetlands, let alone our national interests in area after area.

At the same time that Judge Alito has advocated for a narrower vision of Congress’s constitutional authority, he has argued that the powers of the executive are unlim-

ited. In a 2001 speech to the Federalist Society, Judge Alito stated that since the 1980s, he had believed in “the theory of the unitary executive.” In the Judiciary Committee hearings, Judge Alito denied any connection between the unitary executive theory and the scope of Executive power. But scholars and judges have drawn from this theory to advance expansive views of the executive.

For example, in Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, the Supreme Court reviewed the President’s claim that he could indefinitely detain an American citizen without bringing charges or giving him a day in court to challenge the detention. Eight of the nine Supreme Court Justices rejected the claim, and Justice O’Connor wrote in her plurality opinion that “a state of war is not a blank check for the President when it comes to the rights of the Nation’s citizens.”

In a lone dissenting opinion, Justice Thomas deployed the unitary executive theory to support broad Presidential powers. He wrote that congressional or judicial interference in foreign affairs or national security destroys the purpose of vesting the primary responsibility in a unitary Executive. In view of the long scope of American constitutional history, the unitary executive theory is a relatively recent invention. It was a creation of the Reagan Justice Department in the 1980s. And according to his speeches, Judge Alito has subscribed to it since working there. While he worked in the Reagan administration, Judge Alito proposed a particular idea to, in his words, “increase the power of the Execu-

tive to shape the law.”

In a 1986 memorandum, Alito argued that the President should issue statements when signing a bill because the President’s “understanding of the bill should be just as important as that of Congress.” The administration has followed Judge Alito’s 1986 advice. For example, just recently, the President issued a signing statement regarding the McCain amendment which prohibits the President from construing the McCain amendment “in a manner consistent with the constitutional authority of the President to supervise the unitary executive branch.”

The practice Judge Alito first advocated in the mid-1980s arguably helps the executive to thwart the will of Congress when it passes a law. While the current Supreme Court has not given weight to these signing statements interpreting the meanings of acts of Congress, Judge Alito has maintained that the unitary executive theory of the Supreme Court as well as the President can determine what laws apply to him and how they apply, then he is essentially giving away the power of the Supreme Court as well as the power of Congress.

Ever since Marbury v. Madison, it has been “emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases must of ne-

cessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each.” That settled doctrine, Marbury v. Madison, clashes with this notion of a unitary executive who can declare the law for himself and thus make himself exempt from the law.

Judge Alito’s support for a powerful and unitary executive is exacerbated by his 13-year circuit court record of repeatedly deferring to government officials when American’s civil rights and liberties lie in the balance. As I mentioned earlier, this is the other function the Founding Fathers created for the Constitution. The Framers included the fourth amendment in the Bill of Rights to protect Americans against unreasonable government searches and seizures. It was a response to the abuses of the British in the years leading up to the American Revo-

lution. Yet time and again, Judge Alito has deferred to poll, prosecutors, and other governmental agents instead of ordinary Americans.

Judge Alito wrote in his now famous 1985 job application essay that he disagreed with the Warren Court’s crimi-
nal procedures decisions. These include famous cases in the development of American liberties—for example, Miranda v. Arizona, which sets forth
Judge Alito’s view appears to have been developed well over 20 years ago on these issues. In his 1985 job application essay, Judge Alito wrote that he disagreed with the Warren Court’s establishment clause decisions. These rulings prohibited government-sponsored prayer in public schools, protected students who are members of minority religious faiths, and prevented State interference with and entanglement in America’s religious liberties. Judge Alito’s record on the bench supports a troubling view of the establishment clause. For example, he joined a dissenting opinion in the case of ACLU of New Jersey v. Black Horse Pike Regional Board of Education, supporting a student-led prayer at official, school-sponsored high school graduation ceremonies. The Supreme Court, in an opinion joined by Justice O’Connor, has since explicitly rejected this approach in Santa Fe Independent School District v. Doe and as recently as last year has sought a careful balance in establishment clause cases such as ACLU v. McCreeary County.

In summary, in ACLU of New Jersey v. Black Horse Pike Regional Board of Education, the Circuit majority determined that a student-led prayer at a graduation ceremony violated the establishment clause.

Judge Alito joined the dissent in arguing that the establishment clause allows a high school graduation prayer. The school board involved had decided to allow graduating students to vote whether they wished to have a prayer, a moment of silence, or neither at their graduation ceremony. The Supreme Court, in Wallace v. Jaffree and Board of Education v. Barnette, the Third Circuit majority said:

An impermissible practice cannot be transformed into a constitutionally acceptable one by putting a democratic process to an improper use.

Judge Alito joined the dissenting opinion written by Judge Mansmann, stating that “the establishment clause should not be read to prohibit activity which has nothing to do with the free exercise clause.” The dissent argued that the Supreme Court in Lee had not decided any broad constitutional precedents against prayer at graduation ceremonies, stating the facts in the case were wholly different, as the graduates, not the principal, maintained control over the ceremony, thereby avoiding the appearance of a state actor. The dissenters wrote:

The establishment clause should not be used for imposing content and restrictions on religious speech in a public forum under the appropriate scrutiny analysis.

The dissent further criticized the Lemon test established in Lemon v. Kurtzman, pointing to a “division” existing on the Supreme Court “as to whether the establishment clause precludes the government from conveying a message that endorses or encourages religion in a generic sense, or especially acknowledges or accommodates the broad Judeo-Christian heritage of our civil and social order.” It also concluded:

[An absolute prohibition on ceremonial prayer at graduation would . . . violate the Free Exercise Clause by unduly inhibiting the practice of religion, and would also implicate the free speech guarantees of the First Amendment.]

In another case, Child Evangelism Fellowship of New Jersey v. Stafford Township School District, Judge Alito wrote an opinion requiring a school to distribute a proselytizing religious group’s literature to elementary school students under the Equal Access Act. Judge Alito dismissed the school district’s concerns that students would perceive distribution of the religious fliers as endorsement of religion. Again, Judge Alito’s view in this area of the law differed from that of the Supreme Court. Justice O’Connor’s opinion in Board of Education v. Muroc, for example, carefully distinguished between requiring access to school facilities—which was acceptable under the Equal Access Act—and requiring the active involvement of school officials in teachers, which could claim an inappropriately coercive effect.

Although I could discuss more cases, the basic point I want to make here is that I believe Judge Alito would upset the careful balance between the Free Exercise and Establishment Clauses of the First Amendment, allowing majority religious views to prevail over minority views, and leading to an inappropriate Government coercive effect on religious practice.

As Justice O’Connor states in McCreary:

At a time when we see around the world the violent consequences of the assumption of religious authority by government, American courts have the awesome responsibility to protect the structure of freedoms enshrined in our Constitution.

The First Amendment protects Americans’ religious liberties through two clauses that work in tandem: the free exercise clause and the establishment clause. I worry that if confirmed, Judge Alito would upset the careful balance the Founders sought in constructing this Amendment. I believe Judge Alito seems to interpret the establishment clause as a rarely applicable part of the first amendment. He applies the free exercise clause on a much broader basis, often interpreting establishment clause cases as free exercise cases. He seems to see a plaintiff’s complaint of establishment clause violations as attempts to block the free exercise of religion.

Judge Alito’s views appear to have been developed well over 20 years ago on these issues. In his 1985 job application essay, Judge Alito wrote that he disagreed with the Warren Court’s establishment clause decisions. These
As far as a woman’s right-to-choose is concerned, in his 1985 job application, Samuel Alito wrote that he was proud of his work in the Reagan administration advancing a “legal position” that he “personally believe[d] very strongly” about that “the Constitution does not protect the right to an abortion.” Let me make clear, he did not say that he thought abortion was wrong; he wrote that the Constitution did not protect a woman’s right to choose. I do not think there is anything wrong with that, as a lawyer and then a circuit judge, and that he did nothing to dispel in his Judiciary Committee hearings.

In his work for the Reagan Justice Department, Alito wrote a memo with a strategy for “bringing about the eventual overruling of Roe v. Wade” by chipping away gradually at privacy and reproductive rights. In the case of Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey, Judge Alito used his dissent to argue for a constitutional interpretation that would allow just that, chip away at the protections for the freedom to choose. The Supreme Court explicitly rejected Alito’s opinion, with Justice O’Connor writing that the State “may not give to a man the power to destroy life, or to a woman the power to destroy the life of her child.”

In his application to the Reagan Justice Department in 1985, Samuel Alito wrote that his interest in constitutional law had been “motivated in large part by disagreement with Warren Court decisions” about voting rights. The Supreme Court had held that a broad sweep of the Voting Rights Act had been “motivated in large part by disagreement with Warren Court decisions” about voting rights. In his dissent, Judge Alito wrote that the Court’s decision in cases like Baker v. Carr and Reynolds v. Sims, have enshrined the bedrock principle of “one person, one vote” into our Constitution. They have protected the right of all Americans to have an equal political voice, regardless of the color of their skin or the location of their home.

While Judge Alito backed away from these strong statements in his confirmation hearings, his opinion in a voting rights case he heard on the Third Circuit calls that statement into question. In the case of Jenkins v. Manning, Judge Alito joined an opinion rejecting the African-American plaintiffs’ challenge to the voting system in Alabama for the disloyal judge in the case wrote that Judge Alito’s side had “overlooked the broad sweep of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and its 1982 amendments” which judge noted “is widely considered to be the most successful piece of civil rights legislation ever enacted by Congress.”

The Supreme Court continues to regularly hear cases about the ability of Americans to participate fairly and equally in our democracy, and I believe the Supreme Court should clearly and emphatically treasure and respect the Court’s role in safeguarding voting rights, rather than minimizing it.

At the hearings before the Judiciary Committee, Judge Alito attempted to distance himself from his record and the constitutional views he has advocated throughout his career. An attorney must vigorously serve the interests of his client, but in the case of Judge Alito, he has failed to follow the political objections. If the Reagan Justice Department—precisely because of the constitutional agenda it allowed him to advance. So, I do not accept Judge Alito’s plea that we should not evaluate him based on the constitutional values he advanced through political positions.

I also have not been convinced by Judge Alito’s vague rhetoric during the confirmation hearings, or his begrudging acknowledgment that important Supreme Court cases were indeed “precedents of the Court.” While judges on the Federal circuit courts are circumscribed by Supreme Court precedent, the Supreme Court is the highest court to bind the Justices of the United States Supreme Court. Decisions of the Supreme Court are binding on all lower courts, so even if a circuit judge disagrees with well-established precedent about the rule of law, he or she must follow that law. But this is not true of the Supreme Court.

As Justice Frankfurter once wrote: It is because the Supreme Court wields the power that it wields that appointment to the Supreme Court is a matter of great concern and not merely a question for the profession. In truth, the Supreme Court is the Constitution.

It goes without saying that the constitutional views of the Justices determine the rulings of the Supreme Court. In response to questioning during the hearings, Judge Alito pledged to put aside his personal views. But in his writings and speeches, including his 1985 job application, Judge Alito didn’t just record his personal political views; he wrote down his views about what the Constitution means—about what rights it contains, and what limits it places on Government. This is exactly what it means to serve on the Supreme Court and interpret the Constitution.

America’s courtrooms are staffed with judges, not machines, because justice requires human judgments. This is particularly so on the Supreme Court. Of all the hundreds of thousands of cases filed in American Federal Courts each year, only about 80 reach the Supreme Court. The vast majority of cases, cases that have divided the country’s lower courts. These are cases where one constitutional clause may be in conflict with another; where one statute may influence the interpretation of another; and where one core national value may interfere with another. These cases often divide the Justices of the Court by close margins. Surely the Justices on both sides of a 5 to 4 case can claim to be following the judicial process and respecting the precedents of the Court. What divides their opinions is the set of constitutional values that they bring to the case. Judge Alito’s testimony before the Judiciary Committee suggests a failure either to understand or to acknowledge the impact of his own constitutional views on the outcome of cases that he hears.

Given his lengthy record and his enthusiastic statement about the Constitution, the burden was on Judge Alito to convince the Senate that he would be a judicious and balanced member of the Supreme Court.
The questions he was asked by members of the Judiciary Committee gave him numerous opportunities to do so. Judge Alito did not meet this burden. He failed to inform this body of his views on important constitutional issues, he evaded fair and important questions, offered honest and insightful answers, and he in no way demonstrated that he would uphold not just the letter of the law, but also its spirit.

As a result, I cannot support his lifetime nomination to the highest court in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise this evening to discuss my vote on the confirmation of Judge Samuel Alito, Jr., to the U.S. Supreme Court. After meeting with Judge Alito and studying his record and comparing his answers to my criteria for judicial nominees, I have not found that he is an adequate check on the Government.

The next Justice will have the power to change the Court, change the country, change the rights of Americans. Judge Alito has a very troubling record. In his hearing and in our private meeting he did not show that he will be an independent judge who will uphold the rights and liberties of all Americans.

As with past nominees, I have evaluated this nominee based on my long-standing criteria, which ask: Is the nominee qualified, ethical, and honest? Will the nominee be fair, evenhanded, and independent? And will the nominee uphold the rights and liberties of all Americans?

Personally, I got involved in politics because of another Supreme Court nomination, that of Clarence Thomas. At the time, I was frustrated that average Americans didn’t have a voice in the process that affects them so much. I have worked to be the voice of working families in my State, and I have asked the questions they would ask. I am voting to protect their interests.

I recognize that a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court. The Constitution directs Senators to provide advice and consent on all judicial nominees, and the people of my home State of Washington have trusted me to be their advocate to safeguard their rights and vote on judicial nominees. I take that responsibility very seriously. That is why I have reviewed Judge Alito’s past writings, studied his answers to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and asked to meet with him in my office.

A lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court is a tremendous grant of unchecked power. If the Supreme Court rules incorrectly, there is no option for appeal. There is no backstop. Any seat on the Supreme Court can affect our rights for generations. But there are three factors involved in this particular nomination that make it even more significant. Those factors are the times, the nominee, and the process.

First, I am well aware that we are living in historic times. Each day, it seems that the rights of the individuals and the power of government are being tested. We are at war overseas, we face threats here at home, and the current administration is pushing the bounds of governmental power in remarkable ways.

The Bush administration has arrested U.S. citizens and held them without access to the courts. It has run secret prisons around the world. It has expressed views on torture that put our own troops at risk. As we recently learned, the administration has been spying on American citizens without prior authorization. These are grave issues which will likely come before the Supreme Court. How that Court will rule affects the rights of our citizens, the balance of power between the branches of our Government, and the balance of power between our citizens and Government.

So as I make my decision on this nominee, I am very mindful of the historic times we are living in and the serious questions this Supreme Court will address in the coming years.

Secondly, I am very mindful of the seat that is open on the Supreme Court and its significance. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor was a pioneer in the field of law, and her decisions will shape the lives of the American people for generations to come.

As I said when she announced her resignation, we live in a better America due to her 24 years of service on the Court. Justice O’Connor was often a swing vote in tough decisions. Her successor could easily change the balance of power on the Court, which could dramatically shift the Court’s ruling on so many issues. Because this is a swing seat that could tip the Court’s balance of power, we need to make sure that the person we confirm is someone who will protect our rights and liberties.

Some have suggested that I should just go along and support the President’s nominee. I have a different view. I do not think that is the way I make decisions. I have criteria that I use to evaluate all judicial nominees, and Judge Alito is no different.

Third, I am also well aware of how Judge Alito came to be the President’s nominee. The President, as we all remember, had nominated his counsel, Harriet Miers, to the High Court, but Ms. Miers was not acceptable to the rightwing of the President’s party. I found it very interesting that before her nomination, Republicans were demanding activism here at home, and the Senate floor for anyone the President nominated. But when President Bush nominated Ms. Miers, suddenly we stopped hearing that urgent call for an up-or-down vote. In fact, Ms. Miers’ nomination was killed by the President’s own party, apparently because she did not meet the ideological test of the extreme right.

I want this history tonight not to diminish Judge Alito but to point out that his nomination comes before the Senate in the context of an ideological battle that has been created by the rightwing. When the President nominated Judge Alito, the rightwing was confident that he would vote their way. That reaction gives me pause as to whether this nominee can keep an open mind on the issues that come before him. If the rightwing is so confident that he is going to vote their way, how can all of us be confident that he will put our country’s needs first? That alone does not suggest that Judge Alito cannot be fair, but it did lead me to explore those questions diligently.

Given the importance of the Supreme Court and the background of the times and the seat and the process, I began to evaluate how Judge Alito measured up to my standards for judicial nominees. Judge Alito’s record contains some disturbing statements and pronouncements that require detailed explanations. Does he still hold some of those views? In many cases, we don’t know. I wish Judge Alito had been more forthcoming during his hearing. At the same time, many of the things he said and refused to say spoke volumes.

As I noted earlier, my standards are simple: Is the nominee qualified, ethical, and honest? Will the nominee be fair and evenhanded and independent? And will the nominee uphold the rights and liberties of all Americans?

I am very comfortable that Judge Alito is qualified, he is honest, and he is ethical. But whether he will be fair and evenhanded and independent? And, as was discussed at his hearing, does he have a troubling record for fighting for the government and corporations and against individuals. He seems to favor the entrenched power over the little guy. His record does not give me the confidence that everyone who comes before the Court will be treated fairly.

I am also deeply concerned about Judge Alito’s independence. We rely on our courts as a critical check and balance against government abuse. That independent check helps to protect our rights. This is especially important today because of the growing questions of the expansion of Executive power.

The Supreme Court will need to evaluate whether recent Executive actions are constitutional. Here Judge Alito’s unbalanced minority view of the scope of Executive power tells me he does not have the independence to be an adequate check on the Government’s abuse of power.

Finally, I have serious doubts that Judge Alito will uphold our rights and liberties. One example is his hostility...
to the right of privacy. In the hearings, he refused to say that Roe v. Wade is settled law, and he did not adequately explain his 1985 statement that the Constitution does not protect a right to an abortion.

Last year, when I voted to confirm, yes, Chief Justice John Roberts, I said I was choosing hope instead of fear and that Judge Roberts, through his answers, inspired such hope. Judge Alito, through his writings, his rulings, and his mannerisms, does not inspire confidence in me that he will protect all our rights. Because so much is on the line, because I do not believe he will be sufficiently independent or will uphold our rights and liberties, I will respectfully vote against his confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from teachers around the country who have opposed this nomination.

The projection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN LAW TEACHERS,

January 9, 2006.

Re: The Society of American Law Teachers’ Opposition to the Nomination of Judge Samuel Alito to the United States Supreme Court.

Hon. ABEBN SPECKER,
Chair, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK LEARY,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS SPECKER AND LEARY: The Society of American Law Teachers (SALT) opposes—and urges all members of the Senate Judiciary Committee to vote against—the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito to the United States Supreme Court. SALT is the largest organization of law professors in the United States, representing more than 900 professors at more than 180 law schools. SALT has taken a position opposing only a very few judicial nominations. It did not oppose any of Justice Roberts or Harriet Meirs. However, it is deeply committed to civil rights, individual rights and liberties, and an interpretation of federalism that respects the role of Congress in protecting these rights. Judge Alito’s work in the United States Department of Justice and fifteen year record on the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit evidence his disregard for all three.

Replacing Justice Sandra Day O’Connor with Judge Alito will result in the Court shifting profoundly to the right.

A Knight-Ridder comprehensive review of published opinions written by Judge Alito concludes he has worked opportunistically to rewrite a conservative legal agenda into the fabric of the nation’s laws. [His] record reveals decisions so consistent that the results do matter to him. [He] rarely supports individual rights claims. [And] often goes out of his way to narrow the scope of individual rights.

While Judge Alito’s opinions are devoid of explosive language and appear to reflect a dispassionate application of law to facts, he has used legal craftsmanship and existing precedents to engineer predictable results. As Professor Lawrence Tribe has stated, “I simply make a plea to quit pretending that law, life and an individual’s assumptions can be entirely severed.” A judge’s values, beliefs and experiences do matter. Judge Alito has undermined the protections of civil rights laws, devalued individual rights, overturned or weakened federal statutes, and narrowly reinterpreted precedent in the name of dispassionate application of the law.

UNDERMINING CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS

Employment Discrimination

Judge Alito has engaged in an effort to eviscerate the laws that seek to remedy violations of federal civil rights. This effort can be seen in his published opinions in employment discrimination cases, and has sided with the plaintiff only four times, which includes one case in which he sided with white police officers challenging an affirmative action policy. He has evinced skepticism of the legitimacy of most discrimination claims and an unwarranted belief that discrimination is rare in our society.

In three cases in which Judge Alito would have dismissed claims of harassment, he displayed a lack of understanding of the dynamics of harassment and hostile environment discrimination and their impact on a victim’s workplace environment and psychological well-being. In one case, writing for the court, he reversed a jury verdict, saying the harasser had previously harassed another woman because “the report in no way put the City on notice that Dickerson was a sexual harasser.”

In another case, Piroli v. World Flavors, Inc., there was an undisputed evidence that an employee with mental disabilities had suffered sexually motivated, physically abusive workplace harassment. The trial court dismissed Piroli’s claim, calling the quite horrifying harassment mere macho horseplay. In reversing the lower court, Judge Alito dismissed the case, and sent the case back for trial. Judge Alito dissented, not because Piroli had failed to meet the legal standard for sexual harassment, but because his brief never explicitly asserted that he suffered from a work environment that a reasonable person without mental retardation would find hostile or abusive, even though all the necessary facts had been alleged. In other words, Judge Alito would have dismissed the case for sloppy briefing. Additionally, he would have sided with the defendant in the role of reasonableness than the law requires. Judge Alito would have compared Piroli to a reasonable person without mental retardation. The Supreme Court significantly reversed in Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services, Inc., Justice Scalia writing for the majority, that the severity of the harassment is to be judged from the perspective of a reasonable person in the plaintiff’s position—in this case, a reasonable person with a mental disability.

Lastly, in a dissenting opinion, Judge Alito would have excluded evidence crucial to the victim’s discrimination case in Glass v. Philadelphia Electric Co. Mr. Glass had worked for Philadelphia Electric for twenty-three years and received only one job evaluation less than satisfactory. He applied for and was denied many promotions. The employer explanation was based part on in the one sub-par evaluation Glass had received. Glass tried to present evidence that during that time period he was assigned to a position that a white woman was the best candidate. The cases are troubling for discrimination will have their day in court. Judge Alito dissented from the reversal of a grant of summary judgment. In Sheridan v. E.I. de Ne世es v. Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc. Although the dispute in Sheridan appears to be highly technical, it is central to whether victims of discrimination will have their day in court.

In another discrimination case in which Judge Alito dissented from the reversal of a grant of summary judgment, the majority accused Judge Alito of overstepping his judicial role and acting as a fact finder in resolving the conflicting evidence in favor of the employer. Judge Alito’s hostility towards some employment discrimination cases was reflected in his dissent:

“I have no doubt that in the future we are going to get many more cases where an employer is choosing between competing candidates who are roughly equally qualified. And the candidate who is not hired or promoted may be asking the court to look for some inconsistencies in terms of the employer’s having failed to follow its internal procedures to the letter. We are allowing disgruntled employees to impose the costs of trial on employers who, although they have not acted with the intent to discriminate, may have treated their employees unfairly.

Together, these cases reflect a palpable hostility toward plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases.

DOSCRIMINATION IN JURY SELECTION

Judge Alito has written troubling opinions in cases involving the penalty of death.

Defendants challenged jury selection as reflecting discrimination. The cases are troubling for three reasons. First, they reflect a general hostility toward civil rights. Second, they suggest that Judge Alito is among the most conservative judges when it comes to the death penalty (whereas Justice O’Connor was frequently the swing vote in capital cases). Third, one of the cases reflects Judge Alito’s hostility to the use of statistics to prove discrimination. This hostility is most troubling because statistics has been an important element of proof in creating an inference of discrimination or a discriminatory impact.
While picking a grand jury in Rumsfeld v. United States, the judge announced that he was not randomly selecting jurors because he was trying to pick a cross section of the community and to represent all major racial and ethnic groups, including at least two African Americans, to sit separately in the body of the courtroom. An en banc divided Third Circuit ruled against Judge Alito, who was one of the judges who allowed the petition on the basis of the principle that the government could not select juries by race.

Judge Alito's dissent in this case demonstrated that he believes that a jury has a right to represent members of the community. This is a fundamental right that is protected by the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

In another case concerning Congress' lawmaking authority, Judge Alito has written two opinions that reflect an extreme view of the limits of congressional power to pass legislation. He voted to invalidate the federal gun prohibition on machine gun possession, which had been the subject of a lawsuit. In the United States v. Raich case, Judge Alito argued that the federal ban was unconstitutional because it exceeded Congress' authority to pass laws regulating interstate commerce. He wrote that the ban on machine guns was not reasonably related to the federal government's power to regulate interstate commerce and that the ban was not a proper exercise of Congress' power to promote the general welfare.

In a case concerning the rights of women to control their reproductive decisions, Judge Alito has written opinions that suggest he views individual and other constitutional rights as stopping at the prison door. He would have upheld a Pennsylvania law prohibiting certain forms of birth control. In his opinion, Judge Alito noted that the law was not designed to interfere with a woman's ability to make reproductive decisions and that it was not intended to discriminate against certain groups of women. He wrote that the law was a reasonable exercise of Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce and that it was not discriminatory because it applied equally to all women.

In another case concerning the rights of women, Judge Alito has written opinions that suggest he views individual and other constitutional rights as stopping at the prison door. He would have upheld a Pennsylvania law prohibiting certain forms of birth control. In his opinion, Judge Alito noted that the law was not designed to interfere with a woman's ability to make reproductive decisions and that it was not intended to discriminate against certain groups of women. He wrote that the law was a reasonable exercise of Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce and that it was not discriminatory because it applied equally to all women.

In a case concerning the rights of women to control their reproductive decisions, Judge Alito has written opinions that suggest he views individual and other constitutional rights as stopping at the prison door. He would have upheld a Pennsylvania law prohibiting certain forms of birth control. In his opinion, Judge Alito noted that the law was not designed to interfere with a woman's ability to make reproductive decisions and that it was not intended to discriminate against certain groups of women. He wrote that the law was a reasonable exercise of Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce and that it was not discriminatory because it applied equally to all women.

In another case concerning the rights of women, Judge Alito has written opinions that suggest he views individual and other constitutional rights as stopping at the prison door. He would have upheld a Pennsylvania law prohibiting certain forms of birth control. In his opinion, Judge Alito noted that the law was not designed to interfere with a woman's ability to make reproductive decisions and that it was not intended to discriminate against certain groups of women. He wrote that the law was a reasonable exercise of Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce and that it was not discriminatory because it applied equally to all women.

In a case concerning the rights of women to control their reproductive decisions, Judge Alito has written opinions that suggest he views individual and other constitutional rights as stopping at the prison door. He would have upheld a Pennsylvania law prohibiting certain forms of birth control. In his opinion, Judge Alito noted that the law was not designed to interfere with a woman's ability to make reproductive decisions and that it was not intended to discriminate against certain groups of women. He wrote that the law was a reasonable exercise of Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce and that it was not discriminatory because it applied equally to all women.

In another case concerning the rights of women, Judge Alito has written opinions that suggest he views individual and other constitutional rights as stopping at the prison door. He would have upheld a Pennsylvania law prohibiting certain forms of birth control. In his opinion, Judge Alito noted that the law was not designed to interfere with a woman's ability to make reproductive decisions and that it was not intended to discriminate against certain groups of women. He wrote that the law was a reasonable exercise of Congress' power to regulate interstate commerce and that it was not discriminatory because it applied equally to all women.
to make any findings that state statutes had discriminated against women. The preamble to the statute explicitly states that the purpose of the Act is to remedy sex discrimination.

It seems clear that a long history of litigation striking down state statutes disadvantageing women in the workplace.

Nevertheless, Judge Alito would require Congress to engage the power specifically directed at the FMLA. In a similar challenge, Nevada Department of Human Resources v. Hibbs the Supreme Court later held that state employees can enforce their right to damages pursuant to a violation of another provision of the FMLA.

ADVOCATING AN EXPANSIVE SCOPE OF EXECUTIVE POWER

Since the Nixon Administration, the country has witnessed a legal battle concerning the scope of presidential authority under our Constitution. The present administration advances an extreme, expansionist theory of the scope of presidential power, both foreign and domestic. The theoretical underpinnings for the concept of the “imperial presidency” have been developed by writings of the Federalist Society. Judge Alito’s 1985 application to serve as Deputy Assistant Attorney General of Legal Counsel (OLC) boasts of his regular participation in the Federalist Society, an involvement which continues to this day. OLC, during his tenure, acts as the eyes, ears, and voice of the president in determining the scope of expansive presidential power. For example, OLC opined that the executive branch could ignore congressionally authorized procedures for federal procurement and determined that the President had constitutionally unfettered authority to determine when to tell Congress of his covert initiative with Iran to sell arms sales—even though the power to regulate foreign trade is an express congressional authority.

In other memoranda which Judge Alito wrote while at the Justice Department, he argued in favor of expanded government authority to intercept computer messages and broader authority for government agents to set up shell companies to help with undercover operations. He also told the FBI that it was not bound by two district court decisions restricting the Bureau’s power to invest the money earned from convictions whose jobs were not critical to national security.

During his years on the bench, Judge Alito has frequently affirmed the doctrine of separation of powers and the principle that the judicial branch is the final arbiter of the Constitution’s limits on the executive and legislative branches. The President should be able to control the executive branch. . . . [I]t goes just to the core of the question of scope.

In his opening remarks today on the Alito nomination, the Senator from Vermont said: “This is a nomination that I fear threatens the fundamental rights and liberties of all Americans, now and for generations to come.” That language is simply cut and pasted from the statement as it appears on the Senator from Vermont’s Web site.

The Senator from Vermont made the exact statement yesterday, during the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing at which we considered the Alito nomination. He said: “This is a nomination that I fear threatens the fundamental rights and liberties of all Americans now and in generations to come.”

I was not only in the ballpark, I was standing on home plate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, my time to speak is not until 6:15. Since there is nobody else in the Chamber, I will proceed to speak on the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito to the U.S. Supreme Court.

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Samuel Alito, President Bush’s nominee as Associate Justice to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Alito has the experience, intellect, temperament, and integrity required of a Supreme Court Justice. He has more judicial experience than any Supreme Court nominee in 70 years. In his 15 years on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Judge Alito participated in over 1,500 cases and authored more than 350 opinions.

Prior to becoming a Federal appellate judge, Judge Alito established a record as a tough Federal prosecutor who served as the assistant attorney for the District of New Jersey.

As the State’s top Federal law enforcement official, Judge Alito oversaw the prosecutions of drug traffickers, terrorists, and organized crime figures. He also cracked down on perpetrators of environmental crimes, creating a new position of Environmental Crimes Coordinator.

Prior to being unanimously confirmed twice by the U.S. Senate, Judge Alito proved himself to be an effective advocate on behalf of the United States while serving in the Office of the Solicitor General. There, Judge Alito participated in more than 230 cases, arguing 12 before the Supreme Court.

In sum, Judge Alito has served as a judge on one of the Nation’s highest courts, as the top Federal prosecutor in one of the Nation’s largest Federal districts, and as an effective advocate for the United States in the Office of the Solicitor General. His 30 years of public service spans the full breadth of the law.

Judge Alito is unarguably a highly qualified nominee. However, I told the citizens of Colorado that I would also evaluate judicial nominees on their judicial philosophy and commitment to the rule of law.

Specifically, I pledged to support judicial nominees who rule on the law and facts before them—not judges who attempt to legislate from the bench. Judge Alito’s judicial philosophy corresponds with that promise.

Judge Alito recognizes the limited role of the Federal judiciary, having observed that “although the judiciary has a very important role to play, it’s a limited role. . . . It should always be asking itself whether it is straying over the bounds, whether it’s invading the authority of the legislature, for example, whether it is making policy judgments rather than interpreting the law.

Like his view of the limited role of the judicial branch, Judge Alito also recognizes the limits on the powers of the executive branch. Speaking on his understanding of the “unitary Executive,” Judge Alito explained, “the idea of the unitary Executive is that the President should be able to control the executive branch. . . . [I]t goes just to the question of control. It doesn’t go to the question of scope.”

Further, Judge Alito recognizes that “[n]o person in this country, no matter how high or powerful, is above the law, and no person in this country is beneath the law.” This statement reflects his commitment to a principle so fundamental to justice in this country that it is carved in stone over the entrance to the Supreme Court: “Equal justice under law.”

Consistent with the principle of equal justice under law, Judge Alito does not
allow his personal opinion to decide the outcome of a case. He says “[a] judge can’t have any agenda. . . . The judge’s only obligation—and it’s a solemn obligation—is to the rule of law, and what that means is that in every single case, the judge has to do what the law requires.”

I believe that each of my colleagues would agree that judges should be held to this standard. Yet, at the same time, some criticize Judge Alito’s record for living up to it.

For example, Groovy Judge Alito argued in dissent that a search warrant authorized law enforcement officials to search everyone inside a drug dealer’s house, including the wife and daughter. Even though he personally “share[d] the majority’s visceral dislike of the intrusive search,” Judge Alito’s unwavering commitment to the rule of law led him to do what he believed the law required, despite his personal beliefs on the outcome.

In sum, Judge Alito will serve as an effective steward of the law and Constitution. His record evidences a deep respect for the separation of powers and other fundamental principles envisioned by our Founding Fathers. I have no reason to believe Judge Alito will be deferential to anyone or anything other than the law and the facts before him.

As a representative of Colorado, I also appreciate the uniqueness of the issues that arise in our State and the West. The departure of Justice O’Connor and Chief Justice Rehnquist marks the loss of a Western presence on the Supreme Court.

Earlier this year, I asked President Bush to nominate a judge who could capably decide issues important to Colorado and the West, such as water and resource law.

