

plan. But within what Justice Souter says, and what I have just quoted, it is a matter of legislation when the Court moves into the fact-finding process.

The Lopez case was followed 5 years later by the case of *United States v. Morrison*. There, the Supreme Court of the United States invalidated portions of the Violence Against Women Act, holding that they were not constitutional because of the congressional method of reasoning. Again, Justice Souter sounded the clarion call, speaking for four Justices when he said:

Congress has the power to legislate with regard to activity that, in the aggregate, has a substantial effect on interstate commerce. . . . The fact of such a substantial effect is not an issue for the courts in the first instance . . . but for the Congress, whose institutional capacity for gathering evidence and taking testimony far exceed ours. . . . The business of the courts is to review the congressional assessment, not for soundness but simply for the rationality of concluding that a jurisdictional basis exists in fact.

Justice Souter then went on to point out that there was a mountain of evidence in support of what the Congress had decided to do.

The Supreme Court of the United States later invalidated congressional legislation in *Kimel v. Florida Board of Regents*, largely on the same ground. The case involved allegations of violations of age discrimination in employment, and, in the *Kimel* case as in the *Morrison* case, the Court relied upon a test where it said the act of Congress should be judged in terms of its proportionality and congruence. This test of congruence and proportionality was articulated by the Supreme Court in the *City of Boerne* case. It had never been a part of constitutional doctrine, and the grave difficulty is in inferring what is meant by congruence and proportionality.

In a later floor statement, I will take up two decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, each 5 to 4, involving the Americans with Disabilities Act.

One of the problems which has been found in the confirmation process is the grave difficulty of getting an idea of the ideology of the nominees because of the refusal of the nominees to answer questions. It was thought that the confirmation proceeding of Solicitor General Elena Kagan would provide an opportunity to find out something about the approach, the ideology or philosophy of the nominee because Ms. Kagan had written so critically, in a 1995 article in *The University of Chicago Law Review*, about the nomination proceedings involving Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer.

Ms. Kagan, in that argument, criticized them for stonewalling and not answering any questions. Also, Ms. Kagan in that article criticized the Congress—the Senate, really—for not doing its job in the confirmation process and finding out where the nominees stood.

When Ms. Kagan appeared before the Judiciary Committee, it was a repeat performance. One question which I

asked her brought the issue into very sharp focus. I asked her what standard would she apply, if confirmed, on judging constitutionality? Would she use the “rational basis” standard, which had been the standard of the Supreme Court for decades, the standard which Justice Souter talked about in the two dissenting opinions I have just referenced? Or would she use the “congruent and proportional” standard, which had everybody befuddled.

Justice Scalia said that the standard of proportionality and congruence is a “flabby standard,” which was so indefinite, vague, and unsubstantial that it left the Supreme Court open to make any determination it chose and in effect to legislate.

In later floor statements, I will take up the question as to what might be done to try to stop this erosion of the doctrine of separation of powers, what might be done to stop the reduction of Congressional authority. One line which had been suggested was to defeat nominees. As I will comment later in more detail, there does not seem to be much of a Senate disposition to defeat nominees for failure to answer questions. Based upon what has happened in every confirmation proceeding since Judge Bork’s confirmation proceeding in 1987, the practice has evolved of no answers and confirmation.

Another idea was explored by Senator DeConcini and myself after the Scalia hearings, where Justice Scalia answered virtually nothing. Justice Scalia was confirmed in 1986. Justice Bork’s confirmation proceeding followed in 1987, and after Judge Bork did answer questions, as he really had to with such an extensive paper trail, Senator DeConcini and I decided we didn’t need to pursue the idea of a Senate standard. But that is an option which might be considered.

Another potential method of dealing with the issue would be the idea of televising the Supreme Court—which I have talked about and will talk about in some detail at a later date. Taking off on what Justice Brandeis said about sunlight being the best disinfectant, and publicity being the way, as Justice Brandeis put it in a famous article in 1913—being the way to deal with social ills.

In an article in the *Washington Post* on July 14, just a couple of weeks ago, a noted commentator on the Supreme Court, Stuart Taylor, said that the only way the Supreme Court would change its ways is if there was an infuriated public. To infuriate the public, the first thing that has to happen is for the public to understand what the Supreme Court is doing.

In light of the lateness of the hour, that is a subject which I will take up at a later time in detail. But the focus today is on the three cases: the Lopez case, the Morrison case, and the Kimel case.

I thank the staff for staying overtime. I know there had been a hope to conclude a few minutes earlier, by 6,

but we are not too far gone considering tradition on the Senate floor of extended presentations.

I believe there is an announcement the clerk would like me to make in concluding the proceedings today?

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to 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.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The enactment of this important legislation was a significant milestone in our national journey to perfect our Union, uphold our founding values, and reaffirm our commitment to ensuring that the rights enshrined in our Constitution are truly available to all of our citizens. I was honored to have been able to support this bill in 1990, and am proud to be here today to talk about what its enactment means to millions of our fellow Americans, as well as to celebrate the contributions of those whose tireless work, and undying support, made passage of this bill a reality.

Thanks to this landmark law, our country has made progress in eliminating the historical stigma previously associated with mental and physical disabilities. It is also a critical step toward guaranteeing basic civil rights for an entire population who, for much of our Nation’s history, have faced incredible unfairness and isolation. For decades, we have fought for the civil rights of people with disabilities, combating the antiquated mindsets of segregation, discrimination, and ignorance. Our Nation has come from a time when the exclusion of people with disabilities was the norm. We have come from a time when doctors told parents that their children with disabilities were better left isolated in institutions. We have come from a time when individuals with disabilities were not considered contributing members of society.

Those times have thankfully changed. The passage of the ADA in 1990 provided the first step toward that change our country so desperately needed, and 20 years later, many of these individuals are thriving in ways that a few short years ago, would have been unthinkable. More and more, individuals with disabilities are able to integrate into communities across America. Thanks to the ADA, they are finding employment, buying their first home, and enjoying our public parks,