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

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, tomorrow, we will be in session at 8:45 in the morning, and expect to proceed to a vote on the Kavanaugh nomination, and a cloture vote on the Kempthorne nomination. Thus, Senators can expect three votes very early tomorrow morning. Those votes should begin about 8:15 a.m. I thank my colleagues for their work on the immigration bill that we passed earlier today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator Obama for 10 minutes, Senator Levin for 30 minutes, and then Senator Schumer.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

NOMINATION OF GENERAL MICHAEL HAYDEN

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, let me start by saying that the nomination of General Hayden is a difficult one for me. I generally, as a rule, believe the President should be able to appoint members of his Cabinet, of his staff, to positions such as the one General Hayden is nominated for without undue obstruction from Congress.

General Hayden is extremely well qualified for this position. Having previously served as head of the National Security Agency and as Deputy Director of National Intelligence under John Negroponte, he has 30 years of experience in intelligence and national security matters. And he was nearly universally praised during his confirmation to Deputy DNI.

There are several members of the Intelligence Committee, including Senator Levin, who I hold in great esteem, who believe General Hayden has consistently displayed the sort of independence that would make him a fine CIA Director.

Unfortunately, General Hayden is being nominated under troubling circumstances, as the architect and chief defender of a program of wiretapping and collection of phone records outside of FISA oversight. This is a program that is still accountable to no one and no law.

Now, there is no one in Congress who does not want President Bush to have every tool at his disposal to prevent terrorist attacks—including the use of a surveillance program. Every single American—Democrat and Republican and Independent—who remembers the images of falling towers and needless death would gladly support increased surveillance in order to prevent another attack.

But over the last 6 months, Americans have learned that the National Security Agency has been spying on Americans without judicial approval. We learned about this not from the administration, not from the regular workings of the Senate Intelligence Committee, but from the New York Times and USA Today. Every time a revelation comes out, President Bush refuses to answer questions from Congress.

This is part of a general stance by this administration that it can operate without restraint. President Bush is interpreting article II of the Constitution as giving him authority with no bounds. The Attorney General and a handful of scholars agree with this view, and I do not doubt the sincerity with which the President and his lawyers believe it in their constitutional interpretation. However, the overwhelming weight of legal authority is against the President on this one. This is not how our Constitution is designed, to give the President unbounded authority without any checks or balances.

We do not expect the President to give the American people every detail about a classified surveillance program, but we do expect him to place such a program within the rule of law and to allow members of the other two coequal branches of Government—Congress and the judiciary—to have the ability to monitor and oversee such a program. Our Constitution and our right to privacy as Americans require as much.

Unfortunately, we were never given the chance to make that examination. Time and again, President Bush has refused to come clean to Congress. Why is it that 14 of the Intelligence Committee were kept in the dark for 4½ years? The only reason that some Senators are now being briefed is because the story was made public in the newspapers. Without that information, it is impossible to make the decisions that allow us to balance the need to fight terrorism while still upholding the rule of law and privacy protections that make this country great.

Every democracy is tested when it is faced with a serious threat. As a nation, we have had to find the right balance between privacy and security, between executive authority to face threats and uncontrolled power. What protects us, and what distinguishes us, are the procedures we put in place to protect that balance; namely, judicial warrants and congressional review. These are not arbitrary ideas. They are not new ideas. These are the safeguards that make sure surveillance has not gone too far, that somebody is watching the watchers.

The exact details of these safeguards are not etched in stone. They can be re-evaluated, and should be re-evaluated, from time to time. The last time we had a major overhaul of the intelligence apparatus was 30 years ago in the aftermath of Watergate. After those dark days, the White House worked in a collaborative way with Congress, the Church Committee to study the issue, revise intelligence laws, and set up a system of checks and balances. It worked then, and it could work now. But, unfortunately, the White House has made no effort to reach out to Congress and tailor FISA to fit the program that has been put in place.