When I asked Judge Alito about his understanding of Western resource and water law, he explained that he learned to appreciate the importance and complexity of these issues while working in the U.S. Solicitor General’s Office. He assured me that he understands the uniqueness to the West of such issues as water rights, the environment, and public lands.

In conversations with Judge Alito, I couldn’t help but be reminded of my meeting with now Chief Justice Roberts. Judge Alito is a man of great re- search, a thoughtful, careful, and thorough responses to my many questions—a further reflection of his view of the limited role of a judge.

Although America was already aware of Judge Alito’s distinguished record, the Judiciary Committee hearings were helpful in shedding additional light on his character, temperament, and integrity, particularly in trying circumstances.

During the nearly 18 hours of questioning, Judge Alito was both open and candid. He answered 97 percent of the nearly 700 questions that were asked of him, declining to answer only 3 percent. By comparison, Justice Ginsburg declined to answer 20 percent of questions. Justice Ginsburg received 96 votes in favor of her confirmation.

Throughout the course of the demanding process, Judge Alito demonstrated great patience, humility, and respect for all persons. His temperament and respect for the rule of law and the Constitution is first-rate. His measured approach has not slowed the pace of the bench. The ABA’s stated criteria for evaluating nominees are “integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament.”

I believe that the judges with whom he has served on the Third Circuit offer their praise. Judge Tim Lewis, a former Clinton appointee, commended Judge Alito for his role in discrimination cases. Judge Lewis, testifying in support of Judge Alito, said that “if I believed that Sam Alito might be hostile to civil rights as a member of the United States Supreme Court, I guarantee you that I would not be sitting here today.”

Major newspapers across the State of Colorado, including the Rocky Mountain News and the Denver Post, offer their praise for Judge Alito. “Judge Alito’s jurisprudence and integrity have been lauded by newspapers, legal scholars, former law clerks, and colleagues from both sides of the aisle.”

The Rocky Mountain News says that Judge Alito “personifies judicial restraint” and “deserves confirmation.” He has refused to elevate his ideology above the rule of law while showing deference to the crucial but limited role the Founders envisioned for federal judges.

Commenting on the temptation for Democratic Senators to cave to the demands of “left-wing interest groups” in trying to exploit the muck-raking of oval office misconduct, the Rocky Mountain News says that Senator Alito “personifies judicial restraint” and “deserves confirmation.”

I ask unanimous consent to have the January 9, 2006 Rocky Mountain News editorial reprinted in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Jan. 9, 2006]

ALITO PERSONIFIES JUDICIAL RESTRAN

No one seriously questions the qualifications of federal appeals court Judge Samuel Alito to sit on the Supreme Court. U.S. attorney, assistant to the solicitor general and the attorney general, and a 15-year tenure on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Alito has served capably on a bench of distinguished jurists, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.

And that’s why the Senate should confirm Judge Alito to succeed Sandra Day O’Connor. Alito is uniquely qualified. Alito has served capably on the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Alito’s judicial record is exemplary. He is respected by his colleagues, who worked with Alito the prosecutor who has left his influence on the law rather than pursuing a political agenda. Keep that in mind as confirmation hearings open in Washington today. Liberal interest groups and some partisan Democrats are up in arms because Alito has served as a model of restraint.
The Senate debate should reflect that the job of a judge is to review cases impartially, not to advocate issues. Judges should be evaluated on their qualifications, judicial philosophy, and respect for the rule of law.

It would be unfortunate and irresponsible of me and my colleagues to continue to politicize the judicial confirmation process. Judge Alito is eminently qualified, and he deserves a swift up-or-down vote.

I intend to vote in favor of Judge Samuel A. Alito Jr.'s confirmation as the 110th Justice to the United States Supreme Court and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

I believe that Judge Alito will not be an activist judge and supports limits on the judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from attorney William Banta in which he discusses judicial independence, judicial activism, and judicial usurpation, now referred to by many of us as just judicial activism.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Englewood, CO, September 6, 2005,
Re: A Lawyer's Duty—Judicial Independence, Judicial Activism, and Judicial Usurpation.
Hon. Wayne Allard,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC,
Dear Senator Allard: Recently there has been an outcry from the established bar in defense of judicial independence. However, this has involved three issues: (1) whether Mr. Marbury had a right to his commission; (2) if so, whether the remedy was a writ of mandamus from the Supreme Court of the United States. Marshall said "yes" to the first two issues and "no" to the third.

The Chief Justice held that the Supreme Court lacked the power to issue a writ of mandamus for Mr. Marbury's commission because the Constitution did not provide for the exercise of such original jurisdiction even though an Act of Congress (the Judiciary Act of 1789) did. In ruling against the Supreme Court's having jurisdiction, John Marshall declared the obedience of courts to the Constitution, the Constitution being "a rule for the government of courts, as well as of the legislature.

To paraphrase Chief Justice Marshall, judges are subject to the Constitution; the Constitution is not subject to judges. The Supreme Court's reassertion of the restraints and responsibilities required of the judicial branch.

Now I have a couple of questions regarding what some see as attacks upon judicial independence. Does anyone think that the public is criticizing courts because the judges on the courts are not following the Constitution? Or, are courts being criticized because some judges are seen as expounding political preferences instead of a judicial philosophy? I would certainly be independent of any court to contradict the Constitution, but it would also be unconstitutional and, to use John Marshall's words, "to commit murder on the Constitution.

Roger J. Miner wrote an admonition to us lawyers that I ran across about seventeen (17) years ago: "Should Lawyers Be More Concerned With Courts?" This ad- 

opment was more recently reprinted in The Colorado Lawyer: "Judges' Corner—Criticizing the Courts: A Lawyer's Duty." To his dismay, Judge Miner noticed that "many lawyers' reluctance to criticize judge-made law, specific judicial decisions, or the qualifications of individual judges." He quoted Justice Robert H. Jackson to the effect that the public rightfully looks to lawyers (as the only group that knows how well judicial work is being done) "to be the first to condemn practices or tendencies that they see departing from the best judicial traditions." Does anyone think, as Judge Miner would, that the public has reason to be disappointed in us lawyers for not being properly critical of judges who deviate from their oaths to support the Constitution that governs them?

Therefore, we need to ask what is going on here. To its credit, the established bar does not directly dispute the right of Americans to criticize their judiciary. However, only a very few lawyers have spoken out in defense of Chief Justice Marshall's insistence on judicial scruples—the established bar too often, or even defend in the name of "judicial independence" the conduct of judges who act contrary to the language of the Constitution. In fact, almost all the decisions were infallible so that it would be ir-reverent of lawyers to challenge them very much.

Not only Chief Justice Marshall but Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone would not have it. Chief Justice Stone said, "I have no patience with the complaint that criticism of judicial acts involves any hazard to the courts. When the courts deal, as ours do, with the great public questions, the only possible experiment, or baseless lawmaking contrary to the Constitution, the American people, if not the established bar, tend to hold that court accountable. In holding judicial feet to constitutional fire, critics are not identifying judicial independence; they are reasserting more apt to judges, those public servants, who overstep their roles and thereby become "activist".

The purpose of the Constitution's Article III, its temporary language, of compensation for Federal judges and the purpose of Colorado's constitutional and statutory provisions for judicial nominations, appointments, and retirements are to insulate judges from political pressures as much as practical . . . providing them with a measure of independence to decide cases with restraint and impartiality. Yet, as the United States Supreme Court has decided, the law usurps the jurisdiction of the other governmental branches, or overpowers the will of the people, in order to express the purpose of judicial independence?

That brings me to my last question: isn't the real threat to judicial independence judicial self-interest? Chief Justice Marshall wrote: "The Court acts itself come to this pass had we, as lawyers and judges, insisted on judges remaining faithful to "the
best judicial traditions. Too often we justified baseless decisions on the unsteady promise of political results or indulged the sentiment that the Constitution is whatever a court declares it is. Incidentally, I take it as a profound safeguard of judicial indepedence. The risk of confusing judicial activism with judicial independence could compound our problem so that the public is left with a whole sense of our own making. If that happened, the American people could demand direct political control over those who had Wayne Allard lost the self-control upon which Chief Justice Marshall insisted, those who became unaccountable to the law they had taken an oath to support. To avoid such a misfortune, it might be a good idea to revisit the instruction manual. Perhaps we could think about whether the Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitution, who are on the bench, are more like a nomad's tent pitched on shifting sands. We might ask ourselves whether we ought to dismiss the Constitution as an outdated document or not, after all, that it was designed in light of human experience and human nature to endure for all time. And we can mull over whether our Constitutio...
"And the reason is that having worked with him, I came to respect what I think are the most important qualities for anyone who puts on a robe, no matter what court they will sit on, particularly, the United States Supreme Court."

Judge Lewis on Judge Alito's honesty and integrity. ‘‘As Judge Becker and others have pointed out, tremendous respect for his opinions and for his approach to the cases. Judge Alito’s opinions have heard oral argument and are not propped up by law clerks—we are alone as judges, discussing the cases—that one really gets to know, gets a sense of the thinking of our colleagues. And I cannot recall one instance during conference or during any other experience that I had with Judge Alito, but in particular, when he exhibited anything remotely resembling an ideological bent.’’

Judge Lewis on Judge Alito and civil rights. ‘‘If I believed that Sam Alito might be hostile to civil rights as a member of the United States Supreme Court, I guarantee you that I would not be sitting here today . . . My sense of civil rights matters and how courts should approach them jurisprudentially might be a little different. I believe in being a little more aggressive in these cases, a more restrained approach. As long as my argument is going to be heard and respected, I know that I will prevail. And believe that Sam Alito will be the type of justice who will listen with an open mind and will not have any agenda-driven or result-oriented analysis.’’

Judge Lewis on why he endorses Judge Alito. ‘‘I am here as a matter of principle and as a matter of my own commitment to justice, to fairness, and my sense that Sam Alito is uniformly qualified in all important respects to serve as a justice on the United States Supreme Court.’’

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached editorial by the Arizona Republic, dated January 24, be printed in the RECORD of this debate on the confirmation of Judge Samuel Alito to the U.S. Supreme Court. The editors’ support for Judge Alito is welcome, and their statement that ‘‘Judge Alito is a superior candidate for the high court regardless of his political leanings’’ is absolutely true.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Jan. 24, 2006]

Alito: Wise in the Ways of ‘‘Why?’’

If America is not on pins and needles over today’s Senate Judiciary Committee vote on Samuel Alito for the U.S. Supreme Court, perhaps this Arizona Republic headline on Monday helps provide an explanation: ‘‘Feingold unqualified of Alito’’—WSAW-TV, Wausau, Wis.

If one of the Senate’s most solidly liberal members, Sen. Russ Feingold, D-Wis., remains uncertain about President Bush’s nominee one day prior to his scheduled Judiciary vote, prospects for derailing the nomination in the full Senate would seem dim.

We’ll see how the votes pan out. Still, it is worth wondering whether the Alito show got the drama go?

The most obvious answer among many is that Alito is a superior candidate for the high court regardless of his political leanings. After 15 years on the bench, Alito has established a lengthy track record as a fair jurist who has struck a proper balance between his own constitutional interpretations and those of his colleagues.

Even his obvious discomfort at the beginning of his Judiciary hearings worked to Alito’s favor. The candidate is bookish and uncomfortable in the limelight! All the better for a position on the nation’s most deliberative, most cerebral panel.

Many commentators have noted that the even-keeled Alito presents himself far differently from Robert Bork, the famously rejected conservative. Well, yes. Alito was not combative in the face of relentless grilling, as Bork was. And he wears no wicked-looking beard. But it would seem that Alito’s imminent success is less a matter of televised theatrics, facial adornment or even judicial philosophy than it is a reflection of the public’s expectations of a Supreme Court justice.

Unquestionably, the public wants jurists to be fair, and it seems to believe that Alito will live up to that standard. The public wants a jurist who respects the judgment of other courts, but it also wants one who understands that Job 1 is to interpret the Constitution.

Sometimes, Supreme Court judges have found those two directives in conflict. The public, and most of the senators who represent it, seems to believe Alito will find his way through those conflicts fairly and intelligently.

But most of all, Alito appears to have won over converts because he has demonstrated the trait that increasingly seems to distinguish great jurists from mediocre-to-good ones: He can explain.

We all wish to know why. With all due respect to President Bush’s previous nominee, Harriet Miers, it was not enough that—wink, wink—her vote on the ‘‘right’’ issues was ensured. Indeed, that constituted the most daunting argument against her.

Alito, by contrast, has won support because senators and decisions will be grounded and argued in the facts of the law, not in some predisposed political prejudice that is unsupported by the case before him.

And that is a powerful argument for Alito all by itself.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise in support of Judge Alito’s nomination to the Supreme Court and urge my colleagues to quickly confirm him.

I begin by observing that the party-line vote in the Judiciary Committee yesterday raises a troubling question for the full Court. That vote is basic to our deliberations. What is the proper test for determining whether to confirm a nominee to the Supreme Court? Until very recently, the Senate has evaluated whether the nominee was qualified—that is, whether he or she possessed the requisite experience, integrity, and temperament to serve. But a new test has been proposed by Judiciary Committee Democrats: will the nominee provide assurances that he or she will rule a particular way on cases sure to come before the Court?

Before I discuss the ramifications of that troubling question, though, I would like to apply the traditional test—the proper test—to the nominee before us.

A Supreme Court Justice should be an experienced judge. Samuel Alito has more Federal judicial experience than all but one nominee in U.S. history, Horace Lurton, who was nominated by President Taft. In 15 years of service, Judge Alito has authored more than 360 opinions and participated in more than 4,800 decisions. It is an extensive record.

A Supreme Court Justice should be deeply familiar with American constitutional law. Judge Alito has spent his entire professional life grappling with constitutional jurisprudence—serving as a Federal prosecutor at both the trial and appellate level, as the U.S. solicitor general, as a Justice of the Supreme Court, and as a constitutional lawyer in the Justice Department before becoming a judge. Nobody who watched Judge Alito’s testimony would deny that he is a brilliant legal thinker with a deep understanding of our Nation’s jurisprudence.

A Supreme Court Justice should have unassailable integrity. Here, I look to those who know him best.

First, the American Bar Association, in finding him unanimously “well-qualified” to serve, conducted more than 300 interviews with people who know Judge Alito on a professional and personal basis. They have reported that the high praise for Judge Alito’s integrity was “consistent and virtually unanimous.” I repeat, it was “unanimous.”

Second, let’s look at what the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit had to say. Seven current or former judges said Judge Alito’s behalf—judges who were nominated by Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Reagan, the first President Bush, and Clinton. Collectively, they have served with Judge Alito for more than 75 years. They praised his integrity, his open-mindedness, his temperament, his intellect, and his devotion to the rule of law.

Finally, a Supreme Court Justice must know the difference between the judicial role and the legislative or executive function. This qualification is sometimes difficult to decipher, but there are several clues that can guide us.

First, a long judicial record helps, and Judge Alito gives us that. There is not a trace of judicial activism in his record.

Second, a judge cannot have a policy agenda. He or she must defer to the political branches on policy questions. Judge Alito agreed, testifying, ‘‘We [judges] are not policymakers and we shouldn’t be implementing any sort of policy agenda or policy preferences that we have.’’ Judge Alito’s colleagues on the Third Circuit agrees court confirmed this. Professor Aldisert testified that ‘‘at no time during the 15 years that Judge Alito has served with me and with our colleagues on the court, and the countless number of times that we have sat together in private conference after hearing oral arguments, . . . never did I hear him express any thing that could be described as an agenda.”

Third, a judge must not twist statutes or constitutional provisions to reach a result he favors. As Judge Alito testified, ‘‘I never thought I had the authority to change the Constitution. The whole theory of judicial review . . . is contrary to that notion.” In
other words, a judge must accept that the Constitution will sometimes require him to make rulings that he might disagree with. Politicians are free to vote their convictions; judges must put their personal views aside. I will have more to say about this issue in a moment.

Fourth, the judge must have the right understanding of the “living Constitution.” Our Constitution must always remain alive to new situations that it did not contemplate. But the judge must apply the constitutional provisions in the way that most closely approximates the meaning of the text and the underlying principles as understood when drafted. The Constitution is not infinitely malleable. It is not a blank slate for the judicial branch to draw upon. It has no “trajectory” or “evolutionary theme.” It is a text—words with meanings. If the Constitution can be twisted to mean anything, then it ultimately means nothing, we undermine the rule of judges, not the rule of law.

Judge Alito respects the proper divisions within American constitutional government. As he explained in his testimony, the judiciary “should always be aware that it is straying over the bounds, whether it’s invading the authority of the legislature [or] making policy judgments other than interpreting the law.” He emphasized that judges have a duty to police themselves, he called the “constituent process of re-examination on the part of the judges.” If all judges engaged in this process of re-examination, the quality of justice in this Nation would improve dramatically.

Judge Samuel Alito is not going to legislate from the bench or bend the Constitution to suit any political preferences that he might have. He is not going to rely on foreign law, but will look to our American traditions. He is not going to rewrite the Constitution as he wishes it might be, but as it is written. In exercising this judicial restraint, Judge Alito will protect the people’s ability to govern themselves—and that is ultimately what is at stake.

That is why I support Judge Alito. Here is a man who is the son of an immigrant, comes from a modest background, and has a keen sense of patriotic duty. He is highly intelligent, unembarrassed experienced, and imbued with constitutional integrity. He has a low-key, patient, and respectful personality—the model of what we have come to call the “judicial temperament.” He believes in judicial restraint and has proven it for the past 15 years. He deserves my vote and I will proudly give it to him.

This is the analysis we have applied in the past, and its application has resulted in confirmation for most nominees. It was certainly the analysis used to evaluate President Clinton’s nominees to the Supreme Court. So in this context that I want to discuss what is evolving as a new test—a “results-oriented” test.

The minority members of the Judiciary Committee did not question Judge Alito’s qualifications. Rather, they tried to get him to commit to certain results in cases that are sure to come before the courts. They want to see certain policy goals enacted into law. They want others to become law, but our aim should be enacting constitutional legislation, not relying on the courts to enact our policy preferences.

In my September statement supporting Judge Roberts, I explained that this same dynamic had played itself out during his hearings. It is apparent that there is now a fundamental difference between the majority and the minority parties on this matter. We believe the courts should not try to impose policy results in their decisions; they should just decide the questions of statutory interpretation and constitutional meaning.

For the Supreme Court, the results are—or should be—a function of the proper application of the Constitution and law to the facts of each case. To the minority, however, that’s not enough. As many minority Senators have expressed, they are not going to vote for a nominee who will not assure them that he will vote the way they want in future cases. I submit that is wrong. As Judge Alito testified, “Results-oriented jurisprudence is never justified because it is not our job to predict the political preferences. Yesterday’s meeting of the Judiciary Committee illustrates that many Senators have adopted this results-oriented approach to the confirmation process. The wrong questions are being asked, and the wrong answers are being demanded. The right question is how the nominee will do his job, not what the nominee will decide. This fundamental point is getting more and more lost with each passing confirmation battle.

Let me give a few examples. Yesterday a Senator said that it was necessary to vote against Judge Alito because that Senator believes in a right to abortion and there is no guarantee that Judge Alito will agree with that position in a future case dealing with abortion regulations.

That Senator took the same approach when discussing the just-decided case of Gonzales v. Oregon, which dealt with the Attorney General’s promulgation of regulations in response to a state physician-assisted suicide statute. The Attorney General had said that, despite the Oregon statute, physicians could not use Federally regulated drugs to kill patients. The case therefore did not turn on the Court’s views on physician-assisted suicide, but, rather, on the interpretation of the underlying statute. The majority made this clear in the first paragraph. Justice Kennedy explained:

“The dispute before us is in part a product of this litigation, but its resolution requires an inquiry familiar to the courts: interpreting a federal statute to determine whether Executive action is authorized by, or otherwise consistent with, the enactment.”

The Supreme Court had not ruled on the wisdom or appropriateness or constitutional validity of this law. The case was about how executive power could become law, but our aim should be enacting constitutional legislation, not relying on the courts to enact our policy preferences.

The Supreme Court had not ruled on the wisdom or appropriateness or constitutional validity of this law. The case was about how executive power could become law, but our aim should be enacting constitutional legislation, not relying on the courts to enact our policy preferences.

Six months later, the President’s nominee to the Court was Judge Alito. The question before us was virtually the same: whether the President could lawfully order the re-opening of the wetlands. The question is not whether the President had the power to act, but whether the courts had the power to order the conservation order revised. No, I don’t mean to single out any one Senator, because the same thing happened throughout the committee meeting. Senator after Senator would bring up the results of decisions by Judge Alito without any regard as to why he reached a certain result, such as their procedural disposition, the proper standard of review, the governing case law of the Supreme Court or the Third Circuit, or the legal reasoning that Judge Alito used. It was all about results.

As a final example, another Senator wanted Judge Alito to tell him that it would be unconstitutional for the President to order a major military action against Iran or Syria absent prior congressional authorization. He was exasperated that Judge Alito wouldn’t just pre-judge the question, which the Senator called “basic,” and say that the President could not do so. But Judge Alito gave the judge’s answer. It was anything but “basic.” Judge Alito explained that he needed to consider the political question doctrine first, then to analyze the scope of the President’s Article II War Powers, the history of the use of force absent congressional authorization—it’s a very complicated history—and then apply it to the facts before him. The Senator wanted a politician’s answer, a policymaker’s answer, other words, he wanted to know how that case would turn out, before he was briefed and argued. But all we should be asking is, how he would approach the question. What principles would Sam Alito apply, not what kind of results Sam Alito would have. As Judge Alito testified, “Results-oriented jurisprudence is never justified because it is not our job to predict the political preferences.”

Abortion, executive power in a time of war, congressional power, State sovereign immunity, the 4th amendment,
wetlands regulation, the death penalty—many Senators have constructed a confirmation standard that revolves completely around predictions about how cases related to issues such as these will come out. We cannot allow our preconceptions to cloud our view of the judicial function.

If our process evolves into results-oriented voting, votes will inevitably become partisan. Indeed, it appears that it has already become partisan. The confirmations of Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer speak volumes about how this results-oriented approach is, in fact, a problem centered within the democratic caucus. Both of these nominees had a long history of liberalism. Both were Democrats with ties to the political left. Ginsburg was the former general counsel to the ACLU who had advocated taxpayer funding of abortion, and Breyer had been Senator Kennedy’s chief counsel and an academic promoter of an expansive view of the Constitution. Yet, in both cases, Senate Republicans voted to confirm them. But Republicans evaluated their judicial qualifications favorably, trusted their commitments to approach cases with an open mind, and gave deference to the President’s choice. After all, he had won the election.

We have fallen a long way since Justice Breyer was confirmed in 1994. The Republicans who put aside their policy goals and supported liberal Democratic nominees have been rewarded with unprecedented filibusters of qualified nominees to the lower courts and the adoption of a results-oriented confirmation standard for the Supreme Court.

I say to my Democrat colleagues—is this really the path you want to put us on? You have already dramatically increased the chance of future filibusters. Do we really want Senators to vote against any nominee who will not prefix judge cases and guarantee results? I know that the most ideological activists on both sides of the spectrum would prefer that path, but do you? Does the Senate? Does the Nation?

As this is a Democrat problem. But it is naive to think that, someday, Republicans won’t decide that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. And while your “no” votes on Judge Alito will not keep him from the Supreme Court, I say to my Democratic friends—what if President Bush had lost the 2004 election but there were 55 Republicans in the Senate? If Republicans today were applying your results-oriented, litmus-test-based standard to a Democrat President’s nominee, would we be permitted to confirm anybody even vaguely as liberal as Ginsburg or Breyer. If we followed your path, the answer would clearly be “no.” This is a terribly dangerous road to travel.

We all know that the Supreme Court confirmation process has taken on political campaign-like elements, with television advertisements and grass-roots organizations. That development, plus this results-oriented approach to confirmation, represents the subtle rejection of the very idea of a non-political, independent judiciary. What else can we conclude when Senators won’t vote for a nominee who even they say is qualified? Why, just because they want to guarantee certain results out of the Court? That’s not law. That’s politics. It is the antithesis of the rule of law and constitutional government. Do we really want policy makers in robes? I remember when President Clinton’s former White House Counsel, Lloyd Cutler, testified before the Judiciary Committee. His answer was a resounding “No.”

In conclusion, I remind the Senate of something said last September: the rule of law is “hard to create and easier than most people imagine to destroy.” That warning speaks directly to what we face today. If a partisan block of Senators continues with its path of politicization, the Senate cannot be expected to apply only one party. The ultimate loser will not be Republicans or Democrats, but the rule of law itself.

“Hard to create, and easier than most people imagine to destroy.” My friends, please—take a step back. The man is qualified. He has high integrity. He is fair. He deserves your vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito, Jr., to the U.S. Supreme Court.

One of the greatest honors and responsibilities of a Senator is a vote cast to confirm or reject a President’s nominee to the highest Court in this Nation. That thought is truly reprehensible. The Supreme Court, in fact, has overturned its own precedent at least 225 times. That is nearly once per year.

I support Judge Alito’s nomination because his testimony demonstrates his understanding of the principle that the Constitution, and not precedent, is paramount. In addition to his clear and committed approach to interpreting laws and not being a judicial activist, I think the testimony and support of his colleagues speaks volumes about what we can expect from Justice Alito.

Judge Maryanne Trump Barry has served on the Third Circuit with Judge Alito since President Bill Clinton appointed her in 1999. She also worked in the U.S. Attorney’s Office with Judge Alito in the late 1970s. About his service as U.S. attorney, she stated:

Samuel Alito set a standard of excellence that was contagious—his commitment to

The single most important factor that went into my decision of whether to support Judge Alito has to do with the Justices’ role on the Court. The job of the judiciary is to apply and interpret the Constitution and the laws of the land. Unfortunately, not everyone realizes that our courts’ role has become so politicized. Judicial activism has become so rampant in this country. In no way is it the judiciary’s purview to make laws. That is clearly the job of legislators. Legislators are to make the laws and judges are to interpret the law. It is the antithesis of this principle and has demonstrated so throughout his esteemed career.

In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee he spoke about the limited role of the judiciary. Judge Alito stated it should always be asking itself whether it has strayed over the bounds, whether it is invading the authority of the legislature, for example, whether it is making policy judgments rather than interpreting the law. That is the constant process of reexamination of the judges.

During Judge Alito’s confirmation hearing, Democrats tried to make the case that judicial precedent is more important than the Constitution itself. But the Constitution has to be a constant process of reexamination of the Constitution at any moment? I don’t believe we can.

For this reason, we need judges who value the Constitution first. Precedent is a necessary tool to ensure consistent application of the laws, but precedent should not be held so high that we prohibit judges from revisiting bad precedent. The history of the Supreme Court supports this idea. If bad precedent could not be overturned, Plessy v. Ferguson would still stand and racial segregation would still be legal in this country. That thought is truly reprehensible. The Supreme Court, in fact, has overturned its own precedent at least 225 times. That is nearly once per year.

I support Judge Alito’s nomination because his testimony demonstrates his understanding of the principle that the Constitution, and not precedent, is paramount. In addition to his clear and committed approach to interpreting laws and not being a judicial activist, I think the testimony and support of his colleagues speaks volumes about what we can expect from Justice Alito.

Judge Maryanne Trump Barry has served on the Third Circuit with Judge Alito since President Bill Clinton appointed her in 1999. She also worked in the U.S. Attorney’s Office with Judge Alito in the late 1970s. About his service as U.S. attorney, she stated:

Samuel Alito set a standard of excellence that was contagious—his commitment to
doing the right thing, never playing fast and loose with the record, never taking a short-cut, his emphasis on first-rate work, his fundamental decency.

Judge Alito’s intellect and character are the reasons for it.

The character, the qualifications, and the commitment of Judge Alito are not in question by anybody in this room. His long history of public service has proven that. He has served our judicial system and our Nation with the utmost honor, and we can expect him to continue that legacy from our Supreme Court.

I urge all of my colleagues in the Senate to consider their vote and to avoid partisanship. Consider Judge Alito’s qualifications. Consider his respect for the Constitution, Senator Kyl from Arizona preceded me on the floor. He talked about the dangerous precedent that would be set if this body were to depart from the standard of judging nominees based on their experience in favor of a partisan approach. Republicans, back in the 1990s, voted for two people they knew would be liberal. The basis on which Judge Alito’s confirmation is based will likely determine the basis by which all future nominees will be judged.

What I think is important to consider is not how someone will rule but rather on their judicial approach with respect to the words of the Constitution, at the writing of the Founders, at the principles on which America was founded. That is the judicial approach I want somebody to have on the Highest Court in the land. And that is the judicial approach I believe—no one knows—is what Judge Alito’s background and experience may wonder—“Well, why are you here today saying things that look prospects as a justice on the Supreme Court?”

And the reason is that having worked with him, I came to respect what I think are the most important qualities anyone who puts on a robe, no matter what court they will serve on, but in particular, the United States Supreme Court.

It has been said that the most important decision in Government is “who decides?” With magnificent simplicity, article II, section 2 of the Constitution lays out the process for placing members on our Highest Court. It says: “he [the President] shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint [justices] of the Supreme Court . . . .”

Judge Lewis went on to state: “I am openly and unapologetically pro-choice and always have been.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the rollcall be dispensed with.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I have come to the Senate floor to discuss the nomination of Judge Samuel Alito. My purpose is not to debate with my colleagues and the people of Minnesota my decision to vote to confirm Judge Alito and the reasons for it.

This is one of the most solemn and important events in the life of the Senate. For Minnesota, I watched and listened to the hearings closely. Judge Alito’s intellect and character are nothing short of remarkable. On day four of the hearings, January 12, 2006, four sitting and two former judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit testified on behalf of Judge Sam Alito’s nomination to the Supreme Court. They spoke about his independence, judgment, intellect, and character.

I remember listening to Judge Timothy Lewis tell us that Judge Alito will be the type of Justice who will listen with an open mind and will not have any agenda-driven or result-oriented approach. I think that is what we want in a judge.

What is interesting is that Judge Lewis is a Clinton appointee. He stated:

I am openly and unapologetically pro-choice and always have been.

Judge Lewis went on to state: “I am openly and it’s very well known—a committed human rights and civil rights activist and am actively engaged in that process during my time permitted.”

I am very, very much involved in a number of endeavors that one who is familiar with Judge Alito’s background and experience may wonder—“Well, why are you here today saying things that look prospects as a justice on the Supreme Court?”

And the reason is that having worked with him, I came to respect what I think are the most important qualities anyone who puts on a robe, no matter what court they will serve on, but in particular, the United States Supreme Court.

It has been said that the most important decision in Government is “who decides?” With magnificent simplicity, article II, section 2 of the Constitution lays out the process for placing members on our Highest Court. It says: “he [the President] shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint [justices] of the Supreme Court . . . .”

For us, elected officials, the process of determining who will lead is long, drawn out, expensive, and sometimes very, very messy. The selection of Justices, the Founders wanted the process to reflect the dignity of the office.

Unfortunately, we have witnessed a deterioration of the dignity and solemnity of that process in the last few years. Despite Chairman Specter’s best efforts, the hearing before the Judiciary Committee seemed, at times, to me, at least in some ways, an exercise in futility.

I would like to know the breakdown between the amount of time Senators on the committee spent making speeches for the witness to hear and how much time they spent listening to him. The “advise and consent” process became “lobby and confront.”

The Senate should examine the nominee, not dissect him or her.

I have read he was asked more than 700 questions. The President Officer should know; he was there. He sat through part of that process. I believe he brought, and others try to bring, a sense of asking the nominee about the process that he would employ in making decisions. It was clear that what Judge Alito brought to the table was not one that says here is what I believe and as a result this is what I will do but, rather, what you would want a judge to do: What do the facts say, what does the law say, what does the Constitution say?

In being asked 700 questions, I think that is something like 500 more than Justice Ginsburg was asked. Senators on the committee who had previously counseled nominees not to answer specific questions on issues that will come before them on the Court on this occasion abused the nominee for not doing so. The American people know what this process is supposed to be about. The President nominates and the Senate confirms. The President, who was elected by all the people, did his job. Now it is time for us to do ours.

When we approach issues of greatest magnitude, the Senate should be at its very best. I like Stephen Covey’s advice to leaders when he wrote the Main Thing is to keep the Main Thing the Main Thing.

Despite all the distractions and attempted detours, there is a main thing to be focused on. This main thing is not a particular issue or political agenda. This main thing is not based on personal opinions to the table to create law as he or she sees it but, rather, does what Judge Alito does, looks at the facts, looks at the law, the Constitution.

I would submit that a quick search for the votes and record of judicial nominations over the last 200 years would indicate this is the historical standard almost all Senators have taken. The current circumstance of microscopic examination, politicizing, and threats of filibusters is a major historical aberration. For the sake of the judiciary and the whole constitutional system, I hope we find our way back to the way things have been for over the last 200 years plus, rather than the last 5 years.

In my view, Judge Samuel Alito is extremely well qualified to serve on the Supreme Court. He has an extraordinary legal mind. There is no doubt about it. He has demonstrated in his years on the bench and in hundreds of cases that he views the judicial role as following the Constitution and interpreting the law, not making the law.

Judge Alito told several words that “no person in this country, no matter how high or powerful, is above the law, and no person in this country
is beneath the law.” He also told us that “our Constitution applies in times of peace and in times of war, and it protects the rights of Americans under all circumstances.”

On results-oriented jurisprudence, Judge Alito revealed:

Results-oriented jurisprudence is never justified because it is not our job to try to produce particular results. We are not policymakers. We shouldn’t be implementing any sort of policy agenda or policy preferences we have.

In effect, this was the same standard that Judge Roberts applied. I recall he was asked a question whether he was ruling on behalf of the little guy. And the comment was, if the Constitution says the little guy deserves to win, he will. And if it says that he doesn’t deserve to win, then he won’t. That is what judges should do. That is the way they should operate.

Advice and consent was never intended as a rehash of the previous Presidential election. It was never intended as a means for the Senate to impose its policy agenda on a future court. I worry that we are walking down a dangerous path when Senators start to engage and in effect to acquire them to say, yes, I will rule a certain way or otherwise you will not get my vote.

Advice and consent was never intended as a means to grandstand or placate interest groups. I will proudly vote to support Judge Alito’s nomination. His career, his writings, and his class during this less-than-ideal confirmation process are proof that he will be an outstanding member of the high court. The President has done his job admirably. He has nominated an outstanding Judge. The Senate has examined his qualifications. Now it is time for us to do our job and confirm Samuel Alito as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is the nomination of Judge Sam Alito from the Third Circuit to the U.S. Supreme Court. As I mentioned earlier in the day, it is a historic moment seldom seen on the floor of the Senate when we discuss the possible elevation of an individual to a lifetime appointment to the highest Court in the land.

The Supreme Court is the last refuge for America’s rights and freedoms. It is an important institution for our values and our future. That is why during the course of many Members of the Senate have come to the floor to express their feelings about Judge Alito. It is largely broken down on partisan lines. Those on the other side of the aisle—the Republican side—are virtually all in support of Judge Alito. Most on the Democratic side oppose him.

I have listened to what many of the Republican Senators who have come to the floor have said. Almost every Republican Senator who has come to the floor today has made the argument that we should all vote for Judge Alito because in 1993, some 13 years ago, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a Supreme Court nominee of President Clinton, was confirmed overwhelmingly by the Senate. That appears to be talking point No. 1 that the White House generated not only in conversation today on the floor, but also at the hearing concluded recently in the Senate Judiciary Committee. There are some fundamental flaws in their reasoning and I will point out three:

First, as I mentioned this morning, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, whose vacancy is being filled, has been the fifth and decisive vote on many issues central to our democracy. The Justice who takes her place is truly in the position to tip the scales of justice in America. In the last 10 years, 193 cases have been decided by the Supreme Court by the closest of votes, 5 to 4; and of the 193 cases, Justice Sandra Day O’Connor has been the deciding vote in 148; 77 percent of these closely divided decisions were decided by Justice Sandra Day O’Connor. Now, the Justice whom Ruther Bader Ginsburg replaced in 1993, Byron White, didn’t play the pivotal role Justice O’Connor has played as the decisive vote on so many important issues.

Second, President Clinton selected Justice Ginsburg after a real, authentic consultation with Republicans in the Senate. This morning, I saw Senator HATCH early in the day and I said his book sales must be up because everywhere I go, everyone is quoting him. It is a book he wrote entitled “Square Peg: Confessions of a Citizen Senator.” In that book, Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah described how in 1993, as the top Republican on the Judiciary Committee, he received a telephone call from President Clinton to discuss possible Supreme Court nominees. Senator Hatch recounted in his book—and still stands by it—that he warned President Clinton away from a nominee whose confirmation seemed uncertain. He believed “would not be easy,” in his words. He wrote in his book that he suggested the names of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, whom President Clinton had never heard of, according to Senator HATCH, and Stephen Breyer.

Senator HATCH wrote that he assured President Clinton that Ginsburg and Breyer “would be confirmed easily.”

What a contrast to the situation we face today. President Bush sends the names of nominees to the Senate without a confirmation vote. In fact, I may be mistaken on this particular nominee, Judge Alito, but I do recall Senator SPECTER saying he learned of Harriet Miers’ nomination when the news media announced it—or only shortly before. I think he said he was called within an hour or so before the news announcement. That is much different than the consultation that took place with Senate Minority Bork and President Bush, where President Clinton went to the ranking Republican—not even the Chair at that moment—and asked him for advice and consultation on the next Supreme Court nomination.

Judge Alito was nominated not as a product of bipartisan consultation with the Senate but, rather, as a pay-off—or at least a satisfaction to the radical right who had turned their back on Harriet Miers’ nomination. There is another crucial difference between Judge Alito and Judge Ginsburg. Despite some Republican Senators’ efforts to re-write history, Judge Ginsburg was viewed at the time of her nomination as a moderate and centrist judge based on her dozen years of service on the Federal bench. In a National Public Radio news story dated June 18, 1993, a reporter named Nina Totenberg said as follows:

Why did the Republicans feel so comfortable with Judge Ginsburg? The answer is that her judicial record shows her to be the most conservative Carter-appointed judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals here in the District of Columbia.

She’s considered a centrist, a swing vote. And in fact, a statistical analysis done in 1987 of that Court’s voting pattern shows Judge Ginsburg voting substantially more often with the court’s conservative Republican bloc of judges, led by then-Judge Robert Bork, than with the liberal Democrat judges.

Judge Alito, by contrast, has never been called a centrist judge. At least those who looked at his record have not called him that. He is not a judge who votes more often with his Democratic colleagues than his Republican colleagues. Far from it. Judge Alito is a staunch conservative and the most frequent dissenter on his court. When he dissents, it is almost always in a rightward and more conservative direction.

I spoke earlier about Judge Alito’s track record on civil rights. I talked about some of the cases in which he showed a particular insensitivity to those who came before his court without the trappings of power. In fact, Judge Alito, in many of those cases, was the sole dissenting judge. Because Justice O’Connor was the fifth and deciding vote on so many cases involving civil rights and racial justice, Judge Alito will tip the scales of Justice on those issues if he is confirmed.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter of January 6, 2006, from the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights that has been submitted in opposition to the confirmation of Judge Alito, signed by Dr. Dorothy Height, chairperson, and Wade Henderson, executive director.
There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, Washington, DC, January 6, 2006. Hon. ARLEN SPECTER, Chairman, Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.**

**DEAR CHAIRMAN SPECTER AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY:** On behalf of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR), the nation's oldest, largest, and most diverse civil and human rights coalition, we write to express our opposition to the confirmation of Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr., as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court's jurisprudence over the past 50 years has often served to protect the fundamental constitutional rights of all Americans. Judge Alito's decisions, however, often stand in direct contrast to that jurisprudence and embrace a much more limited and narrow view of constitutional rights and civil rights guarantees. A careful examination of Judge Alito's record reveals a history of troubling decisions in the areas of civil liberties, and fundamental freedoms, decisions that undermine the power of the Constitution and of Congress to, protect the civil and human rights whose views are clearly to the right of where most Americans stand on a number of issues, including the reach of civil rights laws, the constraints courts and juries apply to decisions within our criminal justice system, and the power of Congress to protect Americans in the workplace and elsewhere.

In addition, LCCR is very troubled by the record of Judge Alito's opposition: Hon. John B. Lewis, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

**JUDGE ALITO’S “DISAGREEMENT” WITH SUPREME COURT RULINGS ON REAPPORTIONMENT**

In an essay attached to a 1985 application for a position within the Department of Justice, Judge Alito described his opposition to, among other things, the Warren Court's rulings on legislative reapportionment. Because those rulings first articulated the fundamental civil rights principle of “one person, one vote,” and paved the way for major strides in the effort to secure equal voting rights for all Americans, his stated opposition to them is extremely troubling. It is vital to understand the context in which these cases were decided.

Prior to the 1960s, as urban areas throughout the country experienced rapid population growth, many state and federal legislative districts were often left rural voters with far more representation per capita—and thus far more political power—than urban residents. In Florida, for example, in the 1960s, one county could elect a majority of the state senate. While unequal districts affected all voters, their impact was especially harsh in the South, where, along with discriminatory requirements like poll taxes and literacy tests, malapportionment virtually guaranteed the exclusion of racial minorities from the democratic process. Until 1962, the federal courts generally refused to intervene, dismissing such matters as “political questions.”

The Supreme Court’s ruling in Baker v. Carr broke new ground when the Court declared, for the first time, that the federal courts had a role to play in making sure that all Americans have a constitutional right to equal representation. Subsequently, the Supreme Court heard a series of cases related to the Equal Protection Clause, and, in Reynolds v. Sims, the Court considered legislative districts in the State of Georgia, which had drawn its legislative map so that 533,680 people in the Atlanta area were all represented by one Congressman, while a rural Congressman represented only 272,154 people. The Court held that these disparities violated the Equal Protection Clause, and ordered that the districts be redrawn more evenly. In Reynolds v. Sims, the Court applied the principle of “one person, one vote” to state legislatures, which, in many cases, had even more drastic malapportionment than Congressional districts. For example, the Reynolds case itself challenged Alabama’s legislative districts, in which one county with more than 600,000 people had only one senator, while another county with only 15,417 people also had its own senator. In articulating the concept of “one person, one vote,” the so-called “Reapportionment Revolution” cases equalized political power between rural and urban areas, and ensured that every citizen would have an equal voice in the political process. Along with the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and its subsequent amendments, the decisions also paved the way to far greater representation of racial and ethnic minorities, at both the state and federal levels of government.

The Warren Court decisions that established the constitutional principle of “one person, one vote” were a catalyst for tremendous progress in our nation’s efforts to secure equal voting rights for all Americans, and quickly became so accepted as a matter of constitutional law that they could fairly be described as “superprecedent.” Yet two decades later, long after most of the nation had come to embrace the principle, Judge Alito still boasted of his opposition to it. The fact that he would use his opposition as a “selling tactic” for a job in 1985 is disturbing. Such a commitment to his overall legal philosophy that deserves extensive scrutiny.

**JUDGE ALITO’S NARROW READING OF ANT-DISCRIMINATION AND OTHER WORKER PROTECTION LAWS**

Judge Alito’s record also raises concerns about whether he would be an effective enforcer of our nation’s civil rights and labor laws. His decisions thus far in such cases show a pattern of narrow interpretations of the law, leading greater numbers of plaintiffs to prove discrimination and making it harder for the government to protect workers.

In a number of cases involving race, gender, disability, and age discrimination, Judge Alito was clearly to the right of his colleagues on the Third Circuit. In Bray v. Blue Cross and Blue Shield, Judge Alito concurred in a decision that ruled that an African-American plaintiff who had been denied a promotion had shown no race discrimination. Judge Alito’s decision was based on the fact that he was therefore entitled to take her case to trial. But Judge Alito dissented, writing an opinion that prompted the majority to charge that “Title VII would be eviscerated if our analysis were to halt where the dissent suggests.” In a decision in Charlot v. E.I DuPont de Nemours and Co., a gender discrimination plaintiff had been denied a promotion. A jury ruled in her favor, but the trial judge threw the verdict out. The Third Circuit found that she had presented enough evidence to the jury that discrimination was a factor, but Judge Alito was the lone dissenter in the en banc decision. Judge Alito acknowledged that additional evidence of sexual harassment was needed to prove discrimination, but he maintained that a jury verdict might still be appropriate in some cases. The result Judge Alito would have reached in the Charlot case—reversing a jury finding of sex discrimination that every other judge on the Third Circuit would have upheld—undermines the neutral standard he articulated. To reach this result, Judge Alito not only gave the employer the benefit of the doubt but failed to consider some of the most important evidence brought by Sheridan. Finally, in Nathanson v. Medical College of Pennsylvania, a prospective medical student filed suit under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, claiming that the school had refused to provide her accommodations for a back injury. The trial court granted summary judgment in favor of the school, but a Third Circuit panel reversed on the Rehabilitation Act claim. Judge Alito dissented, writing an opinion that prompted the majority to charge that under his standard, “few if any Rehabilitation Act cases would survive summary judgment.”

Judge Alito’s record on anti-discrimination cases becomes more troubling when considered in light of his record prior to serving on the Third Circuit. As an Assistant Solicitor General during the Reagan administration, Judge Alito co-authored several amicus curiae briefs that sought to eliminate affirmative action policies that were put in place to remedy past discrimination, discrimination which, in one case, persisted in contravention of at least three court orders over an eight-year period. In his 1985 application for a promotion within the Justice Department, Judge Alito later mischaracterized these cases as involving nothing more than challenges to “racial and ethnic quotas.” Judge Alito’s involvement in the Reagan Justice Department’s unsuccessful campaign to undermine affirmative action remedies suggests that he adheres to an ideology that goes beyond mere conservatism on civil rights to one of hostility to our nation’s civil rights and labor laws.
pensions and job safety. Judge Alito has also demonstrated a clear and unmistakable tendency to rule narrowly and against working people. Given a choice between reading a status report, an opinion that was sent to the reporters with the intent to provide workers with basic protections, or reading a statute in the narrowest way possible, he again shows a disturbing tendency to rule against workers. Small businesses, which were small in size and circulation, the papers and all employment decisions were managed by one company and thus amounted to an “enterprise.”

Judge Alito disagreed, however, and would have denied this coverage, claiming that neither the statute nor the legislative history could have been expected to protect Belcufine v. Aloe, on the other hand, Judge Alito took a more expansive reading of the law, and in this case it was in order to benefit corporate workers. Belcufine involved a state law that held corporate officers personally liable for unpaid wages and benefits. Judge Alito ruled, however, that the requirement no longer be applicable, as a matter of policy, once a corporate has filed a bankruptcy petition. The dissenting opinion pointed out that nothing in the statute in question “even remotely can be read to exempt the agents and officers” from liability once a company files for bankruptcy.

JUDGE ALITO’S TROUBLING RECORD ON FUNDAMENTAL PRIVACY AND DUE PROCESS RIGHTS

In cases involving criminal justice matters such as the Fourth Amendment, habeas corpus, and the right to effective assistance of counsel, Judge Alito has shown an expansive tendency to defer to police and prosecutors. This deference frequently comes at the expense of the major rights and civil liberties of individual Americans, and it raises concerns about whether Judge Alito would help enable governmental abuses of power.

In Doe v. Groody, Judge Alito argued in dissent that police officers who conducted strip searches of a warrantless arrestee were entitled to qualified immunity. The majority concluded, in a decision authored by Judge Chertoff, that strip searches of a suspect are an invasive procedure and went well beyond the police’s warrant to search the home of a suspected drug dealer, and that the officers were therefore not entitled to claim qualified immunity as a defense to a subsequent lawsuit. As Judge Chertoff noted, holding otherwise would “transform the judicial officer into little more than a rubber stamp,” an interpretation Judge Alito, in criticizing the majority for what he called a “technical and legalistic” ruling in favor of the plaintiffs, would have granted authority to the police to decide who could be searched and therefore, would have given the officers immunity for invading the privacy rights of the wife and daughter. In United States v. Lee, Judge Alito upheld the warrantless video surveillance by the FBI of a suspect’s hotel suite. He justified his ruling on the ground that the FBI only turned on the surveillance when and if the suspect was present in the suite and could “consent” to the surveillance, but this ruling disregarded the fact that the equipment was capable of functioning at any time and that the FBI invaded the suspect’s privacy at any time. And in Baker v. Monroe Town-ship, a woman and her children were searched as they were entering premises that were the subject of a search warrant. The search warrant specified a location but there was no mention of the defendant in the warrant, which led the majority to conclude that the warrant was deficient under the requirements of the Fourth Amendment. Judge Alito dissented in part, on the grounds that the lack of particularity in the warrant allowed the officers more leeway to search anyone on the premises.

Judge Alito’s overly deferential attitude toward law enforcement at the expense of privacy rights was also evident before his appointment to the Court. In a 1984 memorandum, Judge Alito—then an attorney with the Justice Department—opined that the Attorney General and other government officials had absolute immunity from civil liability for wiretapping the phones of Americans without a warrant. He urged the administration not to pursue such an argument in a pending Supreme Court case, but only on purely strategic grounds. The Supreme Court, in Mitchell v. Forsyth, went on to rule that absolute immunity did not apply in such cases and rejected the broad, troubling view expressed in Judge Alito’s memorandum.

Judge Alito’s record is equally troubling in other areas of criminal justice, and shows the same excessive deference to law enforcement that can open the door to abuses. In a 1998 memorandum, Judge Alito argued in defense of a state law that had authorized Tennessee police to use deadly force against any fleeing felon suspect whom police had probable cause to believe had committed a violent crime or was armed and dangerous. In the case of Tennessee v. Garner, that law was invoked after police shot and killed an unarmed black man severely injured suspect while he was climbing a fence. While Judge Alito did not recommend filing an amicus curiae brief in support of the police in the case, he still found the shooting to be constitutionally defensible. When given a choice between killing a possibly nonviolent suspect and allowing a possibly violent suspect to escape, Judge Alito argued that “[r]easonable people might choose differently in this situation.” The Supreme Court disagreed with Alito’s farfetched analysis, finding the statute unconstitutional by a 6-3 margin.

Judge Alito’s record also reveals a disregard for broad interpretations of the Sixth Amendment. In Rompilla v. Horn, Judge Alito held that in the sentencing phase of a capital murder case, the failure of a defense attorney to investigate and present mitigating evidence, including the defendant’s traumatic childhood, alcoholism, mental retardation, organic brain damage, did not amount to ineffective assistance of counsel in violation of the Sixth Amendment. His ruling was decried as inexplicable by the dissent and was overruled by the Supreme Court, which noted that some of the mitigating evidence was publicly available in the very courthouse in which the defendant was tried. Justice O’Connor concurred in reversing Judge Alito’s ruling, describing the defense attorney’s performance as “unreasonable.”

In another case, United v. v. H. H. slides, Judge Alito’s dissent would have denied the habeas claims of a death row inmate. Judge Alito concluded that a jury instruction regarding the defendant’s mental capacity did not give the jury the right to determine whether the defendant’s mental capacity could have reasonable misunderstood, did not amount to a constitutional violation.

Finally, the case of Riley v. Taylor shows Judge Alito’s reluctance to question prosecutorial discretion even where racism is alleged in the jury selection process. In that case, Judge Alito did not find a constitutional violation in the prosecutor’s apparent use of peremptory challenges to exclude black jurors from a death penalty case involving an African-American defendant. The case illustrated a disregard for the impact of racially motivated peremptory jury strikes on African-American defendants. The majority concluded, in a decision authored by Justice Alito, that the defendant was not entitled to a new trial because black jurors had been excluded, but Judge Alito took issue with the use of statistics, questioning the exclusion of black jurors as a statistical anomaly and comparing it to the fact that five of the last six U.S. Presidents had been left-handed. His com-ment on the decision was that the majority, who said that “[t]o suggest any comparability to the striking of jurors based on their race is to minimize the history of discrimination against prospective black jurors and black defendants.”

JUDGE ALITO’S TROUBLING RECORD ON IMMIGRATION LAW

Judge Alito’s record in appeals of asylum and deportation claims is another example of a pattern of deference that has allowed visas to be processed under a strongly worded standard to extend to deportations. In Sandoval v. Reno, Judge Alito’s interpretation was grounded in “speculative” evidence showing that Judge Alito “thought” that the Attorney General and other government officials had absolute immunity from civil liability for wiretapping the phones of Americans without a warrant. He urged the administration not to pursue such an argument in a pending Supreme Court case, but only on purely strategic grounds. The Supreme Court, in Mitchell v. Forsyth, went on to rule that absolute immunity did not apply in such cases and rejected the broad, troubling view expressed in Judge Alito’s memorandum.

In Riley v. Taylor, Judge Alito argued in defense of a state law that had authorized Tennessee police to use deadly force against any fleeing felon suspect whom police had probable cause to believe had committed a violent crime or was armed and dangerous. In the case of Tennessee v. Garner, that law was invoked after police shot and killed an unarmed black man severely injured suspect while he was climbing a fence. While Judge Alito did not recommend filing an amicus curiae brief in support of the police in the case, he still found the shooting to be constitutionally defensible. When given a choice between killing a possibly nonviolent suspect and allowing a possibly violent suspect to escape, Judge Alito argued that “[r]easonable people might choose differently in this situation.” The Supreme Court disagreed with Alito’s farfetched analysis, finding the statute unconstitutional by a 6-3 margin.

Judge Alito’s record also reveals a disregard for broad interpretations of the Sixth Amendment. In Rompilla v. Horn, Judge Alito held that in the sentencing phase of a capital murder case, the failure of a defense attorney to investigate and present mitigating evidence, including the defendant’s traumatic childhood, alcoholism, mental retardation, organic brain damage, did not amount to ineffective assistance of counsel in violation of the Sixth Amendment. His ruling was decried as inexplicable by the dissent and was overruled by the Supreme Court, which noted that some of the mitigating evidence was publicly available in the very courthouse in which the defendant was tried. Justice O’Connor concurred in reversing Judge Alito’s ruling, describing the defense attorney’s performance as “unreasonable.”

In another case, United v. v. H. H. slides, Judge Alito’s dissent would have denied the habeas claims of a death row inmate. Judge Alito concluded that a jury instruction regarding the defendant’s mental capacity did not give the jury the right to determine whether the defendant’s mental capacity could have reasonable misunderstood, did not amount to a constitutional violation.

Finally, the case of Riley v. Taylor shows Judge Alito’s reluctance to question prosecutorial discretion even where racism is alleged in the jury selection process. In that case, Judge Alito did not find a constitutional violation in the prosecutor’s apparent use of peremptory challenges to exclude black jurors from a death penalty case involving an African-American defendant. The case illustrated a disregard for the impact of racially motivated peremptory jury strikes on African-American defendants. The majority concluded, in a decision authored by Justice Alito, that the defendant was not entitled to a new trial because black jurors had been excluded, but Judge Alito took issue with the use of statistics, questioning the exclusion of black jurors as a statistical anomaly and comparing it to the fact that five of the last six U.S. Presidents had been left-handed. His comment on the decision was that the majority, who said that “[t]o suggest any comparability to the striking of jurors based on their race is to minimize the history of discrimination against prospective black jurors and black defendants.”
Judge Alito’s reading of the law, in INS v. St. Cyr, because such an interpretation would raise serious constitutional questions.

Also troubling is a 1986 letter Judge Alito wrote as a Deputy Assistant Attorney General, to former FBI Director William Webster in which he suggested, inter alia, that “illegal aliens have no claim to nondiscrimination in education or to equal protection of the laws.” That was shortly before his appointment to the bench by President Bush and also before he published his controversial book on gun control. Judge Alito’s membership in a radical group Concerned Alumni of Princeton also raises doubts about whether Judge Alito would be willing to protect the religious liberties of an increasingly diverse America.

For example, in ACLU v. Black Horse Pike Regional Board of Education, Judge Alito voted against an 8 to 1-banc majority of his colleagues on the Third Circuit—to uphold a public school policy that allowed high school seniors to vote on whether a classmate should undergo a graduation ceremony. By allowing a popular majority of public school students to waive the rights of a minority, Judge Alito’s view—had it not also been subsequently rejected by the Supreme Court in a later case—would have essentially defeated the purpose of the Establishment Clause.

Judge Alito’s record in ACLU v. New Jersey v. Schundler (Schundler II) is equally troubling. In Schundler II, the municipality of Jersey City, New Jersey had placed a creche in a commercial district. The 3rd Circuit ruled that the display violated the Establishment Clause, the city added additional creches, thus extending the display, including those of Santa Claus, Frosty the Snowman, a red sled, and Kwanzaa symbols. The district court eventually found that this modified display was also unconstitutional. Judge Alito reversed this decision, however, and upheld the modified display. In doing so, he minimized the fact that the display was approved in response to litigation and that the city had been attempting to promote religion through its holiday displays for decades—even though the Supreme Court considered such displays to be highly relevant when determining whether a practice or policy violates the Establishment Clause.

JUDGE ALITO’S EFFORTS TO LIMIT CONGRESS’S AUTHORITY IN FAVOR OF “STATES’ RIGHTS”

Judge Alito’s record demonstrates a troubling tendency to favor “states’ rights” over the rights of ordinary Americans. During his tenure on the Third Circuit, he has engaged in an excessively narrow reading of the Commerce Clause and an excessively broad reading of the 11th Amendment. In fact, his decisions show that he would go even further than the current Supreme Court in undercutting Congress’ ability to protect Americans.

In United States v. Rybar, the Third Circuit upheld the conviction of a firearms dealer for selling machine guns by joining six other circuits in finding that the federal law banning the transfer or possession of machine guns to be a valid exercise of Congress’ power to regulate interstate commerce. But Judge Alito dissented, arguing that the Supreme Court’s recent decision in United States v. Lopez, that state gun-free school zone ban, made clear that Congress did not have such power. The majority distinguished Lopez because it dealt with a small geographic zone—whereas, as the law at issue in Rybar applied nationwide. Judge Alito would have taken Lopez a step beyond to place further restrictions on Congress’ power to use its Commerce Clause authority to protect Americans from machine gun violence. Judge Alito’s extraor-dinarily narrow perspective of Congressional power expressed in his Rybar dissent raises serious concerns about whether he will uphold major and historically effective pieces of civil rights infrastructure such as the ban on discrimination in employment or public accommodation in the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and whether he will hold a re-strictive view of Congress’ power to move the country forward with additional civil rights laws such as hate crimes and non-discrimination legislation.

In Chittister v. Department of Community and Economic Development, Judge Alito’s majority opinion would have denied a state employee the benefits of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). In this case, a state employee had sued after being fired for taking medical leave that had been approved pursuant to FMLA. A jury ruled in the employee’s favor, but the court reversed the verdict on the ground that the state was immune from suit under the 11th Amendment. On appeal, Judge Alito affirmed the ruling, claiming that Congress had not abrogated state sovereign immunity. The Supreme Court later reached an opposite conclusion from Judge Alito’s holding in its 2003 decision in Nevada Department of Human Resources v. Hibbs. The Court held that state employees could in fact sue their employers under the FMLA, a decision that has since been followed by some courts to validate the constitutionality of the entire law.

JUDGE ALITO’S MEMBERSHIP IN “CONCERNED ALUMNI OF PRINCETON”

In the same application essay—a statement in which he claimed to be a member in 1985. These incidents raise doubts about whether Judge Alito’s record not only fails to show such a commitment, but also raises serious doubts.

In addition, we also have doubts about whether Judge Alito will, at his confirmation hearing, address the above concerns in a fully open and candid manner. For in-stance, Judge Alito has given numerous shifting and conflicting reasons for why he did, as he promised to Senators before being confirmed to the Third Circuit, recuse himself from cases involving the Vanguard companies, in which he had financial hold-ings. Furthermore, Judge Alito has also recently tried to dismiss a number of troubling statements in his 1985 job application, such as his disagreement with the Warren Court’s reapportionment cases, by suggesting that his statements should not be taken seriously because he was simply applying for a job. Fi-nally, as discussed above, Judge Alito has also been accused of having associated with the radical group Concerned Alumni of Princeton, even though he himself proudly claimed to be a member in 1985. These inclu-de doubts about Judge Alito’s responses to tough questions about his record and his legal philosophy can be completely believed when his confirmation hearings begin next week.

For the above reasons, we must oppose his confirmation as Associate Justice. We appreciate the senator’s efforts. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact LCCR Deputy Director Nancy Zirkin at (202) 283-2880 or LCCR Counsel Rob Randhawa at (202) 622-6038. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

DR. DOROTHY L. LIGHT, Chairperson

WADE HENDERSON, Executive Director.
Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there is another aspect of Judge Alito’s record that is equally troubling, and that is his failure to show that he will protect the average American from the overreaching hand of government.

I gather he is dedicated to protecting the privacy rights of individuals from government officials in many critical areas of our lives. For example, I share the concern of many of my colleagues about Judge Alito’s decision to police ourselves. We conduct a strip search of an innocent 10-year-old girl. The police officer, who did not have a valid search warrant in the opinion of a majority of the judges on Judge Alito’s court, took the 10-year-old girl and her mother into a bathroom, ordered them to empty their pockets, and then ordered the young girl and the mother to lift their shirts and drop their pants—a 10-year-old girl. A majority of the judges on Judge Alito’s court said that went too far; the search was not authorized. Judge Alito saw it differently. He was the only judge on the court to say that the Constitution permitted this search.

The majority opinion in this case, incidentally, was written by Michael Chertoff, the Judge Alito is family. He is because then-Judge Chertoff, a conservative Republican, today is in the President’s Cabinet as the head of our Department of Homeland Security. Judge Chertoff, writing the majority opinion, said that what was done was wrong, and Judge Alito’s decision was wrong.

In the context of reproductive freedom, I am troubled about whether Judge Alito accepts some of the basic rights of personal privacy. One of the cases which we should not forget was decided some 41 years ago by the Supreme Court. The case was Griswold v. Connecticut.

As hard as it may be to believe, there was a time when the State of Connecticut and in many other States, including my home State of Illinois, at that time which made it a crime for a married couple to buy birth control devices or for a doctor to prescribe them or for a pharmacist to fill the prescription. It was a crime for married couples to engage in family planning by buying any type of birth control device. It is hard to believe. That was America in the 1960s.

The Supreme Court took a look at this case and said that is wrong. There is built into our rights as a citizen the right of privacy, and that privacy goes to those intimate, personal decisions made by individuals—in this case, husbands and wives—in the State of Connecticut.

I asked Judge Alito what he thought about this Griswold decision and this right of privacy. He was willing to say that Griswold is settled law. But, of course, Griswold v. Connecticut and the right of privacy was the basis of a decision made a few years later in Roe v. Wade. In that particular case, the Supreme Court built on this concept of a right of privacy and said that for a woman making the most important and personal decision of her life, in terms of the continuing of a pregnancy, she had a protected status in certain stages of the pregnancy. That was a decision which was handed down over 30 years ago—33, as a matter of fact.

So we asked Judge Alito if he accepted that Griswold v. Connecticut, which established the right to privacy, was settled law in America, and did he also accept that Roe v. Wade, which followed, was settled law? He repeatedly refused to provide us with that assurance about this landmark decision.

What a contrast to John Roberts, who, just a few months before when he was nominated for the Chief Justice position on the Supreme Court and was asked the same question, said that he believed Roe v. Wade was settled precedent in America. That is a defining difference between these two nominees and an important one.

If Judge Alito is confirmed, there are very serious questions about what will happen with the right of privacy in America, not just for the women who could be affected by these decisions but for everyone.

It wasn’t that long ago, a little over a year ago, that the Congress was embroiled in a controversy over something that many families face every day in America. You will remember the Terri Schiavo situation, where some chemical imbalance led to Terri Schiavo going into a coma. Her life was sustained by extraordinary means for 15 years while her husband argued that she never wanted it that way. She had made it clear not to take extraordinary measures to keep her alive.

There was a battle within the family. Her parents saw it differently, and they went to court regularly to fight this out. The Florida courts reached the decision that what Terri Schiavo’s husband said would be controlling and that her wishes would be honored and that extraordinary measures to keep her alive would be discontinued, and then the case would be appealed.

Finally, the day came when all appeals had been resolved, and it was apparent a decision would finally be made to remove the life support she was not wanting. That moment when a group—a political group—inspired some Members of Congress to get involved. They started arguing it was the time, at that moment, for the Federal courts to step into the hospital room and for the Federal judges to make decisions overriding the State courts, overriding the stated wishes of Terri Schiavo, overriding the wishes of her husband.

There is hardly a person in the Senate who hasn’t faced a similar family decision when someone you love is near the end of their life and the doctor comes in and says there are several things we can do. I know in my family, my mother made it very clear to me she didn’t want any of that life support, extraordinary effort made. I was determined to honor her wishes. She passed away very quickly with a heart attack, and we never had to face that decision, but we knew what she wanted. Her sons said they would stand by her wishes. Most people feel the same way. Do you know why, Mr. President? Because it is an extremely private, personal, and family issue. But in the case of Terri Schiavo, the case in the U.S. Congress, particularly in the House of Representatives, who wanted the Federal Government to step in at that moment.

So when we talk about diminishing the right of privacy in America, it goes far beyond the contentious issue of abortion. It goes to issues involving the last wishes of a person who is dying. It goes to issues involving protecting personal lives. In speeches to the ultraconservative Federalist Society which Judge Alito bragged about belonging to in the 1980s, Judge Alito has made it clear he believes decisions about this landmark decision.

What a contrast to John Roberts, who, just a few months before when he was nominated for the Chief Justice position on the Supreme Court and was asked the same question, said that he believed Roe v. Wade was settled precedent in America. That is a defining difference between these two nominees and an important one.

If Judge Alito is confirmed, there are very serious questions about what will happen with the right of privacy in America, not just for the women who could be affected by these decisions but for everyone.

It wasn’t that long ago, a little over a year ago, that the Congress was embroiled in a controversy over something that many families face every day in America. You will remember the Terri Schiavo situation, where some chemical imbalance led to Terri Schiavo going into a coma. Her life was sustained by extraordinary means for 15 years while her husband argued that she never wanted it that way. She had made it clear not to take extraordinary measures to keep her alive.

There was a battle within the family. Her parents saw it differently, and they went to court regularly to fight this out. The Florida courts reached the decision that what Terri Schiavo’s husband said would be controlling and that her wishes would be honored and that extraordinary measures to keep her alive would be discontinued, and then the case would be appealed.

Finally, the day came when all appeals had been resolved, and it was apparent a decision would finally be made to remove the life support she was not wanting. That moment when a group—a political group—inspired some Members of Congress to get involved. They started arguing it was the time, at that moment, for the Federal courts to step into the hospital room and for the Federal judges to make decisions overriding the State courts, overriding the stated wishes of Terri Schiavo, overriding the wishes of her husband.

There is hardly a person in the Senate who hasn’t faced a similar family decision when someone you love is near the end of their life and the doctor comes in and says there are several things we can do. I know in my family,
voted to uphold the administration’s decision. That Justice, Clarence Thom-as, based his dissent on the unitary ex-
ecutive theory, the same general the-
ory to which Judge Alito says he sub-
scribes.

It appears that if Judge Alito is ap-
proved for the Court, he will join Jus-
tice Thomas and Justice Scalia as only
the third Supreme Court Justice who has
announced public support for this fringe
theory called the unitary executive
theory which gives more and more power
to the President and less restrai-
t of law on his activities.