I have no doubt that General Hayden will be confirmed. But I am going to reluctantly vote against him to send a signal to this administration that even in these circumstances, even in these trying times, President Bush is not above the law. No President is above the law. I am voting against Mr. Hayden in the hope that he will be more forthcoming with Congress, more forthcoming with Congress, the judiciary, and the American public.

Americans fought a Revolution in part over the right to be free from unreasonable searches—to ensure that our Government could not come knocking in the middle of the night for no reason. We need to find a way forward to make sure we can stop terrorists while protecting the privacy and liberty of innocent Americans. We have to find a way to give the President the power he needs to protect us, while making sure he does not abuse that power. It is possible to do that. We have done it before. We could do it again.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes before the Senator from Michigan speaks—he has graciously agreed to allow me to do that—and then he be given as much time as he needs.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to first, again, thank Senator Carl Levin, who I know has been graciously acceding all night. So he will be the last person to speak here, but I very much appreciate it. And I know all of my colleagues do.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the confirmation of Brett Kavanaugh to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

This court is too important, its jurisdiction too broad, and its decisions too final, for a lifetime seat to be entrusted to someone with such limited nonpartisan experience—even someone as bright as Mr. Kavanaugh clearly is.
First, let me say that I am continually frustrated by the nature of the debate that takes place in the Senate and in the public about the so-called politicization of the judicial nomination and confirmation process. We are often told—with a straight face—that politics and ideology play no part in the President’s thinking when it comes to judicial nominations.

But, as anyone who is paying attention knows full well: It is the President who is picking judicial nominees with politics and ideology squarely in mind.

It is the President who too often selects judicial nominees with an eye towards shoring up his conservative political base. It is the President who too often selects judicial nominees with an eye towards picking a political fight. And, of course, on at least one occasion—in the case of Harriet Miers—it was the President who withdrew a nominee with an eye towards mitigating political damage.

So, those who complain that the process has become politicized and that ideology shouldn’t matter should take their complaint to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

In this case—especially after Mr. Kavanaugh’s second hearing—I continue to believe that his nomination is too infused with politics and ideology. Mr. Kavanaugh himself is neither seasoned enough nor independent enough at this early stage of his career to merit a lifetime appointment to the second highest court in the land.

Let me say a word about how deeply important the DC Circuit Court of Appeals is.

But there are serious questions as to why, at barely 40, having never tried a case, and with a record of service almost exclusively to highly partisan political matters, he is being nominated to a seat on the second most important court in America.

Why is the DC Circuit so important? The Court currently takes fewer than 100 cases a year. That means that the lower courts resolve the tens of thousands of cases a year brought by Americans seeking to vindicate their rights. All the other Federal appellate courts handle just those cases arising from within its boundaries. So, for example, the Second Circuit, where I am from, takes cases coming out of New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.

But the DC Circuit doesn’t just take cases brought by residents of Washington, DC. Congress has decided there is value in vesting one court with the power to review certain decisions of administrative agencies. We often call the power the President-infused with politics and that Mr. Kavanaugh himself is neither seasoned enough nor independent enough at this early stage of his career to merit a lifetime appointment to the second highest court in the land.

Let me say a word about how deeply important the DC Circuit Court of Appeals is.

But there are serious questions as to why, at barely 40, having never tried a case, and with a record of service almost exclusively to highly partisan political matters, he is being nominated to a seat on the second most important court in America.

Why is the DC Circuit so important? The Court currently takes fewer than 100 cases a year. That means that the lower courts resolve the tens of thousands of cases a year brought by Americans seeking to vindicate their rights. All the other Federal appellate courts handle just those cases arising from within its boundaries. So, for example, the Second Circuit, where I am from, takes cases coming out of New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.

But the DC Circuit doesn’t just take cases brought by residents of Washington, DC. Congress has decided there is value in vesting one court with the power to review certain decisions of administrative agencies. We often call the power the President-infused with politics and that Mr. Kavanaugh himself is neither seasoned enough nor independent enough at this early stage of his career to merit a lifetime appointment to the second highest court in the land.

Let me say a word about how deeply important the DC Circuit Court of Appeals is.