The Supreme Court is supposed to be
a check on the power of the President.
The Court’s role is to interpret the
Constitution, not to advance some
marginal theory of the Federalist Soci-
ety or any other special interest group.

During his hearings, Judge Alito did
attempt to distinguish his position on
the unitary executive theory from the
Bush administration’s, but he refused
to say whether he agreed with Jus-
tice Thomas’ dissent in Hamdi, and he
repeatedly refused to say whether this
President or any President has the
right to disregard a law passed by Con-
gress.

Several Senators asked Judge Alito
about this directly, and several times
gave the same carefully worded re-
response—and I quote it:

‘The President must take care that the
statutes of the United States that are con-
sistent with the Constitution are complied
with.’

Here is what we don’t know about
that statement: If the President claims
that a law is not consistent with the
Constitution, can he ignore the law
with impunity? And if Judge Alito is
on the Supreme Court, is that how
he would rule? That certainly is the way
he answered the question.

Presidents often issue formal state-
ments when they sign a law. When
Judge Alito was atty. in Presi-
dent Reagan’s Justice Department, he
advocated the use of Presidential sign-
ing statements to, in his own words,
‘increase the power of the Executive to
shape the law.’ In this way, Sam Alito
argued “the President will get in the
last word on questions of interpreta-
tion.”

The Framers of our Constitution
didn’t see it the same as Judge Alito.
They said Congress was to have the
last word.

The Bush administration has adopted
Judge Alito’s proposal. In more than
100 Presidential signing statements, the
Bush administration has cited unit-
ary executive theory and pledged to
uphold a law if it doesn’t conflict with
this theory.

Just 3 weeks ago, we saw a good il-
lustration. The White House issued a
Presidential signing statement claim-
ing that the President could set aside
the McCain torture amendment which
Congress passed overwhelmingly in De-
cember. Under what rationale could a
President ignore a law that passed in
this Chamber 90 to 9? The White House
claimed the President has the power un-
der the “unitary Executive theory.”

So hold on to your seats, America. If
Judge Alito goes onto the Court push-
ing this theory that was inspired by the
Federalist Society saying this President
has the power to set aside a law the
President has ever had, it will consoli-
date more power in the executive
branch than our Founding Fathers ever
imagined.

Does any President have the power
to ignore the McCain torture amend-
ment or FISA, the law that requires court
approval to wiretap American citizens?

Based on his record, I am fearful that
Judge Alito, facing these issues, is more
likely to defer to the President’s
power than defend our fundamental
constitutional rights.

I will speak more to this issue about
wiretaps in a moment.

I also fear that Judge Alito, if con-
formed, would blur the traditional line
between law and politics. In his 1985
job application essay, he indicated his
disapproval of the Warren Court deci-
sions on the establishment clause of
the Constitution.

‘What is the establishment clause? In
the first amendment, the Constitution
makes clear that we have the freedom
of religious belief. Of course, that
means each of us has the right under
the law, under our Constitution, to be-
lieve any religious belief or to hold to
no religious belief. That is our basic
freedom. It says: Congress shall make
no law respecting an establishment of
religion.’

This was an understandable part of
our Constitution because many of our
Founding Fathers hailed from England,
which had an official national church.
They wanted to make it clear that
there would be a separation, a clear
wall of separation between church and
state, as Thomas Jefferson said in the
early 1800’s.

The Warren Court, led by Earl War-
ren, as Chief Justice, struck down gov-
ernment-sponsored prayer and govern-
ment-sponsored devotional Bible read-
ing in public schools, arguing that it
violated the establishment clause. The
decisions by the Warren Court were
nearly unanimous. They stood for the
proposition, as the Constitution said,
that our government must be neutral
toward religion in order to maintain
this healthy separation of church and
state.

With the FISA law there is an
emergency exception so if there is a
suspicion that a conversation about to
take place needs to be wiretapped to
protect America, the Government can
move quickly, without court approval,
so long as they go through the regular
process within 72 hours. So the Govern-
ment can act if it thinks a conver-
sation would lead to terrorism and
endanger Americans.

It is improper to wiretap Americans
in the nonpartisan Congressional Re-
view Service have all concluded that
the NSA program appears to violate
the law.

Here is what we don’t know about
Judge Alito’s record. A wise
President would be deeply con-
sidered about recent rev-
elations that sometime in 2001, Presi-
dent Bush authorized the National Se-
curity Agency to begin spying on
Americans in the United States with-
out court approval. This is an apparent
violation of law.

Let me say at the outset, this is not
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That is the end of the quote. April 20, 2004, after the President had initiated this NSA wiretapping that is not approved by law and does not use a court order.

When President Bush concluded over 4 years ago that he wanted to eavesdrop on Americans without the court approval required by law, he had an obligation to come to Congress and ask us to change the law.

Consequently, it always has been a willing partner when the President has requested additional authority to fight terrorism. I can recall the President, within days of 9/11, asking for an authority for the use of force by this Congress to go after Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, which I readily voted for. There was unanimous support for a bipartisan resolution which passed the Senate.

Shortly thereafter, the President came to Congress and asked us to pass the PATRIOT Act. It was an act that gave the Government more authority, more tools, more legal ways to go after terrorists in the United States. It was overwhelmingly approved with only one dissenting vote in the Senate. Within the PATRIOT Act, the President asked for some changes in this FISA law to make it easier to wiretap terrorists.

So an administration at this point seems to concede the point that they were bound by this law and were looking for changes so they could use it in their words, more effectively. We tried to accommodate them as much as we possibly could. When the White House asked Congress to pass this bill, we cooperated with them. Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle were happy to work with the President to keep America safe.

That is not what the President has done here. Instead, we have learned that the President has not followed even the law that he asked us to change. He claims the power to eavesdrop on the phone conversations of Americans and e-mails without any court approval, without any legal authority.

That raises fundamental questions. Is this President or any President above the law? Does the President have the authority to disregard laws passed by Congress, whether it is the question of torture or eavesdropping? Can Congress place any limits on the President's power over our lives?

Tony Dinozzo, a distinguished minority leader, Senator HARRY REID, and my colleagues, Senators KENNEDY and FEINGOLD, and sent a letter to President Bush. We have urgently requested that the President notify us immediately of the changes in the law that he believes are necessary to permit effective surveillance of suspected terrorists and why the changes are needed.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:


President GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear President Bush: We strongly support efforts to do everything possible, within the limits of the law, to combat terrorism. We are therefore encouraged that sometime in 2001, in apparent violation of federal law, you authorized the National Security Agency (NSA) to eavesdrop on Americans in the United States without court approval.

When you concluded over four years ago that existing law did not provide you sufficient authority to conduct this program, you had an obligation to propose changes in the law to Congress. Rather than doing so, you have repeatedly chosen to ignore the law. We urgently request that you notify us immediately what changes in the law you believe are necessary to permit effective surveillance of suspected terrorists, and why these changes are needed.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) gives the government broad authority to wiretap terrorists. Federal law provides that FISA and the criminal wiretap statute “shall be the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance . . . and the interception of voice, oral, wire, oral, and electronic communications may be conducted.” 18 U.S.C. § 2511(2)(f). FISA makes it a crime, punishable by up to five years in prison, to engage in time-sensitive electronic surveillance except as permitted by statute. 50 U.S.C. § 1809.

In fact, you have recognized that it is improper to subject Americans in the United States to warrantless wiretapping. In a speech on April 20, 2004, you said: “Now, by the way, any time you hear the United States government talking about wiretap, it requires—a wiretap requires a court order. Nothing has changed, by the way. When we’re talking about chasing down terrorists, we’re talking about getting a court order before we do so.”

You and officials in your administration have repeatedly asserted that FISA does not provide adequate authority to monitor suspected terrorists. However, FISA authorizes monitoring suspected terrorists, who are the purported targets of NSA’s warrantless wiretapes. Moreover, FISA includes an emergency exception for situations where there is insufficient time to obtain judicial approval before beginning a wiretap. This exception allows the government to engage in electronic surveillance immediately, as long as it seeks a court order within 72 hours. 50 U.S.C. § 1805(f). During the course of its existence, the FISA court has approved over 19,000 wiretap applications from the government while disapproving only four.

It therefore seems your administration has sufficient authority under FISA to engage in the activities you have described—time-sensitive electronic surveillance of suspected terrorists.

Officials in your administration have asserted that the government’s internal process for preparing and authorizing a FISA application is too burdensome and slow to monitor suspected terrorists effectively. To be clear, your administration’s bureaucratic and paperwork delays are not an excuse for violating the law. As the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS) concluded: “To the extent that a lack of speed and agility is a function of internal Department of Justice and practice and not the law, it does not give the President sufficient authority under FISA” (emphasis added). The Founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times.” 93 U.S. 579, 587–89 (1952).

In light of the very serious nature of this matter, we request that you respond to this letter as soon as possible, and, in any case, no later than February 1, 2006.

Sincerely,

HARRY REID, U.S. Senator.
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. Senator.
RICHARD J. DURBIN, U.S. Senator.
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, U.S. Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. The President cannot continue to simply disregard the law.

At a press conference on December 19, 2005, President Bush called FISA “a very important tool.” I would say to the President, FISA is more than a tool. It is a law, and we are a nation of laws.

Our Constitution separates powers between different branches of Government. Under article I of the Constitution, Congress has the power to make laws. Under article 2 of the Constitution, the President must take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

The Supreme Court has faced questions like this in the past, questions regarding the powers of the President in the midst of a war. During the Korean war, President Harry Truman violated the law by seizing America’s steel mills to aid the war effort. In the historic Youngstown Steel case, the Court rejected President Truman’s actions and concluded: “The Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make laws which the President is to execute. . . . The Founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times.” 343 U.S. 579, 587–89 (1952).

In order to win the war on terrorism, we must maintain the high ground by respecting our Constitution and re-
And that is what is at stake with this Supreme Court nomination. Judge Sam Alito, from his early days in the Reagan administration, through the rulings in his court and his testimony before the Judiciary Committee, time and again seems to defer to the executive’s assertions of power. At this moment in history, like none other in recent times, that is a critical and timely issue. We have to ask the question, would this judge on the Court protect our basic personal freedoms or would he give to this President power to ignore the law?

Last week Attorney General Gonzales issued a long memo supporting the administration’s position on the NSA spying program. That memo went so far as to suggest that this administration is not even bound by the PATRIOT Act. It suggests that the President can use the powers authorized by the PATRIOT Act without even the limited checks and balances contained in the PATRIOT Act, regardless of what Congress says.

So what has happened is the administration has turned the question of torture to this whole question of eavesdropping, and now has suggested that this President has the authority to do whatever he cares to do in the name of his power as Commander in Chief.

The part in the past has not agreed with Presidents who have tried to seize that much power. President Truman learned that the hard way. I am hopeful this Supreme Court will respect the Constitution and respect the land and property in this President or any President who tries to move that far and that fast.

So it comes down to this with the Alito nomination. I am afraid as we look carefully at his record it is clear that he would allow the Government to go too far, to intrude on our personal privacy and our freedoms. I am afraid that he would take the country in the wrong direction when it comes to women’s rights. I am afraid that his record, as I mentioned earlier on the floor today, is evidence that when he is given a choice between ruling in court for an established institution—whether it is a business or a government—or standing with a consumer or an individual, he consistently rules for the established institution. I am afraid that the 1985 memo, which became a large part of his recent hearing, still guides Judge Alito in many respects.

I think the fact that Harriet Miers was rejected by so many conservative groups and the President had to withdraw her nomination has to be taken into consideration here. Judge Sam Alito was not the successor to the nominee. The same groups that had rejected her accepted Sam Alito. They know or believe they know what I have spoken of this evening, that his is a philosophy that is outside the mainstream, that is not consistent with the fine record written by Justice Sandra Day O’Connor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, yesterday in Burbank, CA, I gave a major address before my constituents announcing my opposition to the nomination of Samuel Alito to the Supreme Court of the United States.

To me it is not enough to announce my opposition to the nomination of Samuel Alito to the Supreme Court of the United States.

According to article II of the Constitution, Justices of the Supreme Court are not appointed by the President without the advice and consent of the Senate. So it is our solemn duty to consider each nomination carefully, keeping in mind the interests of the American people.

This nomination is particularly crucial because the stakes have rarely been so high.

First, consider the context in which this nomination comes before us. The seat that Judge Alito has been nominated for is now held by Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, who came to the Court in 1981. For years, Justice O’Connor has provided the tie-breaking vote and a common-sense voice of reason in some of the most important cases to come before the Court, a woman’s right to choose, civil rights, and freedom of religion.

Second, consider the tumultuous political climate in our Nation. President Bush understood that in 2000 when he promised to do so, and he should do so now, and be “a uniter, not a divider.” Sadly, this nomination shows that he has forgotten that promise because it is not from the center and it is not uniting the Nation.

The right thing to do would have been to give us a justice in the mold of Justice O’Connor, and that is what the President should have done.

Let me be clear: I do not deny Judge Alito’s judicial qualifications. He has been a judge in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court for more than 20 years and the American Bar Association rated him well qualified. He is an intelligent and capable person. His family should be proud of him and all Americans should be proud that the American dream was there for the Alito family.

But after reviewing the hearing record and the record of his statements, writings and rulings over the past 24 years, I am convinced that Judge Alito is the wrong person for this job.

I am deeply concerned about how Justice Alito will impact the ability of other families to live the American dream to be assured of privacy in their homes and their personal lives, to be secure in the government from unreasonable searches, to have fair treatment in the workplace, and to have confidence that the power of the executive branch will be checked.

As I reviewed Judge Alito’s record, I asked whether he will vote to preserve the fundamental American liberties and values.

Will Justice Alito vote to uphold Congress’s constitutional power to pass laws to protect Americans’ health, safety, and welfare? Judge Alito’s record says no.

In the 1996 Rybar case, Judge Alito voted to strike down the Federal ban on the transfer or possession of most military firearms because it exceeded Congress’s power under the Commerce Clause. His Third Circuit colleagues sharply criticized his dissent and said that it ran counter to “a basic tenet of the constitutional separation of powers.” And Judge Alito’s extremist view has been rejected by six other circuit courts and the Supreme Court. Judge Alito stood alone and failed to protect our families.

In a case concerning worker protection, Judge Alito was again in the minority when he said that Federal mine health and safety standards did not apply to a coal processing site. He tried to explain it as just a “technical issue of interpretation.” I fear for the safety of our workers if Judge Alito’s narrow, technical reading of the law should ever prevail.

Will Justice Alito vote to protect the right to privacy, especially a woman’s reproductive freedom? Judge Alito’s record says no.

We have all heard about Judge Alito’s 1985 job application, in which he wrote that the Constitution does not protect the right of a woman to choose.

He was given the chance to disavow that position during the hearings and he refused to do so. He had the chance to say, as Judge Roberts did, that Roe v. Wade is settled law, and he refused.

He had the chance to explain his dissent in the Casey decision, in which he argued that the Pennsylvania spousal notification requirement was not an undue burden on a woman seeking an abortion because it would affect only a small number of women, but he refused to back away from his position. The Supreme Court, by a 5 to 4 vote, found the provision to be unconstitutional.

We have all heard about Judge Alito’s opposition to the R.A.D.A.R. program. He was given the chance to back away from his position. The Supreme Court, by a 6 to 3 vote, upheld the program.

I fear for the safety of our workers if Judge Alito’s narrow, technical reading of the law should ever prevail.

Will Justice Alito vote to protect American families from unconstitutional searches? Judge Alito’s record says no.

In Doe v. Groody in 2004, he said a police strip search of a 10-year-old girl was lawful, even though the search warrant didn’t name her. Judge Alito said that even if the warrant did not actually authorize the search of the...
girl, ‘a reasonable police officer could certainly have read the warrant as doing so . . .’ “This casual attitude toward one of our most basic constitutional guarantees—the fourth amendment right against unreasonable searches and seizures—alarmed everyone. As Judge Alito’s own Third Circuit Court said regarding warrants, “a particular description is the touchstone of the Fourth Amendment.” We certainly do not need Supreme Court Justices who do not understand this fundamental constitutional protection.

Will Justice Alito vote to let citizens stop companies from polluting their communities? Judge Alito’s record says no.

In the Magnesium Elektron case, Judge Alito voted to make it harder for citizens to sue for toxic emissions that violate the Clean Water Act. Fortunately, in another case several years later, the Supreme Court rejected the Third Circuit and Alito’s narrow reading of the law. Judge Alito doesn’t seem to care about a landmark environmental law.

Will Justice Alito vote to let working women and men have their day in court against employers who discriminate against them? Judge Alito’s record says no.

In 1997, in the Bray case, Judge Alito was the only judge on the Third Circuit to say that a hotel employee claiming racial discrimination could not take her case to a jury.

In the Sheridan case, a female employee sued for discrimination, alleging that after she complained about incidents of sexual harassment, she was demoted and marginalized to the point that she was forced to quit. By a vote of 10 to 1, the Third Circuit found for the plaintiff.

Guess who was the one? Only Judge Alito thought the employee should have to show that discrimination was the “determinative cause” of the employer’s action. Using his standard, it would make it almost impossible for a woman claiming discrimination in the workplace to get to trial.

Finally, will Justice Alito be independent from the executive branch that appointed him, and be a vote against power grabs by the president? Judge Alito’s record says no.

As a lawyer in the Reagan Justice Department, he authored a memo suggesting for the President to encroach on Congress’s lawmaking powers. He said that when the President signs a law, he should make a statement about the law, giving it its own interpretation, whether it was consistent with what Congress had written or not. He wrote that this would ‘‘get in the last word on questions of interpretation’’ of the law. In the hearings, Judge Alito refused to back away from this memo.

When asked whether he believed the President could invoke another country, in the absence of an imminent threat, without first getting the approval of the American people, of Congress, Judge Alito refused to rule it out. When asked if the President had the power to authorize someone to engage in torture, Alito refused to answer.

The President is now asserting vast powers, including spying on American citizens without seeking warrants—in clear violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—violating international treaties, and ignoring laws of war. We need Justices who will put a check on such overreaching by the executive, not rubberstamp it. Judge Alito’s record and his answers at the hearings raise very serious doubts about his commitment to being a strong check on an ‘‘imperial President.’’

In addition to these substantive matters, I remain concerned about Judge Alito’s answers regarding his membership in the Concerned Alumni of Princeton and his failure to recuse himself from the Vanguard case, which he had promised to do.

During the hearings, we all felt great compassion for Mrs. Alito when she became emotional and spoke of crimes against her husband faced in the Judiciary Committee. Everyone in politics knows how hard it is for families when a loved one is asked tough questions. It is part of a difficult process, and whose standard politics is not for the faint of heart was right.

Emotions have run high during this process. That is understandable. But I wish the press had focused more on the tears of those who will be affected if Judge Alito becomes Justice Alito and his out-of-the-mainstream views prevail.

I worry about the tears of a worker who, having failed to get a promotion because of discrimination, is denied the Opportunity to pursue her claim in court.

I worry about the tears of a mentally ill woman who is forced by law to tell her husband that she wants to terminate her pregnancy, and afraid that he will leave her or stop supporting her.

I worry about the tears of a young girl who is strip searched in her own home by police who have no valid warrant.

I worry about the tears of a mentally retarded man, who has been brutally assaulted in his workplace, when his claim of workplace harassment is dismissed by the court simply because his lawyer failed to file a well-written brief on his behalf.

These are real cases in which Judge Alito has spoken. Fortunately, he did not prevail in these cases. But if he goes to the Supreme Court, he will have a powerful voice—a radical voice that will replace a voice of moderation and balance.

Perhaps the most important statement Judge Alito made during the entire hearing process was when he told the Judiciary Committee that he expects to be the same kind of Justice on the Supreme Court as he has been a judge on the Circuit Court.

That is precisely the problem. As a judge, Samuel Alito seemed to approach his cases with an analytical coldness that reflected no concern for the human consequences of his reasoning.

Listen to what he said about a case involving an African-American man convicted of murder by an all-White jury in a courtroom where the prosecutors had eliminated all African-American jurors in many previous murder trials as well.

Judge Alito dismissed this evidence of racial bias and said that the jury makeup was no more relevant than the fact that left-handers have won five of the last six Presidential elections.

When asked about this analogy during the hearings, he said it “went to the issue of statistics . . . (which) is a branch of mathematics, and there are ways to analyze statistics so that you draw sound conclusions from them.”

That response would have been appropriate for a college math professor, but it is deeply troubling from a potential Supreme Court Justice.

As a great jurist and Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. wrote in 1881, “The life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience . . . The law embodies the story of a nation’s development through many centuries, and it cannot be dealt with as if it contained only the axioms and corollaries of a book of mathematics.”

What Holmes meant is that the law is a living thing, that those who interpret it must do so with wisdom and humanity, and with an understanding of the consequences of their judgments for the lives of the people they affect.

It is with deep regret that I conclude that Judge Alito’s judicial philosophy lacks this wisdom, humanity and moderation. He is simply too far out of the mainstream in his thinking. His opinions demonstrate neither the independence of mind nor the depth of heart that I believe we need in our Supreme Court Justices, particularly at this crucial time in our history.

That is why I will oppose this nomination.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

GSRI HEALTHY LIVING STUDY—THE NEW NORMAL? WHAT GIRLS SAY ABOUT HEALTHY LIVING

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, America is confronting a childhood obesity crisis, and over the past 25 years, the percentage of overweight girls has more than doubled—to 16 percent of girls ages 6 to 19, up from 6 percent in 1974.

To support the search for a solution, the Girl Scout Research Institute
asked girls directly how they define health and what motivates them to lead a healthier lifestyle. The results are captured in a new report, titled The New Normal? What Girls Say About Healthy Living.

This new report brings the voice of girls to the forefront of the conversation on childhood obesity for the first time and finds that girls are in many ways ahead of the curve, using a varied, complex set of norms to define health.

Today's girls are defining "health" on their own terms, placing the same value on emotional well-being and self-esteem as they do on diet and exercise. For girls, being healthy is more than just eating right and exercising; it is also about feeling good about oneself and being supported by family and peers.

Girls say that efforts to reduce childhood and adolescent obesity that focus solely on nutrition or physical activity miss the mark.

The study lays out four key findings:

One, girls aspire to be "normal healthy," a concept they often associate with appearing normal and being supported by peers and family. Girls tend to diet or limit their food choices as healthy as long as it doesn't harm their appearance or their relationships with friends and family.

Overall, 65 percent of girls say their lifestyle is "healthy enough for my age," while just 6 percent describe their lifestyle as "very healthy." Although about two-thirds, 65 percent, correctly identify themselves as either normal weight or overweight, one in three girls has a distorted idea about her weight. Older girls also tend to be less satisfied with their weight than younger girls.

Two, girls have a holistic view of health and describe emotional health as important as physical health. Virtually all girls agree that emotional health is as important as physical health—and 88 percent of 11- to 17-year-old girls believe that feeling good about yourself is more important than how you look. More than a third of girls ages 11-17 reported eating more when they are "stressed out" and overweight girls are more than twice as likely as girls who are not overweight to report eating more in times of stress.

Three, girls already know what is healthy, but many don't use the information they have to make healthy choices. Obstacles at home include a decline in the frequency of family meals and increased television watching and computer use as girls get older. A third of girls report sitting down to a family meal no more than twice a week. More than 60 percent of teenage girls skip breakfast at least once a week and nearly 20 percent skip it every day.

Obstacles at school include reliance on vending machines, poor taste and quality of school lunches, optional physical education classes, and a lack of access to more informal physical activities are all barriers. Many girls ages 11-17 say they do not play sports because they do not feel skilled or competent, 40 percent, or because they do not think their bodies look good, 23 percent.

Four, girls cite their mothers not only as role models but also as leading sources of nutritional information and emotional reinforcement. Mothers exert tremendous influence. Girls tend to mirror their mothers' activity levels and can gain weight as the increasingly poor diet and sedentary lifestyle of today's adults, it is clear that efforts to improve the health of girls must also target parents—especially mothers.

Continuing a 93-year tradition begun by founder Juliette Gordon Low, Girl Scouts offers an array of successful initiatives and age-appropriate curricula in health, nutrition, and fitness—including more than 60 badges and awards related to healthy living. And the findings of The New Normal? What Girls Say About Healthy Living will continue this tradition in helping inform GSUSA's ongoing program and policy work.

To turn this research into action today, Girl Scouts is encouraging all girls and their families to engage in advocacy at the local level. Advocacy is a critical component in educating and influencing key policy and decision makers and making children and the general public aware of what girls need to lead healthy lives. To bring girls' voices to the discussion about health in their communities, Girl Scouts is calling on all girls to become involved in the development and implementation of their local School Wellness Policy.

Ninety-five percent of schools must establish a school wellness program consisting of nutrition and physical activity goals by the first day of the 2006-2007 school year. We want girls to take action through advocacy on this timely and important issue so that as schools address the wellness of our Nation's children and youth, the unique girl perspective is fully considered.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN ROBERT MURREN, M.D.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to remember Dr. John Robert Murren, a renowned oncologist, cancer researcher, and a beloved husband, father, and son.

I first met Dr. Murren 3½ years ago. He visited me in my Capitol office with his brother and sister-in-law, Jim and Heather Murren. In this meeting, they shared with me their vision for a new world-class cancer research facility in Nevada.

Like so many Americans, the Murrens had been touched by cancer. They had witnessed first-hand the devastation cancer can bring and were motivated to do something to lessen the toll of this horrible illness. As such, the Murrens resolved to combine Heather and Jim's business skills and extensive network with John's medical expertise to create a cutting-edge comprehensive cancer institute in Nevada. In 2002, they founded the Nevada Cancer Institute and built a 142,000 square foot facility in Las Vegas that is dedicated to researching, preventing, detecting, and curing cancer. Dr. John Murren served on the institute's board of directors as well as an adjunct faculty member. Dr. Murren's death will inspire those he left behind to make the Nevada Cancer Institute even better. John would want this.

Dr. John Murren's vision for the Nevada Cancer Institute was based on an impressive medical foundation. He earned his B.A. in chemistry and history from Duke University cum laude followed by his M.D. in 1984 from the Loyola-Stritch School of Medicine in Chicago. He completed his internship and residency in Internal Medicine at St. Vincent's Hospital in New York. In 1988, Dr. Murren accepted a postdoctoral fellowship in medical oncology at the Yale-New Haven Hospital where he was an attending physician as well as an associate professor of medicine. Since 1992, he had been awarded grant funding to study cancer drug therapies yielding invaluable contributions to the understanding of the effectiveness of cancer drug therapies, particularly chemotherapy.

Dr. Murren was the chief of the Yale Medical Oncology Outpatient Clinic and director of the Lung Cancer Unit at the Yale Cancer Center in New Haven, Connecticut. At Yale, Dr. Murren had the largest clinical practice at the Cancer Center and treated thousands of patients and their families over a distinguished career. His clinical research widely published. He sat on several peer-review boards and was sought out worldwide for his expertise. He was also a member of the board of trustees of the Frisbee Foundation.

In addition to his clinical, educational, and research endeavors, Dr. Murren served on the Clinical Research Subcommittee of the American Association of Cancer Research and the American College of Surgeons Cancer Committee. He also served as cochair of Novel Therapeutics for the American Association of Cancer Research National Meeting in 2001. He was a member of the Research Grants Council in Hong Kong and was an active lecturer and writer.

The loss of Dr. Murren will be felt beyond medical and scientific circles. Dr. Murren is survived by Nancy, his wife; John, his son; Jean Perkins Murren, his mother; Jim and Michael, his brothers and Kathie, his sister as well as sisters-in-law: Heather Hay Murren and Mary Kay Murren and brothers-in-law George Koether as well as Jeff and Bill Hughes and wives, family and multitudes of neighbors, as well as several nieces and nephews.

Dr. Murren will be missed by his community in Fairfield, CT, where he
led an active life. He was a parishioner of St. Thomas Roman Catholic church there, and he enjoyed reading, skating, tennis, and watching his son, John, play ice hockey.

No one is immune to cancer not even those individuals who, like Dr. Murren, dedicated their life's work to cancer research and treating individuals suffering from cancer. If we in Congress want to honor the life of Dr. Murren and the 1 million Americans who will be diagnosed with cancer this year, then we must invest more Federal money into cancer research. Otherwise, we will continue to lose too many of our family members and friends to this devastating illness.

In closing, I extend to his family, friends, and associates, my sympathy on the passing of a good American, Dr. John Murren. It is my wish that his legacy will be a country that defeats the dreaded disease we call cancer.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT TOBIAS MEISTER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an heroic American who has fallen while serving his country in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. First Sergeant Tobias Meister died December 29, 2005, when a bomb was detonated near his humvee just south of Asadabad, Afghanistan. First Sergeant Meister was part of the Sand Springs based 486th Civil Affairs Battalion and was assigned to the Army Reserve’s 321st Civil Affairs Brigade based in San Antonio, TX. My deepest sympathies go out to his wife Alicia, his 1 year old son Will, his parents David and Judy, his brother and many more family and friends.

First Sergeant Meister was born in Kingsley, IA and graduated from Remsen-Union High School in 1994. He was employed by Horizon Natural Resources, an oil and gas firm, after he had successfully completed a business administration degree with a concentration in international business from the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Tobias Meister joined the Iowa National Guard in 1992 and served as an infantryman before transferring to the U.S. Army Reserve in 1996. He was named Drill Sergeant of the Year in 2002, the award for the Nation’s top Army Reserve drill sergeant. He will be remembered for his patriotism, his love for his country and his fellow soldiers. As written by comrades on his website, he had “so much passion for what he was doing, so much patriotism it was a privilege and an honor to work with him.” I urge all of my colleagues here and all Americans to extend their prayers to the family of a truly heroic American, First Sergeant Tobias Meister.

ROLAND CARROLL BARVELS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Roland Carroll Barvels who died in Iraq on January 18, 2006. Roland was employed with DynCorp International and was assigned to the Civilian Police Advisory Training Team in Iraq. He was helping to train and equip a 350,000-member Iraqi security force. Sadly, he was killed when a roadside bomb struck his convoy during a security patrol.

Prior to joining DynCorp in November 2005, Barvels answered his Nation’s call to duty to protect and defend this great country. After serving for 12 years in the military, he became a police officer. Beginning his career in Minnesota, Barvels eventually served in law enforcement for nearly 20 years including his most recent position with the Aberdeen Police Department.

Friends and former co-workers at the Aberdeen Police Department remember Roland with deep admiration. One colleague remarked, “During his time at the police department, he diligently patrolled the streets of our city providing safety and security to the citizens in our community. Roland possessed an incredible ability to talk to people and [to] make anyone he talked to feel at ease.”

Roland Barvels bravely served our country in so many ways. His wife and children are consummate team players of my family during this difficult time. It is my sincere hope that they will take comfort knowing Ronald’s long and distinguished career of protecting the most in need is truly admirable, and his dedication to helping others is an inspiration to us all.

I join with all South Dakotans in expressing my deepest sympathy to the family and friends of Roland Barvels. He will be missed, but his service to our Nation will never be forgotten.

SPECIALIST MATTHEW C. FRANTZ

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart and deep sense of gratitude to honor the life of a brave young man from Lafayette. Matthew Frantz was killed on January 20 when an improvised explosive device detonated near his vehicle during a patrol near Al Huwijah in Iraq. With his entire life before him, Matthew risked everything to fight for the values Americans hold close to our hearts, in a land halfway around the world.

Following in the family tradition of service, Matthew had been committed to joining the military since he was in the second grade. A 2001 graduate of Lafayette Jefferson High School, his teachers recalled how eager he was to join the service, as well as what a decent and friendly student he was. One of his teachers told a local news outlet, “Matt was very excited about being part of the military. It was what he wanted to do. He was just a young man that wanted to serve his country.”

Matthew had been in the military for nearly 2 years, but this was his first deployment to Iraq. He arrived there only a few months ago as a counterintelligence specialist.

Matthew was killed while serving his country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was a member of the 1st Special Troops Battalion in the 101st Airborne Division based at Fort Campbell, KT. This brave young soldier leaves behind his father and mother, James and Marilyn Frantz; his brothers, Chris and Eric, who also serve in the military; and many more family and friends.

Today, I join Matthew’s family and friends in mourning his death. While we struggle to bear our sorrow over this loss, we can also take pride in the example he set, bravely fighting to make the world a safer place. It is his courage and strength of character that people will remember when they think of Matthew, a memory that will burn brightly during these continuing days of conflict and grief.

Matthew was known for his dedication to his family and his love of country. Today and always, Matthew will be remembered by family members, friends, and fellow Hoosiers as a true American hero, and we honor the sacrifice made while dutifully serving his country.

As I search for words to do justice in honoring Matthew’s sacrifice, I am reminded of President Lincoln’s remarks as he addressed the families of the fallen in Gettysburg. “We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.” This statement is just as true today as it was nearly 150 years ago, as I am certain that the impact of Matthew’s actions will live on far longer that any record of these words.

It is my sad duty to enter the name of Matthew C. Frantz in the official record of the U.S. Senate for his service to this country and for his profound commitment to freedom, democracy, and peace. When I think about this just cause in which we are engaged and the unfortunate pain that comes with the loss of our heroes, I hope that families like Matthew’s can find comfort in the words of the prophet Isaiah who said, “He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces.”

May God grant strength and peace to those who mourn, and may God be with you, as I know He is with Matthew.

SERGEANT CLIFTON YAZZIE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I humbly rise today to pay tribute to SGT Clifton Yazzie. Sadly, this outstanding and brave young man was killed in Hawijah, Iraq, on January 20, 2006.

As a cross-country runner and basketball player in high school, SGT Yazzie was not known for his innate athletic ability. Instead, his coaches and teammates remember him as a consummate team player who worked to improve his skills in every practice and every game. He enlisted after the
terrible attacks of September 11, 2001, fully knowing that his country would soon be going to war abroad. His quiet demeanor and steadfast service is at the core of what the American military service is about: honor, duty, humility, and loyalty.

His wife Michelle, children Chaynitta and Cayden, and parents Clifford and Jeanette will be in all of our thoughts. He and Michelle, who met at a high school dance, had been planning to renew their vows.

He was on his second tour of duty as an infantryman in the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division. Our nation has been 77 years old on January 16. It was Martin Luther King, Jr., who would tell us that, if he were here, he would express satisfaction with the launch of the program and boasted of the millions of participants in the program. MR. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crime legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On October 4, 2002, Gwen Araujo was killed by three men in Hayward, CA. Araujo was beaten up, tied, and then strangled. The apparent motivation for this crime was that Araujo was a transgendered teen.

I believe that the Government’s first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that are born out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

RECOGNIZING MARTIN LUTHER KING DAY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, earlier this week, our Nation celebrated Martin Luther King Day. The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., would have been 77 years old on January 16. It was a day to reflect on the life of a man admired for the dream he dreamed for America, and for his words and deeds in pursuit of it.

He dreamed, as he famously said, “that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal.’” Dr. King argued, in words that stir the heart, that racial segregation must end in the South and that Black Americans must be granted their citizenship rights throughout the land and throughout our institutions: in education, in employment, in housing, and in the voting booth.

His role in the push for full voting rights for African Americans is well known but bears repeating. In the spring of 1965, a national television audience was shocked by broadcasts of State troopers and sheriff’s deputies brutally repulsing voting rights protesters. Hours later, Dr. King declared: “No American is without responsibility.” He went to Alabama and led a march, under Federal protection, from Selma to the State capital. The event garnered national support and momentum for congressional passage of the Voting Rights Act later that year.

Dr. King appreciated the blessings of freedom; he wanted them for his people, and for all people. We remember this Protestant minister’s eloquence and also his sense of spiritual mission—he was an ecumenical religious leader who brought people of all faiths, all races, together in mutual respect for one another.

As Taylor Branch, his biographer, put it: “His oratory fused the political promise of equal votes with the spiritual doctrine of equal souls.”

His belief in nonviolent protest convinced those who listened to him that there were high road routes for disarticulating the rights of Black people in this country. It is a bitter fact that he lost his life to violence—he was only 39 when an assassin’s bullet cut him down in Memphis—and it makes us understand his great courage in taking on the burden of leadership.

In officially celebrating the life of Dr. King, we celebrate the end of legal segregation and the many inroads we have made against racism and discrimination. Of course, there is more we must do to make sure all Americans enjoy the blessings of freedom. He would tell us that, if he were here. He would also insist that we continue on in his way: with passion and with civilility, calling on our fellow human beings to act on their best instincts, not their worst.

Dr. King, who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, is a model here and around the world—from China, and the 1989 antigovernment protests in Tiananmen Square, to South Africa, where apartheid rule gave way in 1990 without provoking the civil war many had feared. In encouraging the holding of free elections and the formation of institutions of civil society in faraway places today, we promote the idea that Martin Luther King put forward so well: that the nonviolent settling of differences among men is the bedrock of democracy.

Let us all take inspiration from the King legacy this week, Mr. President, and every week.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, on January 1, 2006, the administration launched the Medicare prescription drug benefit, a program long touted by President Bush as the vehicle that would provide affordable, easily accessed prescription drugs for seniors. The program has fallen far short of that goal so far. The outcomes that I have heard from pharmacists, beneficiaries, and health providers over the past few weeks make clear that the implementation of the program has been a disaster. This program has not provided either affordable or easily accessed drugs to many Medicare beneficiaries. Instead, it has presented many seniors and the disabled with frustration, confusion, expensive medications, and sometimes no medications at all. It is unacceptable for individuals to go without lifesaving medications, yet this is what has been happening across the country since this program commenced. This situation is an emergency, and Congress needs to address it right away.

Since the beginning of January, I have received personal calls from people in my State saying that they were unable to receive drugs that they had been routinely getting at their pharmacy every other month. Many calls were from people who could not receive essential drugs such as insulin, antipsychotics, or immunosuppressants for transplant patients. At the same time as I was hearing from people suffering from pain because they did not receive their pain medications, I received personal notes from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid officers that expressed satisfaction with the launch of the program and boasted of the millions of participants in the program. There may be millions participating in the program, but too many of them cannot receive their drugs, and too many pharmacists are unable to comply with the complicated regulations in the program. CMS should be focusing its efforts on addressing this emergency rather than disseminating public relations messages.

All anyone needs to do is visit their local pharmacy in order to see the problems with the benefit firsthand. There, they are likely to see harried pharmacists on the phone with Medicare or private drug plans. Chances are high that they are on hold. There are often long waiting lines of people in need of medications, sometimes in desperate need, and there are customers being charged incorrectly for their prescriptions. Sometimes they have been charged so much that they cannot afford it because the costs exceed what they have in the bank or what their credit limits will allow. Tragically, many of the most vulnerable beneficiaries have been forced to walk out of the pharmacies without their drugs.

It is clear that, in many respects, the plan and the contingency plans for implementation have failed. For instance, the drug plan automatically enrolled millions of individuals eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid into drug plans, and although these individuals were supposed to be notified of this, many were not. Imagine the surprise when
people visited the pharmacy this month thinking that they would receive their medications for the same price they paid in December. Some of these doubly eligible individuals were victims of data glitches that resulted in their being unable to verify enrollment in any insurance, and they were told to pay for the full costs of their drugs. Some were charged the wrong amount even though their insurance was verified. These bills trickled into the thousands of dollars at times. I was disheartened to learn that some of the beneficiaries paid for the drugs on their credit cards, their only other option being to go without their medications. Some with little income will be paying for these drugs for months, with interest, and this is a sad burden for the Federal Government to place on the neediest in society.

While my office did its utmost to help those who called, I wonder how many Wisconsinites did not call my office, did not have relatives to help them, or were unable to get through to the help lines that had waiting times of up to 5 days. How many people are being forced into emergency rooms in order to get their medications? How many people are being injured because of lack of medications? Have any deaths occurred as a result of the extraordinary bureaucratic hurdles in this program? The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services needs to find answers to these questions and address this crisis immediately.

Fortunately, many State governments, including Wisconsin’s, came to the aid of the public when the Federal Government would not by enacting emergency provisions. Now, these States are depending on the Federal Government to return the favor and reimburse them for funds that were spent out of tight State budgets. To date, the administration has refused to compensate States. I will work to try to make sure the Congress quickly addresses this problem, passes legislation, and reimburses the States.

The health of our Nation’s citizens is not a partisan issue, and we all must join together to assist the most needy. I voted against this program in 2003 and have since made numerous attempts to try to improve the program. Since mid-December, I have sent three letters to the administration, urging that the most pressing problems with the Medicare drug benefit be addressed. While these efforts were not supported by Republicans, I want to make new efforts that I hope the other side of the aisle will support. We cannot sustain a great nation if we do not care for the elderly, the disabled, and the poor. The Republican tactics have forced these people to use their limited resources to cover the spiraling costs of their medications.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, today, as you may know, Jim Connaughton, chairman of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, called for a comprehensive and collaborative approach to salmon recovery in the Pacific Northwest. While I may not agree completely with Mr. Connaughton’s statement, we must stop ignoring what is going on. It is about time that someone speaks out about the reality of the situation in the Northwest in regards to salmon recovery. He proposed to end outdated hatchery programs and to stop harvest levels and practices that impede recovery of salmon listed under the Endangered Species Act, ESA. He also outlined a comprehensive collaborative process to promote a shared goal and responsibility of salmon recovery. As early as next week, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s fisheries service, NOAA Fisheries, will launch a comprehensive review of how harvest and hatcheries are affecting the recovery of ESA-listed salmon and steelhead.

There has been no clear direction in the past, and CEQ is taking the first step to provide direction. We have sat back and idly watched while the region moved from injunction to injunction and lawsuit to lawsuit. In fact, over the past 2 years, two injunctions have been ordered and more lawsuits have been filed. This situation just fosters mistrust and the inability to meet common goals and objectives.

Our past practices have focused on keeping the fish in the river and in abundant numbers so that we can have our cake and eat it, too. In no other place in the world do we treat an ESA-listed species this way. We don’t raise bald eagles only to use their feathers for our clothes, so why do we spend money each year—to recover the species, and then allow a majority of them to be killed through harvesting? The people who pay for these absurd practices are the Northwest ratepayers.

Here are some facts that the region should know. The total cost of fish migration in the Northwest from 1978 to 2005 has been approximately $7 billion. Fish costs now make up to 30 percent of the Bonneville Power Administration’s $1 billion budget. Each dollar paid for BPA-managed power. Snake River Fall Chinook are the most impacted ESA-listed species in the Columbia River system. These fish drive BPA’s fish and wildlife program. Approximately 40 percent to 60 percent of this species is harvested.

Last summer, Judge Redden ordered a change in river operations that resulted in an approximately $75 million dollar hit to the region’s ratepayers. This means that depending on how many fish survive, summer spill costs between $225,000 and $3 million per fish, and consequently, ratepayers are left with the bill. Even at $225,000 per fish, that is a lot of money. Judge Redden, once again, second-guessed the region’s fish managers and made the decision to increase spill this spring and summer. This will result in another cost to the ratepayers of approximately $60 million dollars.

Management of the river by the courts is not management at all. I would like to help the management agencies—the appropriate managers of the river system—to succeed in their efforts to manage the river, in partnership with local, State, and tribal governments.

Why not trust the experts who have the scientific knowledge to make those decisions and help empower the region to work together instead of giving up and having the court systems make management decisions? How are we to succeed in the future if we keep allowing others to make our decisions for us?

When will this silliness stop? When will the region take ownership and responsibility for the river? And when will we work together as a region and get serious about salmon recovery? CEQ made the first step today.

I will work with other Members of Congress to finally address the challenges and to help provide direction and be more accountable to the public and to recovery of the species. If we are serious about recovery, we need to start acting serious and not avoid the tough questions.

I would like to challenge my colleagues to come together in a bipartisan way to help the region get back on track.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM B. BONVILLIAN

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my profound gratitude and heartfelt best wishes to a dear friend and dedicated American, William B. Bonvillian, who has served as my legislative director and chief counsel since I first took office in the U.S. Senate in January 1989. It is truly a bittersweet occasion to bid farewell this week to an outstanding and valued staff member with whom I have worked for 17 years in this hallowed institution that we both dearly cherish and respect. I can only say that, as Bill embarks on his new venture as director of federal relations for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, my loss is most surely MIT’s gain.

Bill came to my Senate office as an accomplished and respected attorney who had previously served in the executive branch from 1977-1980 as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, where he was involved in major legislation relating to transportation deregulation and funding issues. However, our long association actually goes back much further than that. Bill was my first intern when I was elected to the State Senate; we rode from New Haven to the State Capitol in Hartford
in my old color-coordinated Pinto several times a week after his classes at Yale Divinity School. Later, I hired him for a summer position with our State Senate committee investigating State construction issues. After I was elected to my first term here in the U.S. Senate, I sought to rehire Bill, who by then had become a partner at a national law firm working on corporate, real estate, transportation, and administrative law matters. I was beyond delighted when Bill agreed to leave his partnership to reenter public life.

Bill's record of service in the U.S. Senate has been one of enormous distinction. When I look back with pride on the many legislative initiatives I undertook with Bill's advice and assistance, I recall with great admiration his determination, tenacity, and passionate involvement in drafting legislation. He built a stellar reputation on both sides of the aisle for his skill in nurturing innovative ideas and negotiating measures through an often complex legislative process. Bill's intuitive skills and strong leadership abilities have helped result in the successful passage of many crucial policy initiatives for which I have fought. Bill has played a key role in formulating and enacting vitally important legislative policy in the areas of science and technology; economic growth; innovation, research, and development in the fields of defense, manufacturing, health, and biotechnology; and programs assuring America's global competitiveness.

In addition, Bill's extensive and tireless work has resulted in many other significant legislative victories in our years together, including those pertaining to environmental and wilderness protection; energy security; defense and foreign policy; health and social welfare; campaign finance reform; media safeguards for children; education, and transportation and our Nation's infrastructure. Bill also had a significant role in the creation of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and new intelligence reform initiatives to ensure the protection of our citizens. His ability to forge a consensus on these and countless other complex issues is unequalled. Bill's influence has been felt throughout the halls of Congress, and he has left a great legacy here.

I would like to highlight key legislation, and as a subject area, on which Bill and his legislative team have assisted me over the years. I note that many of these bills or parts of them have gone on to become law:

- We have been extremely fortunate to work with a person of Bill's character and caliber. He has graciously shared his wealth of knowledge and wise counsel with legislative aides, fellows, and other staff members. He helped us form our innovative Legislative Fellows Program, in particular, which has helped us build a strong, substantive, policy- and idea-oriented office. Under Bill's leadership as legislative director, I have consistently had a professional staff of which I am very proud. I think it is the equal of any on Capitol Hill.

Somehow, despite the long hours his work has involved, Bill finds the time to nurture his abiding interest in an array of subjects, from art to history, and this is part of what makes Bill so very interesting to be around. On many occasions, Bill led our new staffers and fellows on unique, memorable tours of the Capitol, where he regaled us with his vast knowledge of the Capitol's architecture, art collections, and historical vignettes of Congress and our democracy.

And how to add to these many accomplishments, Bill has an exciting opportunity to focus his efforts on science and technology innovation and policy, issues of deep concern to him and of critical importance to our Nation and the world. I have no doubt that Bill will distill himself and himself in this endeavor just as he has throughout his Senate career.

I sincerely thank Bill's wife, Janis Ann Sposato, for her understanding of the long hours and enormously demanding work schedule, often imposed by the Senate legislative calendar, even as they juggled the demands of parenting and their public service careers. It has been a pleasure to see Janis and Bill's sons, Raphael and Marcus, grow from childhood into the fine young men they are today.

It has been a memorable journey. Through it all, Bill has maintained his clear vision of a better future for all, a vision that has helped make him a leader in the eye of any approaching storm. In all of his interactions with staff, visiting constituents, and other parties with whom he has come in contact, he has always given generously of his time and talent, often having made a better choice for my legislative director than I did in 1989 when I asked Bill to take on the challenges we have faced together.

I am proud to call Bill a trusted advisor and lifelong friend. The office will be a different place without him. My staff and I will miss him a great deal, but we wish him success, health, and happiness always. I sincerely thank and congratulate Bill Bonvillian on his new position, his dedication, and dedicated service to the U.S. Senate.

TRIBUTE TO ROGER WILLIAMS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President. I rise today to pay special tribute to America's pre-eminent, piano-playing patriot, Mr. Roger Williams. Roger is to American music what the Grand Canyon is to the American landscape.

Roger has enjoyed decades of success and a long and fruitful career, and I take this opportunity to reiterate the sentiment of my colleague who said to the President, ‘‘because he has had the honor to perform for eight of our Nation’s Commanders In Chief. In 2004, Roger celebrated his birthday alongside Jimmy Carter because the two share the exact same birth date.

Despite his advancing years, Roger’s ivory-tickling fingers continue to thrill audiences. In November, he broke his own record for marathon piano-playing with a 14-hour performance at Steinway Hall in New York City. The marathon was to raise awareness of the importance of music education and to commemorate the 50th anniversary of his classic, “Autumn Leaves.” This song is the only piano instrumental that has ever reached No. 1 on the Billboard singles charts.

According to Billboard Magazine, Roger is the greatest-selling pianist of all time, with 18 Gold and Platinum albums to his credit. He is the first pianist to receive a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame, and is—so far—the only recipient of the Steinway Lifetime Achievement Award. Williams has played the music for soundtracks to films of three generations and in 2004 he released his 116th album, his records “Born Free,” “The Impossible Dream,” “Almost Paradise,” and the theme from “Somewhere in Time” are only some of his hits, which span 4 decades.

Not only a virtuoso, Roger is also a man of great virtue. He is a champion of music education in all schools, and California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger named him “Champion for Youth 2004.” Roger regularly
donates his time and talent to charitable efforts and non-profit organizations, including spots on the televised “Hour of Power” ministry since 1974. I am grateful that I had the privilege of friendship with Roger Williams. He is a great man, a superlative musician, and a dear friend. As I reflect upon myself, albeit one who is fairly low on the pecking order, I commend Roger for his talent, hard work, and dedication to his craft. His music will continue to bless the lives of literally millions for generations.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL MICHAEL WARNER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful man, brilliant lawyer, and dedicated public servant—Mr. Paul Michael Warner. Paul has been serving as the United States Attorney for the District of Utah since 1998, and he is stepping down this week to continue his work in other capacities within the legal system. As he embarks on a new chapter of life, I wanted to take this opportunity to honor him for the leadership he has provided, and commend him for his dedication to our country’s legal system.

Paul was nominated by President Bill Clinton on July 29, 1998 to be the United States Attorney for Utah. He was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate on July 21st and by the end of August he had assumed the full duties of this important position. After President George W. Bush took office, he recognized the tremendous leadership Mr. Warner was providing and reappointed him to this position. He was then reconfirmed once again by the United States Senate and has continued to serve with strength and honor.

Prior to being appointed United States Attorney, Paul first joined this office in 1989 and has served in various positions including: First Assistant United States Attorney, interim U.S. Attorney, Violent and Hate Crimes Coordinator, and the Chief of the Criminal Division. For 7 years before joining the U.S. Attorney’s Office, he worked in the Utah Attorney General’s Office as the Chief of the Litigation Division and as an Associate Chief Deputy to the Attorney General.

Throughout his forty years of service within the criminal justice system, Paul has established himself as an effective leader in the fight against crime. He has always greatly valued cohesive working relationships with Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel. I believe that without exception, he has become a highly respected and trusted prosecutor and able administrator.

While serving in the Bush Administration, Paul was appointed the Chairman of U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft’s Advisory Committee of U.S. Attorneys. He also previously chaired the Subcommittee on Terrorism for this Committee, and continues as an ex-officio member of the Committee to this day.

Paul’s legal career began when he graduated with the first class of the J. Reuben Clark Law School at Brigham Young University in 1978. He later went on to receive a masters’ degree in public administration from the Marriott School of Management at BYU.

Following graduation from law school, Paul served 6 years as a trial lawyer in the Judge Advocate General Corps of the United States Navy. In 1983, he enlisted with the Utah Army National Guard, Judge Advocate Branch, where he rose to the rank of Colonel. He is currently serving as the State Staff Judge Advocate, supervising a staff of 17 attorneys. He is also the past president of the Utah National Guard Association. The leadership and work he has provided to the military has been invaluable as he has worked to ensure that the work is performed to a standard and in support of our Nation, but to the men and women who fight to preserve our freedoms.

Paul has also been involved in many professional organizations including serving as a Master of the Bench in the Utah Bar. He has also served on the Board of Visitors for the BYU Law School. He has also been honored by numerous military and civilian organizations with awards including: the United States Army’s Meritorious Service Medal, the Utah National Guard’s Service Cluster, and the 2004 Honored Alumni of the Year for the BYU Law School, the Utah State Bar’s 2004 Dorothy Merrill Brothers Award for the Advancement of Women in the Legal Profession, the Federal Bar Association’s Distinguished Service Award for 2003, and the NAACP’s 2002 Community Relations Award for Civil Rights.

Throughout my years of working with Paul I have always been impressed with his utmost integrity and honesty. He has a strong desire to do what is right. He has garnered the respect and admiration of the staff he has led, and has served as a mentor and friend to many future leaders in Utah’s legal community. He diligently strives to treat all parties with dignity and fairness, and his work has been an example of his commitment to individual rights and the rule of law.

His work within the legal community has had the most lauded, but perhaps his most important accomplishments have occurred within his family and neighborhood. Paul is a devoted husband to Linda, and wonderful father to four children. He has been a friend to many from all walks of life, and all persuasions. His work has been an outstanding example of someone who has dedicated his life to helping others while upholding the principles and ideals embodied in the foundation of our country’s Constitution.

I am grateful for the service Paul Warner has rendered throughout his years of public service—but most importantly as the United States Attorney for Utah. He is a truly dedicated public servant, strong leader, and special friend. I want to wish him well as he travels new pathways in life. I know that he will continue to guide and enrich the lives of those who have the privilege of working with him; and will remain committed to enhancing and furthering the important work of our judicial system.

TRIBUTE TO W. CLEON SKOUSEN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President. I rise today to pay special tribute to a man I deeply admire, W. Cleon Skousen. Cleon was a giant of a man. He was an exceptionally bright scholar; a wonderful husband, father, and grandfather; a special friend; and a true patriot in every sense of the word.

Sadly, Cleon recently passed away leaving a tremendous void in the lives of all who knew him. Cleon played a significant role in the legal and governmental arena throughout Utah, our Nation, and even the world. I can state without any equivocation today that Cleon loved America. He truly loved our country and its citizens. He deeply respected our Founding Fathers, and had the ultimate respect for the document that is the basis of all of our freedoms—our Constitution.

When I first met Cleon, I was a young, enthusiastic, go-getter who wanted to make a difference in our Nation. I was deeply interested in and interested in political activism. Cleon was one of the first people of political significance and substance who agreed to meet with me and discuss my candidacy.

A few short years before this time, Cleon had organized a nonprofit educational foundation named “The Freemen Institute,” to foster “constitutionalist” principles including a drastic reduction in the size and scope of the Federal Government, and a reverence for the true, unchanging nature of our Constitution. I knew that he had strongly held beliefs and I was very interested in what he had to say.

We found in each other at that first meeting many areas of common ground and a shared love for the principles that make America the strongest bastion of freedom on Earth. Cleon quickly agreed to help, and throughout the coming months he became a true champion of my candidacy. He sent a letter to 8,000 of his “friends” stating that I was running for the Senate “for the express purpose of waging a fight to restore constitutional principles in this country.” I was humbled by his support, and I felt a true need to fulfill his expectations of me and to never let him down.

From that first campaign, to every day I have served in the U.S. Senate—Cleon has been there for me, through highs and lows—buoying me up, giving suggestions, discussing principles and issues, and above all else being a true,
supportive friend. I can never overstate what his support has meant to me throughout my years of service.

A natural outgrowth of the successful Freemen Institute was the founding of the National Center for Constitutional Studies which Cleon started to further the study of our Founding Fathers and the U.S. Constitution. He traveled the globe and spoke to literally hundreds of thousands of people each year for four years to promote the ideals of this center.

The mission of the center was so aptly described by our Nation’s first President, George Washington, when he said: ‘‘A primary object . . . should be the education of our youth in the science of government. In a republic, what species of knowledge can be equally important? And what duty more pressing than communicating it to those who are to be the future guardians of the liberties of the country?’’

Cleon took this mission very seriously and spent many hours each week educating and imparting his knowledge of his faith to people throughout our Nation, and even the world. He cultivated friendships far and wide and became to many the ‘‘Master Teacher.’’ As we all know, Cleon was a prolific author and writer. His books, ‘‘The First 2000 Years, The Making of America,’’ and ‘‘The Five Thousand Year Leap’’ have been used by foundations, and in forums across America for many years. His writings and words leave an indelible legacy of knowledge and beliefs that have touched many people and will continue to inspire and educate generations to come.

Many have yearned for even a morsel of his years of study. He was learning, studying and writing until the end. I loved an account I recently read in the Deseret News from the Rev. Donald Sills, a Baptist minister who became close friends over many years with Cleon. He spoke of his knowledge and study as a treat to a time when he found Cleon sitting on the steps of the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, DC. When he asked Cleon what he was doing just sitting there, Cleon’s fitting response was, ‘‘I’m talking to Tom Jefferson.’’

Cleon had a strong desire for good government, and a true love for our Savior Jesus Christ and our Heavenly Father. He believed that our country was founded on pure principles and that our Father had a hand in guiding our historic and profound beginnings. He firmly believed, as many believe, that God governs the affairs of men. He was not shy about sharing this belief with all who would listen. He shared on this subject were not unlike the words spoken by Benjamin Franklin as he arose on the floor to speak at a particularly trying time during the Constitutional Convention. He injected with his passion the call of the Father of the men who called for wisdom and guidance as they continued this most important document.

His words remind me so richly of Cleon when Mr. Franklin stated: ‘‘I have lived, Sir, a long time; and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it not much more probable that an empire can rise without his aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings that ‘except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it,’ I firmly believe this.’’

And Cleon firmly believed it. He had a true testimony of our Savior’s works and our Father’s infinite wisdom and love. He wrote of it. He testified of it. And he lived a life following their teachings.

The wonderful, strong leader General George S. Patton once said: ‘‘It is foolish and wrong to mourn the loss of great men—but I do thank my Heavenly Father that W. Cleon Skousen lived, and that he touched my life in so many ways. His example, passionate beliefs, and wonderful mind will never be forgotten. His journey was full and brought rewards to people throughout the world. I am grateful that I had the privilege of knowing W. Cleon Skousen and working with him. He is a great man, and true American. His life’s work has touched literally thousands, and his testimonies will touch the wonderful words and teachings he leaves behind.’’

Mr. President, I would like to close with a poem that I wrote for him:

W. CLION SKOUSEN
His life seemed like 2000 years
By those who feared the truth,
To us who’ve loved him through our tears
And even from our youth,
This quiet, simple, gentle man,
Who taught us the Truth.
He helped us all to understand
The memories of a thousand springs.
Within this caring, pleasant soul
God’s glory was refined,
Experiences had made him whole
For he had peace of mind.
So many lives he touched each day
Explaining holy things.
In writings left along the way
A treasure fit for kings.

He loved the prophets of the Lord,
The Founding Fathers too.
And Israel’s most precious Word,
God’s children whom he knew,
His precious Jewel, of greatest worth,
He’ll love eternally.
He loved his family here on earth
In loving majesty.
So many others one by one,
This giant among men,
He leaves us now, his work now done.
We know we’ll meet him once again.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF L-3’S COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS-WEST

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today it is an honor and a privilege to rise and congratulate the men and women of L-3’s Communication Systems-West on the 50th anniversary of that company’s arrival in Utah.

I realize that many outside of the state of Utah might not have heard of L-3’s Communication Systems-West, but no one can dispute the strategic advantages that this company has provided to our Nation’s men and women in uniform. Much of the work that Communication Systems-West performs is of a highly classified nature. However, I can say that the real-time, high-speed, disseminating of information and images based on the U-2 and our unmanned aerial vehicles, such as Global Hawk and the Predator, is only possible because of the hard work by the people at Communication Systems-West. For example in 2000, Communication Systems-West was awarded the Collier Award for producing the airborne integrated communications system for the Global Hawk. As my colleagues may know, the Collier Trophy is the National Aeronautic Association’s highest honor for that year’s greatest American aeronautical achievement.

Other examples of Communication Systems-West outstanding work can be found in the SATCOM Tri-Band Satellite Earth Terminals and the ROVER III Remote Operations Video Enhanced Receiver system that are deployed with our forces today. As a stalwart division for L-3, the employees of Communication Systems-West were honored in 2005 to receive the L-3 Chairman’s Award for Best Operating Performance.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the technologies created and built by Communication Systems-West have won battles for the United States and, equally as important, saved countless American lives.

However, the leadership of Communication Systems-West’s 2,300 employees, including 1,000 engineers, is not limited to the battlefield. It is also found in their dedication to their community. Communication Systems-West partners with Utah’s universities to assist in placing new graduates in promising and creative careers. The company is an active member of the Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement, or MESA, consortium. MESA, of course, provides resources to aid minority and female students entering technological fields of study. As a contributor to the Ames and Challenger advanced education programs for high school students interested in technology sciences, Communication Systems-West offers a bright future to the next generation of students.

Finally, Communication Systems-West also supports its home-town National Guardmen and Reservists by fully paying the salaries of its employees who have been activated to fight the War on Terror.

Communication Systems-West and its employees have been an integral part of Utah for a half-century, and we
Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, like most Americans, I start off the year with my new year’s resolution to work harder at getting in shape. As always, my first stop is the Concept2 rowing machine in the Senate gym. I have used it for years, and always think of Vermont when I do.

The rowing machines are made in Vermont, and last fall the Burlington Free Press had an excellent article about the company and its founders. I ask that a copy of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Free Press, Oct. 14, 2005]

**WHAT A CONCEPT**

(By Matt Crawford)

MORRISTOWN—Peter and Dick Dreissigacker will be on Boston’s Charles River next weekend, rowing their way toward the finish line in the annual Head of the Charles regatta.

The Dreissigacker brothers are two members of an eight-man team called the Motley Rowing Club—a team that captured third place in its division during last year’s race. If the Motley team is beaten again, part of the blame can be placed squarely on the broad shoulders of the Dreissigackers.

What Nike is to running, what Orvis is to fly-fishing, what Burton is to snowboarding, Concept2 is to rowing. Concept2 is a Morrisville-based company that employs 55 people, and it is run and owned by Misters Peter and Dick Dreissigacker. The company leads the world in producing oars used by crews and scullers to pull and push on the water’s surface, and in producing a portion of the global indoor rowing machine market, too. “Their products are found around the world,” said Alex Machi, director of rowing at Middlebury College. “They easily dominate the oar manufacturing business.”

How two Connecticut brothers maneuvered their not-so-successful company into the center of the rowing universe from a small town in northern Vermont is a remarkable tale, one that continues to evolve on rivers and ponds and indoor gyms around the world. . . .

“The challenge,” said Peter, “is trying to continue to improve on what we’ve got.”

Dick, now 58, was a member of the 1972 U.S. Olympic Rowing Team and a Brown University product. He drifted out to California to take a rowing coaching position at Stanford, a school Peter, who’s four years younger, was attending.

Dick was looking for a “secret weapon” after the 1972 Olympics and began to explore ways to improve oars, which had been crafted out of wood pretty much since humans started rowing boats through water. “There were quite a few companies making composite oars,” said Peter, “but nobody was making oars.”

By 1976, the Dreissigackers had built a prototype of a composite oar and began making them. “We sold the back of a bread truck,” they said. “And nobody was buying oars.”

The company makes “sweep” oars, oars for sculling and oars for a small niche of rowers who specialize in sculling. Oars range in price from about $200 to more than $400 each, and there are custom orders, blade and shaft repairs and styled custom versions little more than a boat builder’s company’s employees busy. Dick says there are two other companies that are viewed as competitors worldwide, but Concept2 controls about two-thirds of the world’s competitive oar market.

In 1991, the Dreissigackers struck again, changing the shape of the oar blades to a bigger, “hatchet” style, a change that exploded through the rowing scene. At the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona, Spain, said Peter, “boats were on the water, changing their blades to our style.” There was some discussion of banning the bigger blade, which was more efficient and more effective, but the style quickly became the standard. Two-Middlebury teams and a University of Vermont women’s team will be using Concept2 oars when they compete at the Head of the Charles regatta. “If 75 or 80 percent of the teams at the Head of the Charles are using our oars,” said Dick, “then almost 100 percent of those teams will have trained on our indoor trainers. They’re pretty much the standard.”

The Dreissigackers started making the indoor machines in the mid-1980s, the first indoor rowing machines on the market. Now the machines—their fourth version—come equipped with computers to measure rowing ability—a number that the rowing world now refers to as “Erg scores.” “It’s kind of like an athletic SAT score,” said Dick, who attributes Peter’s higher Erg score to being nearly 15 years younger, even though Dick rows almost every day of the summer on a lake at his cottage in Al- bany. There’s a gym for Concept2 employees at the company headquarters and it’s filled with rowing machines. No longer in the barn, the company moved in 1984 to a more industrial location, not far from the center of Morrisville. The factory today is more than 45,000 square feet.

Sarah Tousignant, a senior at the University of Vermont and president of the school’s women’s rowing team, knows how important Concept2’s Erg machines are. The Catamounts train six days a week on the Lamoille River using Dreissigacker oars. “In the winter they’ll move inside and shift onto Ergs. ‘We just ordered 12 new Ergs from them,’ she said. "Most of the Head of the Charles athletes will be using Dreissigacker oars, and nearly all will have trained and honed their skills on Dreissigacker indoor machines. So even if the Motley team gets beaten to the finish line on the Charles River next weekend, the Dreissigackers still win. With the Boston Red Sox out of baseball’s playoffs, the eyes will be on Boston, and turn to Boston, the month for one thing: The Head of the Charles Regatta."

A stretch? Consider that more than 7,000 athletes in 600 teams will compete in 24 race events in the 41st annual Head of the Charles on Oct. 22-23. It is the world’s largest two-day rowing event. Rowing teams from the University of Vermont and Middlebury College will be among the competitors, as will brothers Dick and Pete Dreissigacker from Morrisville.

The Dreissigackers, both former Olympics rowers, have been competing in the Head of the Charles since 1980. In 1991, there were in the majority of oats on the river, given that most of the competitors will be using oars made by the Dreissigackers’ Concept2 company. But the industry is so competitive that彼得 said, “It’s pretty much the most prestigious fall race.” Said Sarah Tousignant, women’s team president of UVM rowing, “It’s the race that everybody looks forward to and holds in high regard.”

The Head of the Charles was first held Oct. 16, 1965. As many as 300,000 spectators are expected to be on hand for the weekend.

**ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS**

**CHINESE LUNAR NEW YEAR**

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize the Chinese Lunar New Year, 2006, is the Year of the Dog.

The Chinese calendar is based on the cycles of the sun and the moon, and the Chinese Lunar New Year is the most important of Chinese festivals. Celeb- rate begins on the first day of the first moon of the lunar calendar and ends on the full moon 15 days later, with the Lantern Festival. In order to prepare for the new year, families perform several oral rituals to cleanse the home and the spirit, to sweep away misfortune and to welcome in the new year with good luck, health, happiness and prosperity.