But there are serious questions as to why, at barely 40, having never tried a case, and with a record of service almost exclusively to highly partisan political matters, he is being nominated to a seat on the second most important court in America.

Why is the DC Circuit so important? The Court currently takes fewer than 100 cases a year. That means that the lower courts resolve the tens of thousands of cases a year brought by Americans seeking to vindicate their rights. All the other Federal appellate courts handle just those cases arising from within its boundaries. So, for example, the Second Circuit, where I am from, takes cases coming out of New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.

But the DC Circuit doesn’t just take cases brought by residents of Washington, DC. Congress has decided there is value in vesting one court with the power to review certain decisions of administrative agencies. We often call the power the President-infused with politics and that Mr. Kavanaugh himself is neither seasoned enough nor independent enough at this early stage of his career to merit a lifetime appointment to the second highest court in the land.

Let me say a word about how deeply important the DC Circuit Court of Appeals is.

But there are serious questions as to why, at barely 40, having never tried a case, and with a record of service almost exclusively to highly partisan political matters, he is being nominated to a seat on the second most important court in America.

Why is the DC Circuit so important? The Court currently takes fewer than 100 cases a year. That means that the lower courts resolve the tens of thousands of cases a year brought by Americans seeking to vindicate their rights. All the other Federal appellate courts handle just those cases arising from within its boundaries. So, for example, the Second Circuit, where I am from, takes cases coming out of New York, Connecticut, and Vermont.

But the DC Circuit doesn’t just take cases brought by residents of Washington, DC. Congress has decided there is value in vesting one court with the power to review certain decisions of administrative agencies. We often call the power the President-infused with politics and that Mr. Kavanaugh himself is neither seasoned enough nor independent enough at this early stage of his career to merit a lifetime appointment to the second highest court in the land.

Let me say a word about how deeply important the DC Circuit Court of Appeals is.

But there are serious questions as to why, at barely 40, having never tried a case, and with a record of service almost exclusively to highly partisan political matters, he is being nominated to a seat on the second most important court in America.
achievements—though impressive—are simply not on a par.

Every active judge had significant professional and nonpartisan experience to help persuade us that they merited confirmation.

I read my colleagues that in recent months, I voted for two Republican nominees who were deeply involved in the impeachment of President Clinton—Tom Griffith for the very court to which Mr. Kavanaugh has been nominated and Paul McNulty, the second highest position in the Justice Department.

Now let me come to the ABA report released recently. Some of my friends across the aisle have fallen over themselves to dismiss, dilute, and denigrate that report. This, of course, despite the fact that last time around, Mr. Kavanaugh and several Senators frequently repeatedly boasted about his original, higher ABA rating.

Here is why the observations noted in that survey are important. When he and I met recently, I asked Mr. Kavanaugh how we are to judge someone with his scant record. He has very few writings. He is younger than almost everyone who has been nominated to the D.C. Circuit. He has never been a judge.

Mr. Kavanaugh told me that one way to make a judgment about him would be to talk to the people who know him, to talk to colleagues and judges and others who are familiar with him and his work.

Well, that is one of the things the American Bar Association actually did in preparing its evaluation. They talked—as Mr. Kavanaugh himself suggested—with people who are familiar with his work.

What is more, they do it under a promise of confidentiality, so that they will be likely to obtain the most honest and candid appraisals—rather than the expected gush from peers and previous employers.

Many of those interviewed echoed precisely the concerns that I and others have raised—his lack of relevant experience and the effect the insularity of his political experience might have on his ability to be a neutral judge.

Now, I understand that none of the 14 committee members found Mr. Kavanaugh flatly "not qualified."

But I ask my colleagues, shouldn’t we give substantial weight to these statements from people who are familiar with his work—not isolated remarks, but a multitude of them, from different quarters, commenting about different court appearances and interactions with him?

Given the importance of the D.C. Circuit, we have a duty to closely scrutinize the nominees who come before us seeking lifetime appointment to this court.

And it is no insult to Mr. Kavanaugh, to say that there can’t be a single person in this room, if they were being honest, who doesn’t recognize that there are scores of lawyers in Washington and around the country who are of equally high intellectual ability, but who have much more significant judicial, legal, and academic experience to recommend them for this post.