The Chinese lunar calendar is associated with a 12-year animal zodiac. According to ancient Chinese legend, Buddha asked all the animals to meet him on the Chinese Lunar New Year. Twelve animals came, and Buddha rewarded each animal by naming a year after each one. The 12 animals—Cat, Ox, Tiger, Rabbit, Dragon, Snake, Horse, Sheep, Monkey, Rooster, Dog and Pig—represent a cyclical concept of time. He told each animal that the person born in the year of an animal inherits some of the personality traits of that animal. It is said that those born in the Year of the Dog tend to be loyal, kind, and generous.

America is rich with the cultural traditions of many countries. In California, the Chinese-American community plays a vibrant and important part of our State’s history. Celebrating the Chinese Lunar New Year allows us to embrace this significant and most important cultural festival of the Chinese calendar.

I hope that the Chinese Lunar New Year brings good health, happiness, peace and prosperity to all. I give my very best wishes for an auspicious New Year.

**TRIBUTE TO THE NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY CHEERLEADERS**

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I pay tribute to the Northern Kentucky University cheerleaders. The squad was ...
I rise to honor an outstanding group of young choir members who have brought joy and musical harmony to countless people in Delaware and around the world.

The Cathedral Choir School of Delaware
- Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I rise to honor a group that captured the hearts of the Cathedral Choir School and volunteers around the world. Their example of hard work and determination should be followed by all in the Commonwealth.

I would especially like to acknowledge the commitment and enthusiasm that the individual members of the choir have shown during their time with the choir. Overseeing the Cathedral Choir School, Dr. Roland has served as a shining example of what is possible when good students and caring adults decide to make a positive difference in the lives of children.

I would like to acknowledge the hard work and determination that the individual members of the choir have shown during their time with the choir. Their dedication and love of music continues to serve as an example of what is possible when young people are given the opportunity to follow their dreams. All of Delaware is proud of them.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAURICE GUERRY
- Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, this past December Idaho unexpectedly lost a generous and gracious man who will be missed terribly by all who had the pleasure of experiencing his welcoming spirit and warm heart.

Maurice was a sheep rancher from Three Creek, ID, who was known for his ready smile, charm and unequivocal love for his wife, family and the land on which he made his livelihood. He had the distinct privilege of working with a number of collaborative land management endeavors and remember well that he made an extraordinary effort to get those who thought themselves at odds to find common ground and work together. He saw the wisdom and value of this approach and was respected and admired for it.

With his sheep dog keeping a sharp eye from the back of his truck, Maurice diligently cared for his land and was known to carry candy with him to share in case he met someone on one of the remote roads near his ranch. He and his wife, Marlene, would put together a dinner party for dozens at the drop of a hat, welcoming strangers with open arms. He was especially close to his fellow Basque friends.

Maurice had a soul of generosity, gentleness and wisdom and knew the value of hard, honest work. This legacy is his gift and it lives on in his family and friends. My prayers are with them during this difficult time.

TRIBUTE TO DOUGLAS W. BOOK
- Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn of the sudden passing of Forest City Chief of Police Douglas “Doug” Book on January 13. Doug leaves behind a remarkable career in law enforcement that spans over three decades. He has had an immense impact not only in his community of Forest City but throughout the entire State of Iowa.

Doug Book began his career as a full-time patrolman in 1968 and quickly rose amongst the ranks of his department until he was appointed chief of police in 1973. He faithfully served in this capacity until his passing. In addition to his dedicated service to his community, Doug also served Iowa as the head of the North Central Iowa Narcotics Task Force for the past 10 years. Doug also served as chairman of the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy Board and as president of the Iowa Association of Chiefs of Police and Peace Officers.

Doug’s constant support and guidance for his fellow officers did not stop at Iowa’s borders but spilled over to other departments in New York City. Chief Book joined a group of Iowa police officers as part of a critical incident stress management team that helped New York City police officers cope with the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

One of Doug’s colleagues described him simply as a “good guy, a good cop, and a good friend.” His friends and family should be very proud of what he has done for so many people. Chief Book’s devotion, hard work, and dedication to duty will be sorely missed.

40 YEARS OF EXEMPLARY FEDERAL SERVICE
- Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on February 3, 2006, Mr. Ray H. Jyo, Deputy District Engineer for Programs and Project Management/Chief, Programs and Project Management Division, Honolulu Engineer District, HED, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, will retire from the Government following nearly 40 years of exemplary service to Hawaii, the Pacific Region, the military and the Nation.

Born and raised in Hawaii, Mr. Jyo is a registered professional engineer and a member of the American Society of Military Engineers, who served in numerous engineering and executive management positions in the U.S. Army. He holds a bachelor’s of science degree in civil engineering from the University of Minnesota. He has attended the Senior Officials in National Security Program, the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University and the Emerging Issues in Public Management Training at the Brookings Institute.

Mr. Jyo has served with pride and distinction. I have witnessed his steadfast dedication and hard work to improve
Mr. Jyo has demonstrated the highest values and ideals in his many accomplishments throughout his distinguished Federal service. Upon retirement, he will have served the Federal Government for 39 years, 11 months and 13 days. He has succeeded at every job position in his career, which covers every facet of the design/construction/management continuum of the construction industry. He has used his considerable leadership and management skills on behalf of the Army Corps and the Nation to achieve much success.

As the chief of the Far East Surveillance Branch from 1982 to 1986, Mr. Jyo pioneered the regionalization concept at the Pacific Ocean Division, POD. His program managers monitored engineering, design and construction efforts at the Japan and Far East Districts with the focus of providing valued-added services to the districts and regional partners with the Army and Air Force. Mr. Jyo’s branch became the “strike” arm of POD’s rapid deployment force which led and provided hands-on project management and technical support to the districts. His teams would deploy to the districts to support them during times of peak workload or during crisis situations making them invaluable to District operations. He also had the responsibility of keeping Pacific Air Command, United States Pacific Air Forces and Air Force inform, keep in contact, and involved in large construction program overseas. Many of the principles and policies he pioneered are still being followed at POD today. During this timeframe, Mr. Jyo led by example when he deployed to Ft. Drum for 2 months to lead the planning and programming efforts to provide quality facilities for the 10th Mountain Division.

During his tenure as the chief, Technical Engineering Division, 1986 to 1987, Mr. Jyo provided quality technical services to all the districts in POD. In addition, he instituted the concept of life-cycle technical services by sending his technical reviewers to the field to assist the construction offices in coming up with viable solutions to sticky construction problems. This formed the basis of the latter consolidation of the technical review and quality assurance staffs at POD. Responsive to the customer, Mr. Jyo has consistently strived to provide quality technical services and products in a responsive manner.

As the chief of Military Division, Mr. Jyo led the planning, engineering, and construction of the military program POD-wide. Through his leadership and experience, POD has become the proven leader in project execution and accomplishment.

As the acting director of Engineering and Construction Directorate, Mr. Jyo forged a culture of excellence between engineering, design, and construction quality. He brought all of POD’s technical assets together to work toward common goals to provide responsive service and engineering and construction excellence to POD. The Engineering and Construction Directorate was the largest directorate at POD and included the operational elements of design, program management, engineering services, environmental, cost engineering as well as design and construction quality assurance. Mr. Jyo maintained technical excellence by pioneering innovative design and procurement tools, such as the construction indefinite delivery indefinite quantity contracting for Tripler Army Medical Center, later to be applied across the division programs, and such technical tools as the Computer Aided Drafting and Design, CADD, and Geographical Information Systems (GIS). By combining the technical elements of design, engineering and construction quality assurance into one division, he unified the quality function and created “life cycle” accountability for a design/construction/management continuum. Mr. Jyo’s leadership and initiatives have resulted in the transformation of POD into a team-oriented matrixed organization.

Since 1997, Mr. Jyo has been the deputy district engineer for programs and project management for the Honolulu District. He has continued to utilize his leadership skills to accomplish considerable successes on their behalf. He has executed programs and projects in a team-oriented matrixed organization. He has led the effort to incorporate a quality management system into the district along with International Organization for Standardization 9001 certification. He has instituted a learning organization with a system of After Action Reviews and Lessons-Learned. He is successfully leading the district through its biggest construction program with highly visible programs such as the Stryker Brigade Combat Team and C-17 implementation in Hawaii. Under his leadership, the Honolulu District has achieved the highest customer satisfaction rating in its history.

Mr. Jyo is a recognized representative of the Corps in the Pacific Region. He has established lasting relationships with the Hawaii Congressional Delegation as well as the Governors of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands. Mr. Jyo’s efforts have made lasting impacts on the abilities of our service men and women to function as a team and bolster the region’s economy while ardently protecting the environment. Mr. Jyo played an instrumental role in expanding the civil works and capital improvement programs to Guam, American Samoa, Kwajalein, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands. In addition, Mr. Jyo oversaw the construction of the Alaeno Stream Flood Control project in Hilo, HI, which was completed in 1997 at a cost of $16 million. During the storms of November 2000, the improvements prevented approximately $13 million in damages and remains fully functional today.

Prominent projects on the island of Oahu include the construction and renovation of military housing and improving facilities at Hickam AFB, Wheeler, Schofield, Aliamanu, and Fort Shafter. In 1989, HED began the design of the Paradise Point Rentals and the Phase 2 recreational hotel at Fort DeRussy in Waikiki. Upon its completion in 1994, the Fort DeRussy area was transformed into a visually pleasing enhancement of Waikiki for the benefit of the military and civilian communities.

His lifelong contributions and achievements to the Army are considerable. His recognized leadership and ability to forge lasting relationships and his clear vision describes an outstanding individual who has dedicated his life to public service. Ray Jyo’s distinguished career may be coming to an end, but his loyalty to the goals of the Army and the Nation will carry on. On behalf of a grateful Nation, thank you for your service and for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO PAMELA ALTMEYER-ALVEY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate a distinguished Hoosier, Mrs. Pamela Altmeyer of Indianapolis, IN, who this year celebrates 25 years of leadership at Gleaners Food Bank of Central Indiana.

Mrs. Altmeyer is a 1964 graduate of Ben Davis High School in Indianapolis and studied at Vincennes University, the University of Indianapolis and the University of Wisconsin at Madison. She has 35 years of experience in managing nonprofit organizations and is a valuable contributor as a member of numerous boards of important community associations.

Gleaners Food Bank was formed in 1980 in a garage in Indianapolis and, under the leadership of Mrs. Altmeyer and other dedicated individuals, has grown into the largest nonprofit provider of assistance to needy families in our State. Over the last 12 months, Gleaners has distributed nearly 11 million pounds of food and other critical grocery products to 400 hunger relief charities in 29 central Indiana counties. Since inception Gleaners has distributed over 173 million pounds of product to Hoosiers in their time of need.

I have had the joy of working closely with Mrs. Altmeyer at Gleaners Food Bank in procuring resources for needy Hoosiers. I believe that, both as a Nation and as individuals, we can do more to improve the lives of those in need. I am deeply grateful for Mrs. Altmeyer’s important service and leadership as well as for the remarkable work done by her colleagues at Gleaners Food Bank of Central Indiana.

BIRTH OF KATHERINE RILEY LUGAR

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I am pleased to share the news of the birth
of Katherine Riley Lugar on December 28, 2005, at Sibley Memorial Hospital in Washington, DC. Katherine was a healthy 8 pounds, 1 ounce at birth. Her parents are David Riley Lugar, son of Richard and Charlene Lugar; and her wife, Katherine Graham Lugar, daughter of Jane Graham. Katherine was born at 4:20 p.m. and in the next few hours was joined in the hospital delivery room by Jane Graham, Richard and Charlene Lugar, and David’s brother, John Lugar with his wife, Katherine. The Lugas are now joined together with a wonderful experience. On the next day, Katherine met her sister, Elizabeth Merrell Lugar, who was born at Sibley Memorial Hospital on May 25, 2004. The two girls and their parents are now safe and healthy in their McLean, VA, residence.

Katherine and David were married on June 3, 2000, in St. David’s Episcopal Church in Austin, TX. Katherine, a graduate of the University of Colorado, is Vice President of Federal Government Relations for St. Paul Travelers. David Lugar, who came with us to Washington, along with his three brothers, 29 years ago, graduated from Langley High School in McLean, VA, and Indiana University. He is a partner of Quinn Gillespie & Associates. Both Katherine and David are well known to many of our colleagues and their staff members. We know that you will understand our excitement and our joy that they and we have been given this divine blessing and responsibility for a glorious new chapter in our lives.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5221. A communication from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration’s Report on Fiscal Year 2005 Competitiveness Sourcing Efforts; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5222. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, information on the ratification of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5223. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Applicable Federal Rates—January 2006” (Rev. Rul. 2006–1) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5224. A communication from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Rev. Rul. 74–503” (Rev. Rul. 2006–2) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Finance.
Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Part 22 of the Commission’s Rules to Benefit the Consumers by Improving Communications Services, et. al.—On Reconsideration and Report and Order” (FCC05–202) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5256. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Victoria, George West, and Three Rivers, Texas)” (MB Docket No. 03–56) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5257. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Caseville, Pigeon, Harbor Beach, and Lexington, Michigan)” (NM Docket Nos. 01–229 and 01–231) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5258. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Greenville, LaGrange and Waverly Hall, Georgia)” (Rev. Proc. 2006–6) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5259. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Holden and Pauls Valley, Oklahoma)” (NM Docket No. 01–180, RM–10200 and RM–11018) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5260. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Caseville, Pigeon, Harbor Beach, and Lexington, Michigan)” received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5261. A communication from the Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Caseville, Pigeon, Harbor Beach, and Lexington, Michigan)” received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.


EC–5263. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Track Safety Standards; Inspection of Joints in Continuous Welded Rail “ (RIN2319–AB71) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.


EC–5265. A communication from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Technical Amendments to Standards for Development and Use of Processor-Based Signal and Train Control Systems; Correc- tions (RIN2120–AA79)” received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5266. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: BAE Limited Edition Model Avro 146-RJ Airplanes” (RIN2120–AA46) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5267. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives: Learjet Model 45 Airplanes” (RIN2120–AA44) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5268. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Nutrition and Agriculture, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace: Wellington Municipal Airport, KS” (RIN2130–AA46) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5269. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Nutrition and Agriculture, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace: Sheldon Municipal Airport, IA” (RIN2120–AA66) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5270. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Nutrition and Agriculture, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Class E Airspace: Wellington Municipal Airport, KS” (RIN2130–AA46) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5271. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Nutrition and Agriculture, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Jet Routes J-8, J-13, J-17, J-22, J-23 and VOR Federal Airways ‘663, ‘665, ‘666, ‘353, and V-611: Las Vegas, NV’” (RIN2319–AA66) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5272. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Nutrition and Agriculture, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Track Safety Standards; Inspection of Joints in Continuous Welded Rail “ (RIN2319–AB71) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5273. A communication from the Committee on the Permanent Select Committee on Nutrition and Agriculture, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Technical Amendments to Standards for Development and Use of Processor-Based Signal and Train Control Systems; Correc- tions (RIN2120–AA79)” received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.
of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Marine Casualties and Investigations; Chemical Testing Following Serious Marine Incidents” ((RIN2120–AA90) (USCG–2006–6991)) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5276. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI” (RCN65–AA67) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5279. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “ Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Pelagic Fishes; Sea Turtle Mitigation Measures” ((I.D. 072105B)) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5282. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment and Revision of Area Navigation Routes; Western United States; Correction” ((RIN2120–A168) (2005–0256)) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5283. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “ Modifications of Class C and Class E Airspace; Salina Municipal Airport, KS; Correction” ((RIN2120–A166) (2005–0256)) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5284. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island, NY” (RCN61–AA01) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5285. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod Quotas; Transboundary Management Area” (I.D. 112105A) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5286. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Anchorages, Port of Boston, MA” (I.D. 112055B) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5287. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Herring Fishery; Closure of Directed Fishery for Management Area 1A” (I.D. 112055B) received on January 4, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5288. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Supplemental Oxygen” (RIN2120–A165) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5289. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “AA 112b, as amended, the report of the ARB’s Preliminary Accident Investigation Report” (RIN2120–AA90) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5290. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating that the Coast Guard implemented new rules in 2005 concerning the Edible Oil Regulatory and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island, NY” (RCN61–AA01) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5291. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island, NY” (RCN61–AA01) received on January 3, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5292. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment and Revision of Area Navigation Routes; Western United States; Correction” ((RIN2120–A168) (2005–0256)) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5293. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (38)” ((RIN2120–A165) (2005–0034)) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5294. A communication from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Department’s Competitive Sourcing Report for Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–5295. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Indian Affairs; Final Rule” (RIN0584–AD66) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5296. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reindeer in Alaska” (RIN1079–AD78) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5297. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Child and Adult Care Food Program; Age Limits for Children Receiving Meals in Emergency Shelters” (RIN0584–AD66) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5298. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Elimination of Interference orOther Than Treaties” (List 05–315—05–323) to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–5299. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Veterans’ Education; Revision of Eligibility Requirements for the Montgomery GI Bill—Selected Reserve” (RIN2900–AL69) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5300. A communication from the Chairman and President (Acting), Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of transactions involving U.S. exports to the Kingdom of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5301. A communication from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Financial Management Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Withholding of District of Columbia, State, City and County Income or Employment Taxes by Federal Agencies” (RIN1305–ZZ77) received on January 6, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
EC–5302. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5303. A communication from the Acting Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that funding for the State of Georgia as a result of the emergency conditions resulting from the influx of evacuees from areas struck by Hurricane Katrina beginning on August 29, 2005, and continuing, has exceeded $5,000,000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5304. A communication from the President of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the emergency with respect to the Government of Cuba’s destruction of two armed U.S.-registered civilian aircraft; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5305. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month report prepared by the Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Industry and Security on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5306. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5307. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-useable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13159 of June 21, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5308. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5309. A communication from the Assistant to the Board, Division of Consumer and Community Affairs, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Home Mortgage Disclosure Act” (Docket No. 1245) received on January 3, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5310. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Electronic Submission of Applications for Grants and Other HUD Financial Assistance” ((RIN2501–AD02)(FR–4875–F–02)) received on January 3, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5311. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Eligibility of Students for Assisted Housing Under Section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1973” ((RIN2501–AD19)(FR–5036–F–01)) received on January 3, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5312. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the rule entitled “Anti-Money Laundering Programs—Special Due Diligence Programs for Certain Foreign Financial Institutions” (RIN5606–A22) received on January 4, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5313. A communication from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Requirements for Building and Loan Associations—Strengthening Capital Requirements” (RIN3133–AD14) received on January 8, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5314. A communication from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fidelity Bond and Fiduciary Insurance; Requirements for Credit Unions” (12 CFR Parts 713 and 741) received on January 8, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5315. A communication from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Audit Requirements for State-chartered Credit Unions” (12 CFR Part 712) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5316. A communication from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Liquidations” (12 CFR Part 712) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5317. A communication from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulation E—Electronic Fund Transfers” (Docket No. R–1247) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5318. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Audit Requirements for State-chartered Credit Unions” (12 CFR Part 712) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5319. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility” ((Doc. No. FEMA–7905)(44 CFR Part 64)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5320. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility” ((Doc. No. FEMA–7905)(44 CFR Part 64)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5321. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility” ((Doc. No. FEMA–7905)(44 CFR Part 64)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5322. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final Flood Elevation Determinations” (70 FR 57791)(44 CFR Part 67)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5323. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility” ((Doc. No. FEMA–7905)(44 CFR Part 64)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5324. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final Flood Elevation Determinations” (70 FR 57791)(44 CFR Part 67)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5325. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility” ((Doc. No. FEMA–7905)(44 CFR Part 64)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.


EC–5327. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final Flood Elevation Determinations” (70 FR 57791)(44 CFR Part 67)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.


EC–5330. A communication from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Solicitor, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Eligibility of Homeowners of High Risk Mortgages” (RIN2502–AD63)(FR–4946–F–02)) received on January 16, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.
a rule entitled “Regulation E—Electronic Fund Transfers” (Dockets R–1210 and R–1234) received on January 16, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–333. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, the report of a draft bill which would amend the Mine Safety and Health Administration’s (“MSHA”) civil money penalty system by permitting MSHA to levy a maximum civil penalty of $220,000 for certain violations (termed “flagrant” violations) that substantially and proximately caused, or reasonably could have been expected to cause, death or serious bodily injury; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–333. A communication from the Deputy Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits” (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received on January 8, 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–333. A communication from the Deputy Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Valuing and Paying Benefits” (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received on January 8, 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 18, 2006, the following reports of committees were submitted on January 24, 2006:

By Mr. McCain, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:
S. 1219. A bill to authorize certain tribes in the State of Montana to enter into a lease or Contract with the State of Montana to the Rural Water Association, Inc. (Rept. No. 109–213).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT
Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 18, 2006, the following executive report of committee was submitted on January 24, 2006:

By Mr. Specter for the Committee on the Judiciary:
S. 1219. A bill to authorize certain tribes in the State of Montana to enter into a lease or other temporary conveyance of water rights to meet the water needs of the Dry Prairie Rural Water Association, Inc. (Rept. No. 109–213).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER:
S. 2354. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide residents of long-term care facilities with assistance with respect to prescription drug coverage under part D of such title for the resident to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAGEL (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CHAFETZ, Mr. KUENEN, Ms. MUKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DODD, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BINGHAMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON):
S. 2363. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM:
S. 2388. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on hydrazine hydrate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH:
S. Res. 350. A resolution responding to the threat posed by Iran’s nuclear program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COLEMAN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BROWNACK, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN): S. Con. Res. 76. A concurrent resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its flagrant violations of its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and calling for certain actions in response to such violations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 2183. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide residents of long-term care facilities with assistance with respect to prescription drug coverage under part D of such title for the resident; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAGEL (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CHAFETZ, Mr. KUENEN, Ms. MUKULSKI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DODD, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BINGHAMAN, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON):
S. 2356. A bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANTORUM:
S. 2388. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on hydrazine hydrate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH:
S. Res. 350. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Senate Joint Resolution 25 (107th Congress), as adopted by the Senate on September 14, 2001, and subsequently enacted as the Authorization for Use of Military Force does not authorize warrantlessness or undetected surveillance of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAHY:
S. Res. 350. A resolution responding to the threat posed by Iran’s nuclear program; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SANTORUM:
S. 2388. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on thiophanate-methyl fungicide 70% wettable powder; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:
S. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish fairness in the treatment of certain pension plans maintained by churches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STEVENS:
S. 2393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish fairness in the treatment of certain pension plans maintained by churches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.
By Mr. STEVENS:
S. 2195. A bill for the relief of Ilya Shestakov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Mr. REID, and Mr. BINGAMAN):
S. 2196. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish the position of Assistant Secretary for Advanced Energy Research, Technology Development, and Deployment to implement an innovative energy research, technology development, and deployment program to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. CORKER):
S. Res. 352. A resolution commending the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):
S. Res. 353. A resolution expressing concern with the deliberate undermining of democratic freedoms and justice in Cambodia by Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):
S. Con. Res. 77. A concurrent resolution to provide for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the State of the Union; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 58, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MUKWOKSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 484, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) were added as cosponsors of S. 756, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance public and health professional awareness and understanding of lupus and to strengthen the Nation’s research efforts to identify the causes and cure of lupus.

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 832, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide taxpayer protection and assistance, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 908, a bill to allow Congress, State legislatures and regulatory agencies to determine appropriate laws, rules, and regulations to address the problems of weight gain, obesity, and health conditions associated with weight gain or obesity.

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) were added as cosponsors of S. 914, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a competitive grant program to build capacity in medical education and expand the workforce of veterinarians engaged in public health practice and biomedical research.

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to provide for paid sick leave to ensure that Americans can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 941, a bill to amend the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to establish a program to provide assistance to States and nonprofit organizations to preserve suburban forest land and open space and contain suburban sprawl.

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 960, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to prohibit the use of certain anti-competitive forward contracts.

At the request of Mr. DE MINT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 983, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights.

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1060, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids.

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to make permanent the enhanced educational savings provisions for qualified tuition programs enacted as part of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001.

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1159, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strengthen the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the pet industry.

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DeWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1167, a bill to provide that certain wire rods shall not be subject to any anti-dumping duty or countervailing duty order.

At the request of Mr. DEMINT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1173, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure the right of employees to a secret-ballot election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1263, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish eligibility requirements for business concerns to receive awards under the Small Business Innovation Research Program.

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1294, a bill to amend the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to preserve and protect the ability of local governments to provide broadband capability and services.

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1354, a bill to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II.
January 25, 2006

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 1357

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1357, a bill to protect public health by clarifying the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe performance standards for the reduction of pathogens in meat, meat products, poultry, and poultry products processed by establishments receiving inspection services and to enforce the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) System requirements, sanitation requirements, and the performance standards.

S 1449

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1449, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the eligibility of veterans for mortgage bond financing, and for other purposes.

S 1516

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Kyl) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1516, a bill to prohibit Federal agencies from obligating funds for appropriations earmarks included only in congressional reports, and for other purposes.

S 1521

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1521, a bill to repeal the sunset on the reduction of capital gains rates for individuals and on the taxation of dividends of individuals at capital gain rates.

S 1723

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1723, a bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to establish a grant program to ensure waterfront access for commercial fisherman, and for other purposes.

S 1791

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for qualified timber gains.

S 1800

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1800, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the new markets tax credit.

S 1807

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PHYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1807, a bill to provide assistance for small businesses damaged by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, and for other purposes.

S 1821

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1821, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to preparation for an influenza pandemic, including an avian influenza pandemic, and for other purposes.

S 1901

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1901, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide extended and additional protection to Medicare beneficiaries who enroll for the Medicare prescription drug benefit during 2006.

S 1906

At the request of Mr. BURNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1906, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S 1909

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1909, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to stabilize the amount of the medicare part B premium.

S 1907

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PHYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1907, a bill to promote the development of Native American small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S 1915

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1915, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

S 1908

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to expand the research, prevention, and awareness activities of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with respect to inflammatory bowel disease.

S 1934

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1934, a bill to reauthorize the grant program of the Department of Justice for reentry of offenders into the community, to establish a task force on Federal programs and activities relating to the reentry of offenders into the community, and for other purposes.

S 1956

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1956, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to create a new three-tiered approval system for drugs, biological products, and devices that is responsive to the needs of seriously ill patients, and for other purposes.

S 1960

At the request of Mrs. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1960, a bill to establish a pilot program to provide grants to encourage eligible institutions of higher education to establish and operate pregnancy and parenting student service offices for pregnant students, prospective parenting students who are anticipating a birth or adoption, and students who are placing or have placed a child for adoption.

S 2084

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2084, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue regulations concerning the safety and labeling of portable generators.

S 2123

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. DOLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2123, a bill to modernize the manufactured housing loan insurance program under title I of the National Housing Act.

S 2129

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Kyl) were added as cosponsors of S. 2129, a bill to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, and for other purposes.

S 2154

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. 2154, a bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Rosa Parks.

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2154, supra.
At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DeWine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2158, a bill to establish a National Homeland Security Academy within the Department of Homeland Security.

At the request of Mr. Frist, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2170, a bill to provide for global pathogen surveillance and response.

At the request of Mr. Schumer, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Snowe), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Dorgan), the Senator from Washington (Ms. Cantwell), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kerry) were added as cosponsors of S. 2178, a bill to make the stealing and selling of telephone records a criminal offense.

At the request of Mr. Obama, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Clinton), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Salazar), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Nelson) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Bingaman) were added as cosponsors of S. 2179, a bill to require openness in conference committee deliberations and full disclosure of the contents of conference reports and all other legislation.

At the request of Mr. Reid, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. Cantwell) were added as cosponsors of S. 2180, a bill to provide more rigorous requirements with respect to disclosure and enforcement of ethics and lobbying laws and regulations, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Jeffords, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2180, supra.

At the request of Mr. Nelson of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2180, supra.

At the request of Mr. S. 2180, supra.

At the request of Mr. Rockefeller, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Obama), the Senator from California (Mrs. Feinstein) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez) were added as cosponsors of S. 2183, a bill to provide for necessary beneficiary protections in order to ensure access to coverage under the Medicare part D prescription drug program.

At the request of Mr. Isakson, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Chambliss) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Coleman) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 69, a concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of A Day of Hearts: Congenital Heart Defect Day in order to increase awareness about congenital heart defects, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Coley, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Sarbanes), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Carper) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 182, a resolution authorizing efforts to increase childhood cancer awareness, treatment, and research.

At the request of Mr. C. 320.

At the request of Mr. Ensign, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. Collins) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Sarbanes) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 320, a resolution calling on the President to ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide.

STATMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Reid (for himself, Mr. Durbin, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Akaka, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Bohn, Mr. Biden, Mr. Bingaman, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Carper, Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Conrad, Mr. Dayton, Mr. Dorgan, Mr. Feingold, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kerry, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Lautenberg, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Levin, Mr. Lieberman, Mrs. Lincoln, Mr. Menendez, Ms. Mikulski, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Obama, Mr. Reid, Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Salazar, Ms. Wyden, and Mr. Inouye):

S. 2180. A bill to provide more rigorous requirements with respect to disclosure and enforcement of ethics and lobbying laws and regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

- Mr. Reid. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2006''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Title I—Closing the Revolving Door

Sec. 101. Extension of lobbying ban for former Members and employees of Congress and executive branch officials.

Sec. 102. Elimination of floor privileges for former Member lobbyists.

Sec. 103. Disclosure by Members of Congress and senior congressional staff of employment negotiations.

Sec. 104. Ethics review of employment negotiations by executive branch officials.

Sec. 105. Wrongfully influencing a private entity’s employment decisions or practices.

Title II—Full Public Disclosure of Lobbying

Sec. 201. Quarterly filing of lobbying disclosure reports.


Sec. 203. Additional lobbying disclosure requirements.

Sec. 204. Disclosure of paid efforts to stimulate grassroots lobbying.

Sec. 205. Disclosure of lobbying activities by certain coalitions and associations.

Sec. 206. Disclosure by registered lobbyists of past executive and congressional employment.

Sec. 207. Creation of a comprehensive public database of lobbying disclosure information.

Sec. 208. Conforming amendment.

Title III—Restricting Congressional Travel and Gifts

Sec. 301. Ban on gifts from lobbyists.

Sec. 302. Prohibition on privately funded travel.

Sec. 303. Prohibiting lobbyist organization and participation in congressional travel.

Sec. 304. Disclosure of noncommercial air travel.

Sec. 305. Per diem expenses for congressional travel.

Title IV—Enforcement of Lobbying Restrictions

Sec. 401. Senate Office of Public Integrity.

Sec. 402. Increased civil and criminal penalties for failure to comply with lobbying disclosure requirements.

Sec. 403. Penalty for false certification in connection with congressional travel.

Sec. 404. Mandatory annual ethics training for congressional employees.

Title V—Open Government

Sec. 501. Sense of the Senate on conference committee deliberations and full disclosure of the contents of conference reports and all other legislation.

Sec. 502. Actual voting required in conference committee deliberations.
SEC. 102. ELIMINATION OF FLOOR PRIVILEGES FOR FORMER MEMBER LOBBYISTS.

Rule XXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting after "Ex-Senators and Senators elect" the following: "except for any ex-Senator or Senator elect whose term was not a full two-year period, unless a Senator can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Senate a good and substantial reason for extending the period of one year's privilege in his or her case; and

SEC. 103. DISCLOSURE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND SENIOR CONGRESSIONAL STAFF OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS.

(a) SENATE.—Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(a) A Select Committee on Ethics shall maintain a current public record of all notifications received under subparagraph (a) and of all recusals under subparagraph (c).

(b) The Committee on Ethics shall maintain a current record of all notifications received under subparagraph (a) and of all recusals under subparagraph (c)."

SEC. 104. ETHICS REVIEW OF EMPLOYMENT NEGOTIATIONS BY EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIALS.

Section 204 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting after "the Government official" the following: "or his or her position" the following: "and the Office of Government Ethics; and"

SEC. 205. ADDITIONAL LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) QUARTERLY FILING OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REPORTS.

SEC. 206. ELECTRONIC FILING OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REPORTS.

Section 5 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1604) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) ELECTRONIC FILING REQUIRED.—A report required to be filed under this section shall be filed in electronic form, in addition to any other form that may be required by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives. The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall provide for public access to such reports on the Internet."
leadership PAC, or political party committee, to whom a contribution was made; and

(7) a certification that the lobbying firm or its employee directed a gift, including travel, to a Member or employee of Congress in violation of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) REGISTRATION.—Section 4(a) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 1603(b)(1)) is amended by striking "shall be rounded to the nearest

amount that a fair good faith estimate of the total amount specifically relating to paid advertising"; and inserting "shall be rounded to the nearest $1,000".

SEC. 204. DISCLOSURE OF PAID EFFORTS TO STIMULATE GRASSROOTS LOBBYING. (a) DISCLOSURE OF PAID EFFORTS TO STIMULATE GRASSROOTS LOBBYING.—Section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(c)) is amended by striking "shall be rounded to the nearest $20,000" and inserting "shall be rounded to the nearest $1,000".

(b) LARGE GRASSROOTS EXPENDITURE.—Section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(b)(6)) is amended by striking "(A) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

(1) in paragraph (7), by adding at the end the following:

"(A) a report under this section not later than

20 days after receiving, spending, or agreeing to spend that amount; and

(B) an additional report not later than 20
days after each time such registrant receives

or controls such lobbying activities."

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) an additional report not later than 20
days after each time such registrant receives

or controls such lobbying activities."

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) an additional report not later than 20
days after each time such registrant receives

or controls such lobbying activities."; and

by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5) and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(5) in the case of a grassroots lobbying firm, for each client—

(A) a good faith estimate of the total disbursements made for grassroots lobbying activities; and

(B) a good faith estimate of the total amount specifically relating to paid advertising;"

and inserting "shall be rounded to the nearest $1,000".

SEC. 205. DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN COALITIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS. (a) GENERAL.—Section 4(b) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(b)(3)) is amended by striking "as included" and inserting "shall be rounded to the nearest $1,000".

(b) AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—Section 6(4) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of the sentence: "and any report filed under this Act, whether before or after the Senate is in session, shall not be available to the public over the Internet, without a fee or other access charge, in a searchable and downloadable manner, an electronic database that includes the information contained in registrations and reports filed under this Act, and shall be maintained for public inspection over the Internet not more than 48 hours after the report is so filed.".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 6(9) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 206. DISCLOSURE BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS OF PAST EXECUTIVE AND CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT. Section 4(b)(6) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1603(b)(6)) is amended by striking "or a covered legislative branch official" and all that follows through "as a lobbyist on behalf of the client, and insert-" and inserting "or a covered legislative branch official.

SEC. 207. CREATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC DATABASE OF LOBBYING DISCLOSURE INFORMATION. (a) DATABASE REQUIREMENT.—Section 6 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1605) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as para-" and all that follows through 

"through a person or entity who serves as an"

(b) AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—Section 6(4) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of the sentence: "and any report filed under this Act, whether before or after the Senate is in session, shall not be available to the public over the Internet, without a fee or other access charge, in a searchable and downloadable manner, an electronic database that includes the information contained in registrations and reports filed under this Act, and shall be maintained for public inspection over the Internet not more than 48 hours after the report is so filed.".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out section 6(9) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 208. CONFORMING AMENDMENT. The requirements of this Act shall not apply to the activities of the present Senate stall committee described in section 301(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

TITLE III—RESTRICTING CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL AND GIFTS

SEC. 301. BAN ON GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS. (a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph 2(a)(1) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking "all but those which are absolutely necessary to effectuate the purpose of the rule.".

(b) RULES COMMITTEE REVIEW.—The Committee on Rules and Administration shall report to the Senate the provision of this Act or an organization identified under that paragraph (3)(B) if it is publicly available knowledge that the organization that would be identified is affiliated with the client or has been directly or indirectly provided anything pending to the client, unless the organization in whole or in major part plans, supervises or controls such lobbying activities. Nothing in paragraph (3)(B) shall be construed to re-
SEC. 301. PROHIBITING LOBBYIST ORGANIZATION AND PARTICIPATION IN CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL.
(a) In general.—Paragraph 2 of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following: "(g) A Member, officer, or employee may not accept transportation or lodging otherwise permissible under this paragraph from any person, such Member, officer, or employee shall obtain a written certification from such person (and provide a copy of such certification to the Select Committee on Ethics) that—"

1. The trip was not planned, organized, requested, arranged, or financed in whole, or in part by a registered lobbyist or foreign agent and was not organized at the request of a registered lobbyist or foreign agent;
2. registered lobbyists will not participate in or attend the trip; and
3. the person did not accept, from any source, any money, supplies, or services earmarked for the purpose of financing the travel expenses.

The Select Committee on Ethics shall make public information received under this sub-paragraph as soon as possible after it is received.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph 2(e) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—
1. by striking "of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed";
2. in clause (5), by striking "and" after the semicolon;
3. in clause (6), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and
4. by adding at the end the following: "(7) a description of meetings and events attended, during such travel, except when disclosure of such information is deemed by the Member or supervisor under whose direct supervision the employee works to jeopardize the investigation or other cause, to interfere with the purpose of financing the travel expenses."

SEC. 401. SENATE OFFICE OF PUBLIC INTEGRITY.
(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Senate an office to be known as the "Senate Office of Public Integrity" (referred to in this section as the "Office") and the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended by striking "Secretary of the Senate" and inserting "Office of Public Integrity".

(b) AUDIT AUTHORITY.—Section 8 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1607) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated in a separate account such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 402. INCREASED CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LOBBYING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.
Section 7 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1606) is amended—
1. by inserting "(a) CIVIL PENALTIES.—" before "Whoever";
2. by striking "$50,000" and inserting "$100,000"; and
3. by adding at the end the following: "(b) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Whoever knowingly and wilfully fails to comply with any provision of this section shall be imprisoned for not more than 3 years, or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both."

SEC. 403. PENALTY FOR FALSE CERTIFICATION IN CONNECTION WITH CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL.
(a) CIVIL FINE.—Whoever makes a false certification in connection with the travel of a Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress (within the meaning given those terms in sections 207 of title 18, United States Code), under paragraph 2(h) of rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, shall, upon proof of such offense by a preponderance of the evidence, be subject to a civil fine depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

(b) MAXIMUM FINE.—The maximum fine per offense committed under this section shall be imposed for each offense committed in connection with the number of separate trips in connection with which the person committed an offense under this subsection, as follows:
1. FIRST TRIP.—For each offense committed in connection with the first such trip, the amount of the fine shall be not more than $100,000 per offense.
2. SECOND TRIP.—For each offense committed in connection with the second such trip, the amount of the fine shall be not more than $300,000 per offense.
3. ANY OTHER.—For each offense committed in connection with any such trip after the second, the amount of the fine shall be not more than $500,000 per offense.

(c) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Whoever knowingly and wilfully fails to comply with any provision of this section shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or fined under title 18, United States Code, or both.

SEC. 404. MANDATORY ANNUAL ETHICS TRAINING FOR CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.
(a) ETHICS TRAINING.—
TITLE V—OPEN GOVERNMENT

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONFERENCE COMMITTEE PROTOCOLS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) conference committees should hold regular, formal meetings of all committees that are open to the public;

(2) all conferees should be given adequate notice of the time and place of all such meetings;

(3) all conferees should be afforded an opportunity to participate in full and complete debates of the matters that such conference committees may recommend to their respective Houses;

(4) all matters before a conference committee should be resolved in conference by votes on the public record; and

(5) existing rules should not be enforced and new rules adopted in the Senate to shine the light on special interest legislation that is enacted in the dead of night.

SEC. 502. ACTUAL VOTING REQUIRED IN CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS.

Rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(8) Each Senate member of a conference committee shall be afforded an opportunity at an open meeting of the conference to vote on the full text of the proposed report of the conference."

SEC. 503. AVAILABILITY OF CONFERENCE REPORTS ON THE INTERNET.

Rule XXVIII of all the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a conference report unless such report is available to all Members and made available to the general public by means of the Internet for at least 24 hours before its consideration."

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Collins, Dayton, Reed, Jeffords, Lincoln, Leahy, Wyden, Stabenow, Johnson, Kennedy, Dorgan, Lieberman, Clinton, Chafee and Dodd):

S. 2181. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for an offset from the Medicaid clawback for State prescription drug expenditures for covered part D drugs for Medicaid beneficiaries, and for other purposes; and

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Medicare State Reimbursement Act along with my colleagues, Senators SNOWE, SCHUMER, COLEMAN, FEINSTEIN, PRYOR, DEWINE, BOXER, MENENDEZ, COLLINS, DAYTON, REED, JEFFORDS, LINCOLN, LEAHY, WYDEN, STABENOW, JOHNSON, KENNEDY, DORGAN, LIEBERMAN, CLINTON, CHAFFE and DODD.

There have been many difficulties surrounding implementation of the Medicare prescription drug benefit, however, few have experienced the severity of this matter that those who are dually eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid have faced.

"Dual Eligibles" are the Nation’s poorest seniors and the disabled. Many suffer from multiple chronic debilitating conditions and on average take between five and ten medications per day. Missing even one dose of medication could result in a life threatening situation.

Across America, countless beneficiaries who tried to have their prescriptions filled for the first time under the new system were told that their enrollment could not be verified, their drugs were not covered, or they would be charged larger co-payments or deductibles than they could afford. As a result, many were at risk of not receiving lifesaving prescription drugs.

Regardless of how Senators voted on the Medicare Drug bill, I think all Senators can agree on one thing; the flaws in the startup of this program are unacceptable.

Fortunately, a number of States including New Jersey have taken actions to help those who have experienced problems with access to medications under the new prescription drug benefit. As of Wednesday this week, New Jersey had already spent $16.6 million dollars.

Congress has been asking the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services whether New Jersey and other States will be paid back for its expenditures. The answers we have gotten so far are not satisfactory.

That is why we need to legislate on this issue. It must be crystal clear to the Federal Government that it needs to repay these States that are bailing them out.

Accordingly, I am introducing emergency legislation today that will reimburse States for the cost they have incurred for filling this unanticipated gap in coverage.

Specifically, this legislation would: require the Federal Government to reimburse the states for the cost of prescriptions for low income seniors and people with disabilities ("dual eligibles") who were eligible for coverage under Medicare Part D, but were improperly denied Federal coverage.

Reimburse states through an equivalent reduction in funds owed by each state under the "claw back" provision of the new Medicare law.

Reimbursement will be at a rate equal to 100 percent of all State costs plus an interest rate equal to the market rate on 3-month Treasury Securities plus 0.1 percent.

DIRECTS the Secretary of HHS to recover overpayments by states to private prescription drug plans and return that money to the Medicare Trust Fund.

This is not just about access to the Federal entitlement program—it’s about life and death.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation and move for its immediate passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2181

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the "Medicare State Reimbursement Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR STATE PRESCRIPTION DRUG EXPENDITURES FOR COVERED PART D DRUGS FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.

Section 1928(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "Each of the 50 States" and inserting "Subject to paragraph (7), each of the 50 States";

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7) OFFSET FOR STATE PRESCRIPTION DRUG EXPENDITURES FOR COVERED PART D DRUGS FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of payment for a month (beginning with January 2006) under paragraph (1) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the sum of—

(i) the amount (as documented by the State) that the State expended during the month for payment for covered part D drugs for part D eligible individuals who are enrolled in a prescription drug plan under part D of title XVIII but were unable to access on a timely basis prescription drug benefits to which they were entitled under such plan; and

(ii) interest on such amount (for the period beginning on the date on which an expenditure described in subparagraph (A) is made and ending on the date on which payment is made under paragraph (1)) equal to the average of interest on 3-month marketable Treasury securities determined for such period, increased by 0.1 percentage point.

(B) RECOVERY OF REDUCED PAYMENT FROM PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS.—The Secretary shall provide for recovery of payment reductions made under subparagraph (A) from prescription drug plans under part D of title XVIII or MA-PD plans under part C of such title that would otherwise be responsible for the expenditures described in subparagraph (A).

Any such amounts recovered shall be deposited into the Medicare Prescription Drug Account in the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator LAUTENBERG today to introduce urgent legislation to assist the many States which have stepped forward to provide an essential safety net to Medicaid Part D beneficiaries. Our States have acted as "payers of last resort"—as beneficiaries faced unaffordable costs when errors in implementing their coverage
denied them access to vital medications. The Medicare State Reimbursement Act will reimburse our States for their costs in ensuring that millions receive their medications. So many of our colleagues have recognized the crisis which was averted—Senators Coleman, Schumer, DeWine, Feinstein, Collins, Jeffords and many more have joined us in this bipartisan effort to support the States in the vital role they have played in countering a deficit of action by the Federal bureaucracy.

The introduction of the prescription drug benefit is a landmark step in the progress of Medicare. This benefit will save the average senior about $1,000 per year. This is the relief that millions have needed for so long. It must eliminate the terrible choices so many have had to make between vital medications and the other essentials of life—not create new dilemmas.

As we worked to ensure a prescription drug benefit, many of us worked hard to assure special help to those with the most limited resources. We enacted a benefit which provided additional help for those on limited incomes, including millions who rely in both Medicaid and Medicare. It was essential that these individuals would see uninterrupted coverage of their essential medications. So we needed to ensure each would be enrolled in a drug plan. To do this, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, randomly assigned each of them to a plan. In a program based on competition—based on choices—plans are going to differ. To make sure low income seniors receive their medications, in Maine alone, approximately $5 million in assistance has been given to ensure medications are dispensed.

This drug benefit must increase access, not make it more difficult. I am appalled, that with all the technology we have, so many have faced such difficulty in the implementation of this benefit. I salute the forbearance of our pharmacies, as they strove to meet essential needs, and the efforts of my State and others which have assured that these most vulnerable Americans not receive the benefits to which they are entitled. It does this by a simple mechanism: an adjustment in the "claw back" payments which States are making to pharmacy plans for their dual eligibles. Accordingly, CMS is authorized to collect those funds from those who were obligated to serve our beneficiaries—the drug plans and managed care plans which deliver the drug benefit.

It has been confirmed that CMS does not presently have this authority, and it simply is not acceptable to propose that CMS will simply help the States collect from the plans. It was CMS which approved the plans, and it is CMS which administers Part D. They are in the best position to assure plan compliance.

I look forward to prompt consideration of this legislation, and look forward to continuing work with my colleagues to assure that the Medicare drug benefit meets the needs of all our beneficiaries, and that none of our most vulnerable citizens should suffer from such administrative failures as we have seen here.

I call on my colleagues to join us in assuring our States are justly compensated.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators Lautenberg, Snowe, Schumer, Coleman and many others to introduce legislation to reimburse States for prescription drug expenses they have incurred for their residents who are dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid. States have had no other option but to step in and ensure seniors can still get their drugs because the implementation of the new Medicare drug benefit has been so poorly handled by the Bush administration.

The faulty implementation of the new drug benefit has caused a major health emergency in California and States across the country, particularly for seniors with chronic and debilitating diseases who rely on multiple medications every day to keep them alive.

It is incomprehensible to me that with all the money and time given to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, to implement this new drug benefit, stories emerge every day of seniors and disabled individuals being hospitalized because they are without the funds they have needed of dollars for their medications which they cannot afford and thus don't take.

Because of severe glitches in the database run by CMS, these individuals are leaving pharmacies without their medications or are making undue sacrifices to pay for costs they should not have incurred in the first place.

So far, more than 24 States and the District of Columbia have stepped in to say they will cover the cost of prescription drugs for their residents who are dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid and who cannot access lifesaving and life sustaining drugs as a result of Federal incompetence.

Earlier this week, the Governor of California and California's State legislative leaders announced a plan to make $150 million available for 30 days to cover drug costs for dual eligible individuals who have fallen through the system. In California, these individuals account for more than 1 million of the State's 4 million total Medicare recipients.

Problems with the Bush administration's implementation of the drug benefit have cost California $5.5 million to fill 62,000 prescriptions, as of January 18. I have no doubt these costs are just the beginning.

Unless these significant implementation errors are fixed immediately, the new drug benefit amounts to a massive unfunded mandate. The Bush administration must reimburse States, in full, for the drug costs they have absorbed as a result of major implementation errors that occurred on their watch.

The legislation I am introducing today with Senators Lautenberg, Schumer, Snowe, Coleman and many others to ensure that States are repaid in full by the Federal Government for all costs associated with prescription drugs for dual eligible individuals. The States did not create the crisis felt by our Nation's poorest and most vulnerable seniors and disabled and the States should not be responsible for costs associated with a Federal program that was intended to provide these individuals with comprehensive prescription drug coverage at little or no cost.

It is simply unacceptable for the Bush administration to tell States and the Congress not to worry because the private health insurance plans will reimburse States for the costs they've incurred. States should not be made to wait to be reimbursed because of implementation foul-ups caused by CMS.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.
S 2183. A bill to provide for necessary beneficiary protections in order to ensure access to coverage under the Medicare Prescription Drug program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2183

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ‘‘Requiring Emergency Pharmaceutical Access for Individual Relief (REPAIR) Act of 2006’’.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Transition requirements.
Sec. 3. Federal fallback for full-benefit dual eligible individuals for 2006.
Sec. 4. Identifying full-benefit dual eligible Medicare beneficiaries in data records.
Sec. 5. Prohibition on conditioning Medicaid eligibility for individuals enrolled in certain creditable prescription drug coverage on enrollment in the Medicare part D program.
Sec. 6. Ensuring that full-benefit dual eligible individuals are not overcharged.
Sec. 7. Reimbursement for States for 2006 transition costs.
Sec. 8. Facilitation of identification and enrollment through pharmacies of full-benefit dual eligible individuals in the Medicare part D drug program.
Sec. 9. State health insurance program assistance regarding the new Medicare prescription drug benefit.
Sec. 10. Additional Medicare part D informational resources.
Sec. 11. GAO study and report on the imposition of co-payments under part D for full-benefit dual eligible individuals residing in a long-term care facility.
Sec. 13. Protection for full-benefit dual eligible individuals from plan termination prior to receiving functioning access in a new Medicare part D plan.

SEC. 2. TRANSITION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1860D-4(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–5(4)(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

(4) FORMULARY TRANSITION.—The sponsor of a prescription drug plan is required to provide at least a 30-day supply of any drugUser, if such individual qualifies prior to enrolling in such plan. A formulary transition supply provided under this section shall be made by the sponsor of a prescription drug plan without imposing utilization requirements or other access restrictions for individuals stabilized on a course of treatment and at the dosage previously prescribed by a physician or recommended by a physician going forward.

(b) TRANSITION REQUIREMENTS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish a Medicare Part D assistance to no more than 20 minutes; and

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE AND ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may impose a monetary penalty in an amount not to exceed $5,000 for conduct that a sponsor of a prescription drug plan or an organization offering an MA–PD plan knows or should know is a violation of the provisions of paragraphs (4) or (5) of section 1860D-4(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–5(4)(b)), as added by subsection (a), shall apply to the plan serving as the national point of sale contractor under part D of title XVIII of such Act.

(3) COST-SHARING.—The cost-sharing for a dual eligible individual for 2006.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a full-benefit dual eligible individual (as defined in section 1935(c)(6) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–5(c)(6)), or an individual who is presumed to be eligible for such an individual’s Medicare drug plan (as defined in section 1860D-4(a)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u–5(a)(3))) and MA–PD plans (as defined in section 1395w–114(a)), the Secretary of Health and Human Services and a prescription drug plan or an MA–PD plan when the individual is enrolled in a Medicare part D plan shall establish a Medicare Prescrip
the Secretary certifies the enrollment of such an individual in a plan.

(c) Definition of MA–PD Plan and Prescription Drug Plan.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘‘MA–PD plan’’ means a prescription drug plan that has the meaning given such term in sections 1860D–1(a)(3)(C) and 1860D–1a(a)(14); 1395w–116(a)(14), respectively.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON CONDITIONING MEDICAL ASSISTANCE ELIGIBILITY FOR INDIVIDUALS ENROLLED IN CERTAIN CREDITABLE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE ON ENROLLMENT IN THE MEDICARE PART D DRUG PROGRAM.

(a) In General.—Section 353 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w–12) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(1) Prohibition on Conditioning Eligibility for Individuals Enrolled in Certain Creditable Prescription Drug Coverage on Enrollment in the Medicare Part D Drug Program.

(1) In General.—The Secretary shall, as of such date of enactment, establish processes for the identification and enrollment inquiries as required by section (e); and

(2) Requirement for State Plan Amendments, Redetermination of Eligibility.—In the case of a State that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, has not participated in the Medicaid program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–116) and shall be deemed to mean the State reasonably expected would have been covered under such part but were not because the individual was unable to access such part, such payments shall be made from the Medicare Prescription Drug Account under section 1860D–16 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–116) and shall be made with respect to fees and costs incurred during the period beginning on December 1, 2005, and ending on June 1, 2006.

(b) Report to Congress.—Not later than January 1, 2007, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to Congress on the implementation of the processes established under subsection (a) of section 1860D–14 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–114), as added by subsection (a).

SEC. 7. REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES FOR 2006 TRAFFIC COSTS.

(a) Reimbursement.—

(1) In General.—Notwithstanding section 1935(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395f–6), the Secretary shall, as of such date of enactment, establish a prescription drug plan under part D of title XVIII or an MA–PD plan under part C of such title.

(2) Coordination of Benefits with Part D for Other Individuals.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as prohibiting a State from coordinating medical assistance under the State plan with benefits under part D of title XVIII for individuals not described in paragraph (1).

(b) Nullification of State Plan Amendments, Redetermination of Eligibility.—In the case of a State that, as of the date of enactment of this Act, has not participated in the Medicaid program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–116) and shall be deemed to mean the State reasonably expected would have been covered under such part but were not because the individual was unable to access such part, such payments shall be made from the Medicare Prescription Drug Account under section 1860D–16 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–116) and shall be made with respect to fees and costs incurred during the period beginning on December 1, 2005, and ending on June 1, 2006.

(c) Payments from Account.—Payments under paragraph (1) shall be made from the Medicare Prescription Drug Account under section 1860D–16 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–116) and shall be deemed to be payments from such Account under subsection (b) of such section.

SEC. 9. STATE HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM ASSSISTANCE REGARDING THE NEW MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.

During the period beginning on the date that is 7 days after the date of enactment of this Act and ending on May 15, 2006 (or a later date if determined appropriate by the Secretary of Health and Human Services), the Secretary shall ensure that an employee of the Medicare and Medicaid Services is stationed at each State health insurance program to provide guidance and assistance to pharmacists; and

(a) assist Medicare beneficiaries and counselors under such program in better understanding the Medicare prescription drug benefit;

(b) attend training; and

(c) report to the Secretary and the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services regarding issues related to oversight and enforcement of provisions under the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

SEC. 10. ADDITIONAL MEDICARE PART D INFOR MATION RESOURCES.

(a) 1–800–MEDICARE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall increase the number of trained employees staffing the toll-free telephone number 1–800–MEDICARE in order to ensure that the average wait time for callers does not exceed 20 minutes.

(b) PHARMACY HOTLINE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) establish a toll-free telephone number that provides information regarding the Medicare prescription drug benefit under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and

(2) staff such telephone number in order to ensure that the average wait time for a caller does not exceed 20 minutes.

SEC. 8. FACILITATION OF IDENTIFICATION AND ENROLLMENT THROUGH PHARMACIES FOR FULL-BENEFIT DUAL ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS IN THE MEDICARE PART D DRUG PROGRAM.

(a) In General.—(1) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall facilitate, at point of sale, the identification and enrollment of Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare part D prescription drug coverage for such individuals.

(2) Reducing Wait Times at Pharmacies.—If the Secretary determines that a pharmacy does not facilitate the identification and enrollment of Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare part D prescription drug coverage for such individuals, the Secretary may take such action as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure that such pharmacies facilitate the identification and enrollment of Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare part D prescription drug coverage for such individuals.

(b) Reducing Costs of Formularies.—The Secretary shall reduce the costs of Medicare prescription drug formularies for such beneficiaries.

(c) Reducing Administrative Burden.—The Secretary shall reduce the administrative burden associated with the identification and enrollment of Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare part D prescription drug coverage for such individuals.
S. 2186. A bill to establish a commission to strengthen confidence in Congress; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill to establish a commission to strengthen confidence in Congress be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2186

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Commission to Strengthen Confidence in Congress Act of 2006”.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established in the legislative branch a commission to be known as the “Commission to Strengthen Confidence in Congress” (in this Act referred to as the “Commission”).

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of the Commission are to:

(1) evaluate and report the effectiveness of current congressional ethics requirements, if penalties are enforced in an ethical and impartial manner, and make recommendations for new penalties;

(2) weigh the need for improved ethical conduct with the need for lawmakers to have access to expertise from public and private sectors;

(3) determine and report minimum standards relating to official travel for Members of Congress and staff;

(4) evaluate the range of gifts given to Members of Congress and staff, determine and report the effects on public policy, and make recommendations for limits on gifts;

(5) evaluate and report the effectiveness and transparency of congressional disclosure laws and recommendations for improvements;

(6) assess and report the effectiveness of the ban on Member of Congress and staff from lobbying their former office for 1 year after they leave office;

(7) make recommendations to improve the process whereby Members of Congress can earmark priorities in appropriations Acts, while still preserving congressional power of the purse;

(8) evaluate the use of public and privately funded travel by Members of Congress and staff, violations of travel rules governing travel, and make recommendations on limiting travel; and

(9) investigate and report to Congress on its findings, conclusions, and recommendations for reform.

SEC. 4. COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall be composed of 10 members, of whom—

(1) the chair and vice chair shall be selected by agreement of the majority leader and the minority leader of the House of Representatives and the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate;

(2) 2 members shall be appointed by the senior member of the leadership of the House of Representatives, 1 of which is a former member of the Senate;

(3) 2 members shall be appointed by the senior member of the leadership of the Democratic Party, 1 of which is a former member of the Senate;

(4) 2 members shall be appointed by the senior member of the leadership of the House of Representatives of the Republican Party, 1 of which is a former member of the House of Representatives;

(5) 2 members shall be appointed by the senior member of the leadership of the House of Representatives of the Democratic Party, 1 of which is a former member of the House of Representatives.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS; INITIAL MEETING.—An individual appointed to the Commission may not be an officer or employee of the Federal Government or any State or local government.

(3) OTHER QUALIFICATIONS.—It is the sense of Congress that individuals appointed to the Commission should have prominent United States citizens, with national recognition and significant depth of experience in professions such as governmental service, government consulting, government contracting, the law, higher education, historian, business, public relations, and fundraising.

(4) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—All members of the Commission shall be appointed on a date 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) INITIAL MEETING.—The Commission shall meet and begin the operations of the Commission as soon as practicable.

(c) QUORUM; VACANCIES.—After its initial meeting, the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 5. FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION.

The functions of the Commission are to submit to Congress a report required by this Act containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations as the Commission shall determine, including proposing organizational arrangements, procedures, rules and regulations—

(1) related to section 3; or

(2) related to any other area the commission unanimously votes to be relevant to its mandate to recommend reforms to strengthen ethical safeguards in Congress.

SEC. 6. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or, on the authority of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act—

(1) hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths, and

(2) subject to subsection (b), require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and
testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member may determine advisable.

(b) SUBPOENAS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued under this subsection—
(A) by the agreement of the chair and the vice chair; or
(B) by the affirmative vote of 6 members of the Commission.

(2) SIGNATURE.—Subject to paragraph (1), subpoenas issued under this subsection may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the Commission, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or by a member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(c) OBTAINING INFORMATION.—Upon request of the Commission, the head of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government shall furnish information deemed necessary by the panel to enable it to carry out its duties.

SEC. 7. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), members of the Commission shall receive no additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Commission.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Each member of the Commission shall receive travel, transportation, and per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) STAFF AND SUPPORT SERVICES.—
(1) STAFF DIRECTOR.—
(A) APPOINTMENT.—The Chair (or Co-Chairs) in accordance with the rules agreed upon by a majority of the Commission shall appoint a staff director for the Commission.

(B) COMPENSATION.—The staff director shall be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) STAFF.—The Chair (or Co-Chairs) in accordance with the rules agreed upon by the Commission shall appoint such additional personnel as the Commission determines to be necessary.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The staff director and other members of the staff of the Commission shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(4) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—With the approval of the Commission, the staff director may employ experts and consultants as services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) PHYSICAL FACILITIES.—The Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the appropriate entities in the legislative branch, shall locate and provide suitable office space for the operation of the Commission on a nonreimbursable basis. The facilities shall serve as the headquarters of the Commission and shall include all necessary equipment and initial furnishings for the proper functioning of the Commission.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Architect of the Capitol and the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a nonreimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

SEC. 8. SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.

The appropriate Federal agencies or departments shall cooperate with the Commission in expeditiously providing to the Commission members and staff appropriate security clearances to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements, except that no person shall be provided with access to classified information under this Act without the appropriate security clearance.

SEC. 9. COMMISSION REPORTS; TERMINATION.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit—
(1) an initial report to Congress not later than July 1, 2006; and
(2) annual reports to Congress after the report required by paragraph (1); containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date of submission of each annual report and the final report under this section, the Commission shall—
(1) be available to provide testimony to committees of Congress concerning such reports; and
(2) take action to appropriately disseminate such reports.

(c) TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—
(1) FINAL REPORT.—At such time as a majority of the members of the Commission determined that the establishment of the Commission no longer exist, the Commission shall submit to Congress a final report containing information described in subsection (a). The Commission shall—
(2) TERMINATION.—The Commission, and all the authorities of this Act, shall terminate 60 days after the date on which the final report is submitted under paragraph (1), and the Commission may use a 60-day period for the purpose of concluding its activities.

SEC. 10. FUNDING.

There are authorized such sums as necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 2193. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish fairness in the taxation of certain pension plans maintained by churches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to fix an unfortunate application of our current pension rules on church pension beneficiaries.

Church pensions are critically important compensation plans that help support over a million clergy members across the country in their retirement, particularly those who dedicated their careers to serving in economically disadvantaged congregations.

Some of these plans date back to the 18th Century, and they are designed to ensure that our pastors and lay staff who are often paid lower salaries have adequate resources during their retirement years.

Unfortunately, the Internal Revenue Code impedes the ability of church pensions to recognize these valuable contributions to society with provisions that negatively impact church plans while exempting other equally important plans.

For example, Section 415(b)(1)(B) of the Code limits benefits for a retired church employee to 100 percent of the participant’s average compensation for his or her highest three years.

This limitation penalizes church employees because some church plans allow lower-paid employees to accrue benefits based on median salaries rather than their own, individual, lower compensation.

While the Code allows exceptions to this general limitation for governmental and multimember plans, it does not allow one for church plans.

The rationale for allowing an exception for governmental plans but not church plans cannot be reconciled when one acknowledges the situation in which most ministers find themselves when they retire.

For example, ministers often live in parsonages throughout their careers; and they are faced with acquiring housing for the first time when they retire.

Not having a significant asset in retirement, such as a house—an asset which could be used as collateral and security in time of need, leaves ministers vulnerable in their retirement years and justifies the need for inclusion of church pensions in an exception to the general limitation.

The Code further punishes church pensions by requiring church plans to pay unrelated business income taxes on investments in leveraged real estate, while exempting the vast majority of retirement plans from this very same tax.

This unequal treatment is simply unfair, and it is time we correct it.

The legislation I am introducing today would rectify this unequal treatment by exempting church plans from the 415(b)(1)(B) limit and the unrelated business income tax.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in establishing parity for the beneficiaries of church pensions by supporting this necessary, long-overdue fix to the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2193

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
SEC. 2. EQUALIZING TREATMENT OF RETIREMENT INCOME ACCOUNTS PROVIDED BY CHURCHES WITH RESPECT TO PARTICIPANTS IN CHURCH PLANS WHICH ARE NOT HIGHLY COMPENSATED EMPLOYEES.

(a) In General.—Paragraph (11) of section 415(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:—

"(ii) a retirement income account (as defined in section 414(q)) of the organization described in section 501(c)(3) for purposes of applying paragraph (1)(B) to highly compensated benefits, all benefits of the employee otherwise taken into account (without regard to this paragraph) shall be taken into account.

(b) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2005.

SEC. 3. PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF UNDISCLOSED NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES BY THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) In General.—Section 514(c)(9)(C) of the International Nuclear Non-Proliferation Review Conference Act of 1986 (defining "or") is amended by striking "or" at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting ", or", and by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) a retirement income account (as defined in section 403(b)(9)(B));"

(b) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2005.

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 2174. A bill for the relief of Nadezda Shestakova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 2187. A bill for the relief of Ilya Shestakov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President. I offer today two private relief bills to provide lawful permanent resident status to Nadezda Shestakova and her son, Ilya Shestakov.

The Shestakov family has lived and worked in Anchorage, Alaska for more than ten years. Nadezda has now returned to Russia, and Ilya is attending high school in Canada, in order to avoid further immigration problems, and to demonstrate that they intend to be good citizens who live within the letter of the law.

Nadezda’s husband, Michail, is a legal immigrant working for Aleut Enterprise Corporation (AEC), an Alaska native corporation, and their youngest son is a United States citizen. Both remain in Anchorage awaiting the reunification of the family.

During their time in Alaska, Michail has been an exemplary employee of the Aleut Corporation. As a matter of fact, it was the Aleut Corporation who first brought this issue to my attention, as they felt it was their responsibility to support the Shestakov family in any way possible.

The children have excelled in school, and Nadezda has remained an at-home mother, pursuant to the terms of her original visa.

The Shestakov family’s problems began when they overstayed their visa due to an error by their attorney, who did not file the extension paperwork on their behalf, as required.

These are long-standing members of the Alaska community, and they should not be punished due to an error by their former attorney. I would like to see this family reunited in Alaska, so that they can continue to contribute positively to our community.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 349—CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN, IN NOVEMBER 2004, ON THE TERMS OF THE 2004 PARIS AGREEMENT, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR EFFORTS TO REFER IRAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL, FOR ITS NONCOMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY OBLIGATIONS

Mr. SANTORUM (for himself and Mr. KYL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 349

Whereas the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reported in November 2004 that Iran had been developing an undeclared nuclear enrichment program for 18 years and had covertly imported nuclear material and equipment, carried out over 110 unreported experiments to produce uranium metal, separated plutonium, and concealed many other aspects of its nuclear facilities;

Whereas, in the context of Article XII.C of the Statute of the IAEA for voluntarily suspending uranium enrichment activities and to resume nuclear research efforts;

(2) commends the Governments of Britain, France, and Germany for their efforts to secure the 2004 Paris Agreement, which resulted in the brief suspension in Iran of nuclear enrichment activities;

(3) supports the referral of Iran to the United Nations Security Council under Article XLC and Article III.B-4 of the Statute of the IAEA for violating the Paris Agreement; and

(4) condemns actions by the Government of Iran to develop, produce, or acquire nuclear weapons.