So I would say that many of my colleagues and I have a sincere and good-faith concern that this nominee is not apolitical enough, not seasoned enough, not independent enough, and has not been forthcoming enough. The hearing did not alleviate those concerns.

Indeed, Mr. Kavanaugh was evasive when he should have been forthright; he sidestepped questions when he should have met them head-on.

During an extended exchange with me, he repeatedly refused to answer a simple question—whether he had ever expressed opposition to a potential judicial nominee within the White House, even though there is no conceivable earthly privilege that should have prevented him from answering.

On another occasion, I asked Senator Leahy four tries before Mr. Kavanaugh would answer the simple question: Why did you take 7 months to respond to the Judiciary Committee’s written questions in 2004?

On yet another occasion, he continued to refuse to tell us whether he is in the mold of Scalia and Thomas, even though he has spent several years selecting and vetting highly ideological judges for the President who has repeatedly promised to nominate judges in “the mold of Scalia and Thomas.”

If the President can say repeatedly at campaign stops and speeches that he wants judges in the mold of Scalia and Thomas, and if those statements are not just meaningless, empty rhetoric, why can’t we Senators find out in some meaningful way whether there is any truth in advertising?

In short, if the nominee had spent the last several years on a lower court or in a nonpolitical position proving his ideological inclinations, I could view his nomination in a different light.

But he has not. Instead, his resume is almost unambiguously political. Perhaps with more time, and different experience, we would have greater confidence in the President’s more ideological nominations. I would be comfortable imagining Mr. Kavanaugh on this court. But that day is not yet here.

Therefore, I vote nay on the nomination and urge my colleagues to do the same.

With that, I yield the floor and, once again, thank my colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF GENERAL MICHAEL V. HAYDEN

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, General Hayden’s nomination for Director of the Central Intelligence Agency comes at a critical time. The Agency is in disarray. Its current Director has apparently been forced out, and the previous Director, George Tenet, departed under a cloud after having compromised his own objectivity and independence and that of his Agency by misusing Iraq intelligence to support the administration’s policy agenda. The next Director must right this ship and restore the CIA to its critically important mission.

Indeed, Mr. Hayden because his actions have demonstrated on a number of important occasions the independence and strength of character needed to fulfill the most important role of the CIA Director—speak truth to power about the intelligence assessments of professionals in the intelligence community.

This nomination has been considered by me on two key issues: One, whether or not General Hayden will be independent—and I believe he will—and two, what judgment should be rendered about him based on what is known about the National Security Agency’s surveillance program which he administered during his tenure as Director of the NSA. Again, the highest priority of the new Director must be to ensure that intelligence provided to the President and the Congress is objective and independent of political considerations.

It was only a few years ago that then-CIA Director George Tenet shaped intelligence to support the policy position of the administration. There are many examples.

On February 11, 2003, just before the war, Director Tenet publicly stated, as though it were fact, that Iraq has “provided training in poison and gases to two Al-Qaeda associates.” However, we now know that the DIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, had assessed a year earlier that the primary source of that report was more likely intentionally misleading his deputies, and that the CIA itself had concluded in January 2003, before the Tenet public declaration that I have quoted, that the source of the claim that Iraq had provided training in poisons was not in a position to know if any training had in fact taken place.

On September 28, 2002, President Bush said that “each passing day could be the one on which the Iraqi regime gives anthrax or VX nerve gas or some day a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group.” A week later, on October 7, 2002, a letter declassifying CIA intelligence indicated that Iraq was unlikely to provide WMD to terrorists or al-Qaeda and called such a move an “extreme step,” a very different perspective from that which had been stated by the President. But the very next day after that declassification was obtained, Director Tenet told the press that there was “no inconsistency” between the views in the letter and the President’s views on the subject.

His statement was flatly wrong. His effort to minimize inconsistency or eliminate it not only by misunderstanding the lack of independence, but it damaged the credibility of the Central Intelligence Agency.