SENATE RESOLUTION 350—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 23 (106TH CONGRESS), AS ADOPTED BY THE SENATE ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2001, AND SUBSEQUENTLY ENACTED AS THE AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE DOES NOT AUTHORIZE WARRANTLESS DOMESTIC SURVEILLANCE OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 350

Whereas the Bill of Rights to the United Nations Constitution was ratified 21 years ago;

Whereas the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees to the American people the right "to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures";
Whereas the Fourth Amendment provides that courts shall issue "warrants" to authorize searches and seizures, based upon probable cause;

Whereas the United States Supreme Court has consistently held for nearly 40 years that the recording and monitoring of private conversations constitutes a "search and seizure" in violation of the meaning of the Fourth Amendment;

Whereas Congress was concerned about the United States Government unconstitutionally spying on Americans in the 1960s and 1970s;

Whereas Congress enacted the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, and specified provisions of the Federal criminal code (including those governing wiretaps for criminal investigations), as the "exclusive means by which domestic electronic surveillance . . . may be conducted pursuant to law (18 U.S.C. 2511(2)(f));

Whereas the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 establishes the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (commonly referred to as the "FISA court"), and the procedures by which the United States Government may obtain a court order authorizing electronic surveillance (commonly referred to as a "FISA warrant") for foreign intelligence collection in the United States;

Whereas Congress created the FISA court to review wiretapping applications for domestic electronic surveillance to be conducted by any Federal agency;

Whereas the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 provides specific exceptions that allow the President to authorize warrantless electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence purposes (1) in emergency situations, provided an application for judicial approval from a FISA court is made within 72 hours; and (2) within 15 calendar days following a declaration of war by Congress;

Whereas the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 makes criminal any electronic surveillance not authorized by statute;

Whereas the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 has been amended over time by Congress since September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States;

Whereas President George W. Bush has confirmed that his administration engages in warrantless electronic surveillance of Americans inside the United States and that he has authorized such warrantless surveillance more than 30 times since September 11, 2001; and

Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 23 (107th Congress), as adopted by the Senate on September 14, 2001, and House Joint Resolution 64 (107th Congress, as adopted by the House of Representatives on September 14, 2001), together enacted as the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40), to authorize the use of the Armed Forces against those individuals responsible for the attacks on September 11, 2001, does not authorize warrantless eavesdropping on American citizens.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am submitting this resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Authorization for Use of Military Force, which Congress passed to authorize military action against those responsible for the attacks on September 11, 2001, does not authorize warrantless eavesdropping on American citizens.

As Justice O'Connor underscored recently, even war "is not a blank check for the President when it comes to the rights of the nation's citizens."

Now that the illegal spying of Americans has become public and the President has acknowledged the 4-year-old warrantless electronic surveillance program, the administration's lawyers are contending that Congress authorized it. The September 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force did no such thing. Republican Senators also know it and a few have said so publicly. We all know it. The liberties and rights that define us as Americans and the system of checks and balances that serve to preserve them should not be sacrificed to threats of terrorism or to the expanding power of the government. In the days immediately following September 11, and I continue to believe, that the terrorists win if they frighten us into sacrificing our freedoms and what defines us as Americans.

I well remember the days immediately after the 9/11 attacks. I helped open the Senate to business the next day. I said then, on September 12, 2001: "If we abandon our democracy to battle them, they win. . . . We will maintain our democracy, and with justice, we will use our strength. We will not lose our commitment to the rule of law, no matter how much the provocation, because that rule of law has protected us throughout the centuries. It has created our democracy. It has made us what we are in history. We are a just and good Nation."

I joined with others, Republican and Democrat, and we engaged in round-the-clock efforts over the next months in connection with what came to be the USA PATRIOT Act. During those days the Bush administration never asked us for this surveillance authority or to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to accommodate such a program.

Just as we cannot allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of false comfort when it comes to our national security, we cannot allow ourselves to be lulled into a blind trust regarding our freedoms and rights. The Framers built checks and balances into our system specifically to counter such abuses and undue assertions of power. We must retain our vigilance for all future stand to lose these rights forever. Once lost or eroded, liberty is difficult if not impossible to restore. The Bush administration's after-the-fact claims about the breadth of the Authorization to Use Military Force—as recently as this morning in the House of Representatives at the White House's behest by the Department of Justice—are the latest in a long line of manipulations of the law. We have also seen this type of overreaching in that same Justice Department office's twisted interpretation of the torture statute, an analysis that had to be withdrawn; with the detention of suspects without charges and denial of access to counsel; and with the so-called warrantless eavesdropping law, a witness statute as a sort of general preventive detention law. Such abuses serve to harm our national security as well as our civil liberties.

Now we have learned that the Pentagon maintains secret databases containing information on a wide cross-section of ordinary Americans, and that the FBI is monitoring law-abiding citizens in the exercise of their First Amendment freedoms. When I worked with Senator Wyden and others in 2003 to stop Admiral PoinDEXTER's Total Information Awareness program, an effort designed to.datamining information on Americans—and we meant it. And when I added a reporting requirement on government's e-mail monitoring program, to the Department of Justice Authorization law in 2002, we meant it. We demanded that Congress be kept informed and that any such program not proceed without congressional authorization.

The New York Times reported that after September 11, 2001, when former Attorney General John Ashcroft loosened restrictions on the FBI to permit it to monitor Web sites, mosques and other public entities, "the FBI has used that authority to investigate not only groups with suspected ties to foreign terrorists, but also protest groups suspected of having links to violent or disruptive activities." When I learned of such efforts and that they reportedly included monitoring Quakers in Florida and possibly Vermont, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense demanding an answer. That was a month ago. So far he has refused to provide that answer. Now we have learned that President Bush has, for more than four years, secretly allowed the warrantless wiretapping of Americans inside the United States. And we read in the press that sources at the FBI say that much of what was forwarded to them to investigate was worthless and led to dead ends. That is a dangerous diversion of our investigative resources away from those who pose real threats, while precious time and effort is devoted to looking into the lives of law-abiding Americans.

The United States Supreme Court has consistently held for nearly 40 years, since its landmark decision in Katz v. United States, that the monitoring and recording of private conversations constitutes a "search and seizure" within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment. Congress enacted the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, FISA, to provide a legal mechanism for the government to engage in domestic electronic surveillance of Americans in connection with intelligence gathering. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, along with
Spending on Americans without first obtaining the requisite warrants is illegal, unnecessary and wrong. No President can simply declare when he wishes to follow the law and when he chooses not to, especially when it comes to the hard-won rights of the American people.

The resolution I submit today is intended to help set the record straight. It is an important first step toward restoring checks and balances between the co-equal branches of government. I urge all Senators to join me.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, what is past is prologue. Today, we see history repeating itself. In 1978, President Carter signed into law the “Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act,” successfully concluding years of debate on the power of the President to conduct national security wiretapping.

As a result of lengthy hearings and consultation, Congress enacted that law with broad bipartisan support. Its purpose was clearly to put a check on the power of the President to use wiretaps in the name of national security. One of the clear purposes of that law was to require the government to obtain a judicial warrant for all electronic surveillance of the United States in which communications of U.S. citizens might be intercepted. The Act established a secret court, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, to review wiretapping applications and guarantees that any such electronic surveillance followed the rule of law. Since 1979, the special court has approved nearly 19,000 applications and denied only 4. Last year, the Administration reached an all-time-high with the number of applications granted.

In the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, Congress established the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance could be conducted in the United States for national security purposes. The purpose of the legislation was to ensure that information obtained from illegal wiretaps could not be used to obtain a warrant from the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. We even made sure that there would be criminal penalties for anyone who failed to comply with these rules.

The PATRIOT Act did not give the President the authority to spy on anyone without impartial judicial review—and neither did the Joint Resolution that was enacted in 2001, authorizing use of force against those responsible for the attacks of September 11th.

The President seemed to agree. In 2004, in Buffalo he stated categorically that “any time that you hear the United States talking about a wiretap, it requires a court order.” He said that “Nothing had changed—when we’re talking about chasing down terrorists, we’re talking about getting a court order before we do so.”

Now the President and the administration claim they do not have to comply with the law. Just yesterday, the administration again asserted its constitutional authority to eavesdrop on any person within the United States—without judicial or legislative oversight and it claims that the Congress implicitly granted such power in the Joint Resolution of 2001.

But that Joint Resolution says nothing about domestic surveillance. As Justice O’Connor has said, “A state of war is not a blank check for the president when it comes to the rights of the nation’s citizens.”

The bipartisan 9/11 Commission made clear that the Executive Branch has the burden of proving why a particular governmental power should be retained—and Congress has the responsibility to see that adequate guidelines and oversight are made available.

The Executive Branch has failed to meet the 9/11 Commissioners’ burden of proof. The American people are not convinced that these surveillance methods achieve the right balance between our national security and protection of our civil liberties.

These issues go to the heart of what it means to have a free society. If President Bush can make his own rules for domestic surveillance, Big Brother has run amok. If the President believes that winning the war on terror requires new surveillance capabilities, he has a responsibility to work with Congress to make appropriate changes in existing law. He is not above the law.

Congress and the American people deserve full and honest answers about the Administration’s domestic electronic surveillance activities. On December 22, 2005, I asked the President to provide us with answers before the Senate Judiciary Committee began hearings on Judge Alito’s nomination to the Supreme Court. We got no response. The Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin separate hearings on February 6th. I urge all Senators to support it.

The Administration has failed to consult, Congress enacted that law was supposed to be reviewed and reauthorized every 45 days. Every day, the President ordered the National Security Agency to conduct surveillance. Since 2001, the Administration has applied for nearly 50,000 wiretaps, and has been denied access to a telephone record for over 80% of all Americans.

The Executive Branch has failed to consult, Congress and the American people deserve full and honest answers about the Administration’s domestic electronic surveillance activities. On December 22, 2005, I asked the President to provide us with answers before the Senate Judiciary Committee began hearings on Judge Alito’s nomination to the Supreme Court. We got no response. The Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin separate hearings on February 6th. I urge all Senators to support it.

The Administration has failed to consult, Congress enacted that law was supposed to be reviewed and reauthorized every 45 days. Every day, the President ordered the National Security Agency to conduct surveillance. Since 2001, the Administration has applied for nearly 50,000 wiretaps, and has been denied access to a telephone record for over 80% of all Americans.

The Executive Branch has failed to consult, Congress enacted that law was supposed to be reviewed and reauthorized every 45 days. Every day, the President ordered the National Security Agency to conduct surveillance. Since 2001, the Administration has applied for nearly 50,000 wiretaps, and has been denied access to a telephone record for over 80% of all Americans.

The Executive Branch has failed to consult, Congress enacted that law was supposed to be reviewed and reauthorized every 45 days. Every day, the President ordered the National Security Agency to conduct surveillance. Since 2001, the Administration has applied for nearly 50,000 wiretaps, and has been denied access to a telephone record for over 80% of all Americans.
or times of war, which is why we established a secret court to expedite the review of sensitive applications from the government.

Now, the administration has made a unilateral decision that Congressional and judicial oversight can be discarded, in spite of what the law obviously requires. We need a thorough investigation of these activities. Congress and the American people deserve answers, and they deserve answers now.

SENATE RESOLUTION 351—RESPONDING TO THE THREATPOSED BY IRAN’S NUCLEAR PROGRAM

Mr. BAYH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Rs. 351

Whereas Iran is precipitating a grave nuclear crisis with the international community that directly impacts the national security of the United States and the efficacy of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force May 5, 1970 (commonly referred to as the “Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty”);

Whereas the United States welcomes a diplomatic solution to the nuclear crisis, but the Government of Iran continues to reject a peaceful resolution to the matter;

Whereas, alternatively, the Government of Iran agreed to suspend uranium enrichment activities and to sign and ratify the IAEA’s Additional Protocol on extensive, intrusive inspections in 2003, it has repeatedly failed to live up to its obligations under this agreement;

Whereas the Government of Iran broke IAEA seals on three centrifuges in September 2004, converted uranium to a gas needed for enrichment in May 2005, limited IAEA inspections to a few sites, and said it would not allow inspections of its laboratories; and

Whereas the Board of Governors of the IAEA declared in September 2005 that Iran was in non-compliance of its Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Obligations;

Whereas Iran announced on January 3, 2006, that it would resume uranium “re-search” activities at Natanz and invited IAEA inspectors to a few sites, and said it would not allow the resumption of the gas-line necessary to make its economy run and currently imports 40 percent of its refined gasoline from abroad;

Whereas most comprehensive implementation of United States sanctions laws and the adoption of additional statutory penalties would improve the chances of a diplomatic solution to the nuclear crisis with Iran;

Whereas President George W. Bush has for 4 years given too little attention to the growing nuclear problem in Iran beyond rhetoric of sanctions and has carried out an Iran policy consisting of loud denunciations followed by minimal action and ultimate appeasement of the current nuclear policy which has been riddled with contradiction and inconsistency and damaging to United States national security;

Whereas, had President Bush effectively marshaled world opinion in 2002 and not wasted valuable time, diverted resources, and ignored the problem in Iran, the United States would not have been faced with the full extent of the current nuclear crisis in Iran;

Whereas action now is imperative and time is of the essence; and

Whereas the United States has to avoid the choice between military action and a nuclear Iran may be measured only in months; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should cut assistance to countries whose companies are investing in Iran’s energy sector, including pipelines to export Iranian oil and gas;

(2) supplies of refined gasoline to Iran should be cut off;

(3) there should be a worldwide, comprehensive ban on sales of weapons to Iran, including from Russia and China;

(4) the United Nations Security Council should impose an intrusive IAEA-led weapons inspection regime on Iran similar to that imposed on Iraq after the 1991 Persian Gulf War;

(5) the United Nations Security Council should adopt reductions in diplomatic exchanges with Iran, limit travel by some Iranian officials, and limit or ban sports or cultural exchanges with Iran;

(6) the President should more faithfully implement the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) (commonly known as “ILSA”), and Congress should—

(A) increase the requirements on the President to justify waiving ILSA-related sanctions;

(B) repeal the sunset provisions of ILSA; and

(C) set a 90-day time limit for the President to determine whether an investment constitutes a violation of ILSA; and

(D) make exports to Iran of technology related to weapons of mass destruction sanctionable under ILSA;

(7) the United States should withdraw its support for Iran’s accession to the WTO until Iran meets weapons of mass destruction, human rights, terrorism, and regional stability standards; and

(8) the United States must make the Government of Iran understand that if its nuclear activity continues it will be treated as a pariah state.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 76—CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN FOR ITS FLAGRANT VIOLATIONS OF ITS OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY, AND CALLING FOR CERTAIN ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO SUCH VIOLATIONS

Mr. COLEMAN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LUTENBERG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mrs. FRIEDEN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 76

Whereas the Government of Iran concealed a nuclear program from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the international community for nearly two decades until it was revealed in 2002;

Whereas the Government of Iran has repeatedly refused to sign and ratify the IAEA’s Additional Protocol on extensive, intrusive inspections of nuclear-related activities, including uranium enrichment and laboratory-scale separation of plutonium;

Whereas the Government of Iran recently removed IAEA seals from a uranium enrichment facility at Natanz and announced the resumption of “research” on nuclear fuel in a brazen affront to the international community;

Whereas members of the international community have agreed that the pursuit of a nuclear weapons program constitutes a “red line” for United Nations Security Council referral that has now unequivocally crossed by Iran;

Whereas this provocation represents only the latest action by the Government of Iran in a long pattern of intransigence relating to its nuclear program, including its violation of the “Paris Agreement” during the late 1980s and early 1990s in which it agreed to freeze its enrichment program (commonly known as the “Paris Agreement”), its failure to provide IAEA inspectors access to various nuclear facilities outside of Iran, and its refusal to answer outstanding questions related to its nuclear program;
Whereas the regime in Iran has made clear the nefarious intentions behind its nuclear program in a series of inflammatory and reprehensible statements, including calling for Israel to be erased from the "map" at a conference titled "A World without Zionism" and asserting that the Holocaust was a "myth" and that Israel should be transferred to Europe;

Whereas previous activities of the regime, including the sponsorship of terrorist groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and Islamic Jihad through the provision of funding, training, weapons, and safe haven and the destabilization of neighboring countries such as Iraq, Israeli, and Lebanon, indicate that a nuclear-armed Iran would pose an unprecedented threat to the national security of the United States;

Whereas the Director General of the IAEA, Mohamed El Baradei, has publicly stated that once the Government of Iran perfects its capability to produce nuclear material and completes a parallel weaponization program, it would be only months away from building a nuclear bomb;

Whereas the Institute for Science and International Security in a Washington, D.C. nonproliferation advocacy group, released a January 2, 2006, satellite photograph showing extensive new construction at the Natanz facility;

Whereas the IAEA Board of Governors passed a resolution on September 24, 2005, indicating that Iran’s noncompliance with its IAEA obligations would result in the referral of Iran to the United Nations Security Council under Article XII.C of the Statute of the IAEA;

Whereas each member of the EU-3, the leading partner of the United States in diplomatic efforts regarding Iran’s nuclear program, has publicly stated its intention to refer Iran to the United Nations Security Council and called for an “extraordinary meeting” of the IAEA Board of Governors on February 2, 2006;

Whereas the Governments of China and Russia have expressed agreement with the United States and the EU-3 that the Government of Iran has violated its commitments to the IAEA;

Whereas China and Russia sit on the United Nations Security Council, and their cooperation was critical to the call for Iran to be referred to the United Nations Security Council and called for an “extraordinary meeting” of the IAEA Board of Governors; and

Whereas the Government of Iran has demonstrated the capability to produce a bomb-grade quantity of uranium enriched to 90 percent and that is sufficient to make a nuclear weapon;

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress:

(1) categorically condemns the Government of Iran for its flagrant violations of its obligations under the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force March 5, 1970 (commonly referred to as the “Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty”);

(2) calls for the immediate suspension of all uranium enrichment activities of the Government of Iran;

(3) supports calls for an emergency meeting of the Board of Governors of the IAEA for the purpose of immediately referring Iran to the United Nations Security Council;

(4) calls on all nuclear suppliers to cease immediate cooperation with Iran on nuclear materials, equipment, and technology; and

(5) calls on the Governments of Russia and China as well as all other responsible stakeholders in the international community by supporting efforts to refer Iran to the United Nations Security Council and by taking appropriate measures in response to Iran’s violations of its commitments under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Whereas the IAEA’s Board of Governors has met eight times in 2005 and called for Iran to be referred to the IAEA for violation of its obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force March 5, 1970;

Whereas evidence of the campaign to undermine the democratic opposition, stifle criticism of the Government of Cambodia, and silence and intimidate civil society in Cambodia;

Whereas, despite constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression and association in Cambodia, Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia have cruelly and blatantly violated basic democratic principles, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;

Whereas the United States affirms its support and respect for the welfare, human rights and dignity of the people of Cambodia;

Whereas, under the leadership of Prime Minister Hun Sen, the Government of Cambodia has engaged in a systematic campaign to undermine the democratic opposition, stifle criticism of the Government, and silence and intimidate civil society in Cambodia;

Whereas, despite constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression and association in Cambodia, Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia have cruelly and brutally violated basic democratic principles, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;

Whereas the United States, the United Nations, and other international donors have publicly expressed concern with Prime Minister Hun Sen’s authoritarian conduct (including inappropriate influence and control over the judiciary) and the official corruption and climate of impunity that exist in Cambodia today.

Whereas evidence of the campaign to undermine the democratic opposition in Cambodia is found in the revocation of parliamentary immunity of opposition leaders Sam Rainsy, Chea Poch, and Cheam Channy, and the 7-year prison sentence of Cheam Channy for allegedly forming “a secret army to overthrow the government” and 18-month sentence in absentia of Sam Rainsy on charges of allegedly defaming Prime Minister Hun Sen;

Whereas evidence of the campaign to stifle criticism of the Government of Cambodia is found in the detention and charges of criminal defamation of radio journalist Mom Sonando and Rong Chhum, president of the Cambodian Independent Teachers Association;

Whereas the decision by Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia on January 25, 2006, to drop all charges against Mom Sonando and Rong Chhum, Kem Sokha, and Pa Nguyen is a welcome step, but does little to alleviate the underlying climate of intimidation in Cambodia;

Whereas evidence of the campaign to silence and intimidate civil society is found in the arrest and detention of human rights activist Kem Sokha, Yeng Virak, and Pa Nguyen on charges of criminal defamation; and

Whereas other champions of democracy in Cambodia, including former parliamentarian Om Radsady and labor leader Chea Vichea, were brutally murdered in Cambodia, and no one has been brought to justice for committing these heinous crimes;

Whereas Cambodia is a donor dependent nation and more than 80 percent of government revenue has been invested by donors in the democratic development of that country; and

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of Texas at Austin football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship;

(2) congratulates the team for completing an undefeated, 13-0 season; and

(3) directs the Secretary of the Senate to make available to the University of Texas at Austin an enrolled copy of this resolution for appropriate display.
Whereas the current atmosphere of intimidation and fear calls into question the viability of the Khmer Rouge Tribunal; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate—
(1) affirms the support and respect of the United States for the welfare, human rights, and dignity of the people of Cambodia;
(2) calls on Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to immediately cease and desist from its systematic campaign to undermine democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;
(3) calls on Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to immediately release all political prisoners and drop all politically motivated charges against opponents of the government;
(4) calls on Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to demonstrate through words and deed the government’s commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;
(5) calls upon the King of Cambodia to play a more active and constructive role in protecting the constitutional rights of all Cambodian citizens; and
(6) urges international donors and multilateral organizations, including the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the United Nations, to hold Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia fully accountable for actions that undermine the investment of international donors in the democratic and economic development of Cambodia.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 77—TO PROVIDE FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Resolved by the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 31, 2006, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving the President of the United States a message delivered to the Senate on Wednesday, January 25, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., for a hearing titled, “Lobbying Reform: Proposals and Issues.”

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

Committee on Foreign Relations

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 25, 2006, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing on nominations.

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

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 25, 2006, at 4:30 p.m., to hold a hearing on nominations.

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

Committee on Armed Services

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 25, 2006, at 3:30 p.m., to receive an operations and intelligence briefing on Iraq.

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

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 25, 2006, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on “Proposals To Reform the National Flood Insurance Program.”

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

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with the like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on Tuesday, January 31, 2006.

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

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS LONGHORNS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 352 which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 352) commending the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship.

The RESOLUTION. That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship;
(2) recognizes the Longhorns for achieving an undefeated season, the Longhorns set an all-time season record of an undefeated, 13–0 season; and
(3) commends the Longhorns for winning the BCS national title on January 4, 2006; thereby winning the College Football Playoff national championship.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 31, 2006, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

AUTHORITIES FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 25, 2006, at 3:30 p.m., in closed session, to receive a message from the President of the United States.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 25, 2006, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on “Proposals To Reform the National Flood Insurance Program.”

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 77) was agreed to, as follows: S. CON. RES. 77

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 31, 2006, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with the like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on Tuesday, January 31, 2006.

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

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS LONGHORNS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 352 which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 352) commending the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship.

The RESOLUTION. That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship;
(2) recognizes the Longhorns for achieving an undefeated season, the Longhorns set an all-time season record of an undefeated, 13–0 season; and
(3) commends the Longhorns for winning the BCS national title on January 4, 2006; thereby winning the College Football Playoff national championship.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 31, 2006, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with the like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on Tuesday, January 31, 2006.

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

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS LONGHORNS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 352 which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 352) commending the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship.

The RESOLUTION. That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 31, 2006, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.
Whereas the University of Texas now owns the longest-active winning streak in the Nation at 20 games;
Whereas, under the leadership of Coach Mack Brown, the Longhorns claimed the Big 12 Conference South Division title, won the Big 12 Conference championship, and earned their eighth consecutive bowl game berth;
Whereas, under the leadership of Prime Minister Hun Sen, the government of Cambodia has engaged in a systematic campaign to undermine the democratic opposition, stifle criticism of the Government of Cambodia to immediately release all political prisoners and drop all politically motivated charges against opponents of the government; and to demonstrate its commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and human rights;
Whereas the Longhorns have brought great honor to their university, their community, and the great State of Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) commends the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship;
(2) congratulates the team for completing an undefeated, 13–0 season; and
(3) directs the Secretary of the Senate to make available to the University of Texas at Austin an enrolled copy of this resolution for appropriate display.

CONCERN FOR JUSTICE IN CAMBODIA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 353, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The resolution (S. Res. 353) expressing concern with Prime Minister Hun Sen's authoritarian conduct (including inappropriate influence and control over the judiciary) and the official corruption and climate of impunity that exist in Cambodia today;

Whereas evidence of the campaign to undermine the democratic opposition in Cambodia is found in the detention and charges of criminal defamation of radio journalist Mom Sonando, Rong Chhum, and Cheam Channy, and the 7-year prison sentence of Cheam Channy for allegedly defaming Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to immediately cease and desist from its systematic campaign to undermine democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

Whereas the University of Texas now owns the longest-active winning streak in the Nation at 20 games;
Whereas, under the leadership of Coach Mack Brown, the Longhorns claimed the Big 12 Conference South Division title, won the Big 12 Conference championship, and earned their eighth consecutive bowl game berth;
Whereas, under the leadership of Prime Minister Hun Sen, the government of Cambodia has engaged in a systematic campaign to undermine the democratic opposition, stifle criticism of the Government of Cambodia to immediately release all political prisoners and drop all politically motivated charges against opponents of the government; and to demonstrate its commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and human rights;
Whereas the Longhorns have brought great honor to their university, their community, and the great State of Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) commends the University of Texas at Austin Longhorns football team for winning the 2005 Bowl Championship Series national championship;
(2) congratulates the team for completing an undefeated, 13–0 season; and
(3) directs the Secretary of the Senate to make available to the University of Texas at Austin an enrolled copy of this resolution for appropriate display.

CONCERN FOR JUSTICE IN CAMBODIA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 353, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The resolution (S. Res. 353) expressing concern with Prime Minister Hun Sen's authoritarian conduct (including inappropriate influence and control over the judiciary) and the official corruption and climate of impunity that exist in Cambodia today;

Whereas evidence of the campaign to undermine the democratic opposition in Cambodia is found in the detention and charges of criminal defamation of radio journalist Mom Sonando, Rong Chhum, and Cheam Channy, and the 7-year prison sentence of Cheam Channy for allegedly defaming Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to immediately cease and desist from its systematic campaign to undermine democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

Whereas the United States affirms its support and respect for the welfare, human rights and dignity of the people of Cambodia;
Whereas, under the leadership of Prime Minister Hun Sen, the government of Cambodia has engaged in a systematic campaign to undermine the democratic opposition, stifle criticism of the Government of Cambodia to immediately release all political prisoners and drop all politically motivated charges against opponents of the government; and
Whereas the United States, the United Nations, and other international donors have publicly expressed concern with Prime Minister Hun Sen's authoritarian conduct (including inappropriate influence and control over the judiciary) and the official corruption and climate of impunity that exist in Cambodia today;

Whereas evidence of the campaign to undermine the democratic opposition in Cambodia is found in the detention and charges of criminal defamation of radio journalist Mom Sonando, Rong Chhum, and Cheam Channy, and the 7-year prison sentence of Cheam Channy for allegedly defaming Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to immediately cease and desist from its systematic campaign to undermine democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;

Whereas other champions of democracy in Cambodia, including former parliamentarian Om Radsady and labor leader Chea Vichea, were brutally murdered, and no one has been brought to justice for committing these heinous crimes; Whereas Cambodia is a donor dependent country, and more than $2,000,000,000 has been invested by donors in the democratic development of that country; and
Whereas the current atmosphere of intimidation and fear calls into question the viability of the Khmer Rouge Tribunal; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—
(1) affirms the support and respect of the United States for the welfare, human rights, and dignity of the people of Cambodia;
(2) calls on Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to immediately cease and desist from its systematic campaign to undermine democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia; and
(3) calls on Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to immediately release all political prisoners and drop all politically motivated charges against opponents of the government; and
(4) calls on Prime Minister Hun Sen and the Government of Cambodia to demonstrate through words and deeds the government's commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in Cambodia;
ORDERS FOR THURSDAY.
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Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:45 p.m. on Thursday, January 26; I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Samuel Alito to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States as under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today we have had a full day of debate on the nomination of Judge Alito for the Supreme Court. This all-important debate will continue tomorrow and the balance of the week. Tomorrow, we will again be alternating hour time blocks for Members to speak, with the Democratic side speaking from 10 until 11 and the majority from 11 to 12 and alternating back and forth throughout the day. Members are encouraged to use this time to make their statements. As the majority leader announced earlier today, we are hoping we can work toward a time certain for a vote on the Alito nomination and will notify Members so they can plan their schedules accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 TOMORROW

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:06 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 26, 2006, at 9:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 2006:
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 26, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 30

2 p.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine Hurricane Katrina response issues, focusing on urban search and rescue during a catastrophe.

SD-342

JANUARY 31

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine nominations of Edwin G. Foulke, Jr., of South Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, and Richard Stickler, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health.

SD-106

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine challenges in a catastrophe, focusing on evacuating New Orleans in advance of Hurricane Katrina.

SD-342

FEBRUARY 1

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine off-reservation gaming issues, focusing on the process for considering gaming applications.

SR-485

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine consolidation in the energy industry.

SD-226

10 a.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Hurricane Katrina, focusing on managing the crisis and evacuating New Orleans.

SD-342

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the death penalty in the United States.

SD-226

FEBRUARY 2

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine "The Jobs for Veterans Act Three Years Later: Are VETS' Employment Programs Working for Veterans?".

SR-418

FEBRUARY 6

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine wartime executive power and the NSA's surveillance authority.

Room to be announced

FEBRUARY 7

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2007 and the future years defense program.

SD-106

FEBRUARY 9

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold an oversight hearing to examine commercial aviation security, focusing on Transportation Security Administration’s aviation passenger screening programs, Secure Flight and Registered Traveler, to discuss issues that have prevented these programs from being launched, and to determine their future.

SD-562

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Energy.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 14

10 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SR-418

FEBRUARY 15

11 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider the President’s views and estimates to be submitted to the Committee on the Budget.

SD-366

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the progress made on the development of interim and long-term plans for use of fire retardant aircraft in Federal wildfire suppression operations.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 28

2 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine legislative presentation of the Disabled American Veterans.

SD-106

POSTPONEMENTS

FEBRUARY 9

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To continue oversight hearings to examine commercial aviation security, focusing on physical screening of airline passengers, including issues pertaining to Transportation Security Administration's Federal passenger screener force, TSA procurement policy, air cargo screening, and the deployment of explosive detection technology.

SD-562

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
HIGHLIGHTS

Senate began consideration of the nomination of Samuel A. Alito, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Supreme Court Nomination: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Samuel A. Alito, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Pages S35–S108

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at 9:45 a.m., on Thursday, January 26, 2006. Page S143

Escort Committee—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m., Tuesday, January 31, 2006. Page S141

Appointments:

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a)(1) and 4355(a)(2), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: Senator Collins, designated by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Senator Hutchison, from the Committee on Appropriations, Senator Reed, At Large, and Senator Landrieu, from the Committee on Appropriations. Pages S141–42

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a)(1) and 6968(a)(2), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: Senator McCain, designated by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services,
Senator Cochran, from the Committee on Appropriations, Senator Sarbanes, At Large, and Senator Mikulski, from the Committee on Appropriations.

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy:
The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a)(1) and 9355(a)(2), appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: Senator Allard, designated by the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Senator Craig, from the Committee on Appropriations, Senator Pryor, At Large, and Senator Johnson, from the Committee on Appropriations.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

- Thomas J. Barrett, of Alaska, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.
- Brett M. Kavanaugh, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.
- Michael A. Chagares, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.
- Vanessa Lynne Bryant, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.
- Renee Marie Bumb, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.
- Brian M. Cogan, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.
- Andrew J. Guilford, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.
- Noel Lawrence Hillman, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.
- Gray Hampton Miller, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.
- Susan Davis Wigenton, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.
- S. Pamela Gray, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.
- Steven G. Bradbury, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.
- Rajkumar Chellaraj, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Administration).

Richard T. Miller, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.


- 1 Army nomination in the rank of general.
- 1 Coast Guard nomination in the rank of admiral.

Committee Meetings

U.S. VISITOR & IMMIGRANT STATUS INDICATOR TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine the United States Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology (U.S. VISIT) program, relating to United States Entry/Exit Tracking information, allowing for the collection of the information and sharing across the immigration and border management systems, after receiving testimony from James A. Williams, Director, U.S. VISIT Program, Department of Homeland Security; and Randolph C. Hite, Director, Information Technology Architecture and Systems Issues, Government Accountability Office.

IRAQ

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing regarding operations and intelligence in Iraq from Brigadier General Carter Ham, USA, Deputy Director for Regional Operations, J–3, and Rear Admiral David J. Dorsett, USN, Director of Intelligence, J–2, both of The Joint Staff; and MaryBeth Long, Principal Deputy...
Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee held a hearing to examine proposals to reform the National Flood Insurance Program, focusing on the causes of the financial disarray of the Program, receiving testimony from David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; David I. Maurstad, Acting Director and Federal Insurance Administrator, Mitigation Division, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; and Donald Marron, Acting Director, Congressional Budget Office.

Hearing recessed subject to the call.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mark D. Wallace, of Florida, to be U.S. Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be Alternate U.S. Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, and Jackie Wolcott Sanders, of Virginia, to be Alternate U.S. Representative for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be an Alternate U.S. Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Alternate U.S. Representative for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Janet Ann Sanderson, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Haiti, after the nominee testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Patricia Newton Moller, of Arkansas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Burundi, Robert Weisberg, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Congo, Bernadette Mary Allen, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Niger, and Steven Alan Browning, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uganda, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

LOBBYING REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine lobbying reform proposals and issues, focusing on S. 2128, to provide greater transparency with respect to lobbying activities, and S. 2180, to provide more rigorous requirements with respect to disclosure and enforcement of ethics and lobbying laws and regulations, after receiving testimony from Senators McCain, Santorum, Coleman, Durbin, and Feingold; Dick Clark, Aspen Institute Congressional Program, John Engler, National Association of Manufacturers, and William Samuel, AFL-CIO, Fred Wertheimer, Democracy 21, all of Washington, D.C.; and Paul A. Miller, American League of Lobbyists, Alexandria, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet at 12 noon on Tuesday, January 31, 2006.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
JANUARY 26, 2006

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold a closed briefing on intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
9:45 a.m., Thursday, January 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Samuel A. Alito, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12 noon, Tuesday, January 31

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.