

the back for an auto bailout that is expected to cost taxpayers tens of billions of dollars. Nearly 14 million Americans are looking for jobs and can not find them. Yet the President, who acknowledges that free-trade agreements will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, is now suddenly holding them hostage in exchange for even more government spending. American businesses want to expand and hire. Yet the White House has weighed them down with mountains of new regulations and costs, health care mandates, taxes, and conflicting signals about the future. American energy producers want to tap into our own resources. Yet the administration is blocking them at every turn. One of our Nation's biggest and proudest manufacturers wants to build a new factory that would employ thousands and solidify its reputation as an industry leader in the world. Yet the administration is standing in the way in order to help their union allies. Since when do businesses have to ask the President's permission to create jobs?

Most people know that when it comes to politicians, you should pay more attention to what they do than what they say. Never was this truer when it comes to Democrats in Washington today.

Just consider this. Three years ago, my good friend the majority leader issued a press release blasting the Bush administration on its approach to unemployment and debt. He called these figures a casualty of the administration's failed economic policies and a shameful legacy of the policies of the previous 8 years. At the time my friend the majority leader made that statement, unemployment was 5 percent and the national debt stood at \$9.2 trillion. Today, with unemployment above 9 percent and the debt at more than \$14 trillion, Democrats are silent. They have no plan, no proposals, no sense of urgency. They run the White House and they run the Senate, and yet their entire approach is to sit back and wait—no budget, no plans, just wait for the next election; let Republicans offer solutions, and then we will attack them and pretend we care about jobs.

That is the game plan. Here is the problem. Unless one is a political consultant or just standing around waiting for a bailout, their plan won't do anything to create a single new job—and it won't do anything to address the crisis we know is coming.

There is no excuse for inaction. That is why Republicans refuse to sit back and wait. Until these crises are met, until we see more jobs being created, until the American people begin to regain their confidence in this economy, then we will have to be out there proposing solutions, coming up with answers, and making our case. And we will keep at it until our Democratic friends finally start to focus on the battle for America's future instead of the battle over next year's election.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to talk about two subjects briefly this afternoon. The first is the relatively bad news about unemployment in the country; the fact that the latest numbers are out and the country has not produced as many jobs as had been hoped for.

In fact, it added only 54,000 payroll jobs in May and thereby fell short of the 130,000 to 150,000 which are needed each month just to keep pace with population growth. So we lost ground. As a result, the unemployment rate has now gone back up to 9.1 percent.

It is not just the lack of jobs but also other economic news. Factory orders were down 1.2 percent in April, so we are not growing there. Interestingly, the Home Price Index, which is something very important in my State, the S&P Case-Schiller Home Price Index edged down .2 percent in March and is now 3.5 percent from this time a year ago.

All of these and other pieces of the news present a very bleak picture for economic recovery. One of the interesting commentators on this is Michael Barone, who is well known to most of us involved in political work. He had an interesting op-ed today in the Washington Examiner with the unfortunate title, "Obama Tunes Out, and Business Goes on Hiring Strike." The problem is, there is some information to back up the title of his piece. He is reflecting on government policies the last couple of years such as growing government spending as a percent of GDP, which has gone up from 21 percent to 25 percent.

So we have been expanding government borrowing and spending at the same time as the economy is depressed. That included the time in which the failed stimulus plan was supposed to have provided economic growth and job creation. It also included the time of the health care entitlement, the Dodd-Frank financial regulation bill, and so on. So let me quote from the piece. He said:

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the threat of tax increases and increased regulatory burdens have produced something in the nature of a hiring strike.

In relation to the President's speech at George Washington University,

where the President had sort of repackaged his Federal budget, Barone says:

The message to job creators was clear. Hire at your own risk. Higher taxes, more burdensome regulation, and crony capitalism may be here for some time to come.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Michael Barone dated June 6, 2011, printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

#### NEW START TREATY

Mr. KYL. The other subject I would like to address today is news on a totally different front, but it is a subject that will be familiar to us from last December when the Senate argued the New START treaty and ultimately passed it. I am going to speak primarily about questions of missile defense cooperation with Russia, which was a big part of that discussion.

I wanted to first call attention to the fact that the Department of State released a fact sheet last Wednesday. It was entitled "New START Treaty Aggregate Numbers of Strategic Offense Arms"—a long title. But the statement from the State Department confirmed what we had argued during the time of this START debate and what I thought was pretty widely understood at the time, despite administration protestations to the contrary; namely that the New START treaty is perhaps the first bilateral treaty that resulted in U.S. unilateral reductions in nuclear forces.

As this fact sheet makes clear, Russia was already below the deployed strategic forces and deployed delivery vehicle limits of the treaty when we ratified the treaty. This is something we tried to point out. We said this is not a two-way street. Russia has already reduced its weapons below the levels called for in the treaty. The only country that will have to reduce levels from what currently exists is the United States. Now this information is confirmed by the State Department. Even the Arms Control Association recognized this when it posted on its blog recently, on June 1:

Why has Russia already met its obligations? Because Moscow was in the process of retiring older strategic missiles while the treaty was under negotiation.

Exactly correct. This fact should not be overlooked, especially not as the administration undertakes a review of the nuclear deployment guidance and targeting and deterrence doctrines, which are designed, or so the administration claims, to be "preparations for the next round of nuclear reductions." That is according to the President's National Security Adviser.

I worry that the next round may also be a unilateral round where the United States makes all of the concessions, as occurred under the New START treaty.

According to Gary Samore of the national security staff, at an Arms Control Association Conference, he said

these may be “unilateral steps that the U.S. could take.”

Obviously, that is something we would be concerned about if we are making unilateral concessions while the Russians make none. He made one other point at the Arms Control Association. He said:

We’ve reached the level in our forces where further reductions will raise questions about whether we retain the triad or whether we go to a system that is only a dyad. Those are important considerations. Reductions below the level that we have now are going to require some more fundamental questions about force structure.

When we speak of the triad or the dyad, remember the triad is the system we have had all throughout the Cold War that relies on a combination of ICBMs on land, submarine-based missiles at sea, and a bomber force that can deliver weapons from the air.

As Mr. Samore points out, if we reduce our weapons levels even further, we will probably reach a point where instead of all three systems, we will only have two. So I think it is clear we have reached a breaking point where further reductions will require significant changes to the U.S. nuclear deterrent and could presumably alter the commitments that the administration made to the Senate as to the modernization of deterrent.

During our debate on the START treaty, there were a lot of promises made about how we were going to retain the triad, and we were not going to eliminate further strategic weapons. Now those matters seem to be in doubt, and this is why, one of the reasons why, 41 Senators wrote to the President on March 22 and asked that the Senate be consulted about any further changes that the administration may choose to embark upon. And I want to be clear, it is a choice. There is no compelling justification to change the current U.S. nuclear posture. So this would be something the administration would be doing on its own.

But I am concerned that in the National Security Adviser’s letter—responding to ours—on May 31 there was no reference to how the administration intended to keep the Senate involved as this process goes forward. I think it makes all the more clear the need to pass S. 1097, the New START Implementation Act, which provides, as one of its provisions, for the Congress to be consulted before any changes are made to the nuclear guidance.

I also look forward to an opportunity to discuss these matters with the President’s nominee for Secretary of Defense, Mr. Leon Panetta. I will be curious to learn if he agrees with the 10-year commitments made to the Senate last year regarding the modernization of the nuclear deterrent, if he agrees with General Chilton who told the Senate that current levels of nuclear forces are exactly what is needed for deterrence, and also whether he agrees with Secretary Gates’ recent comments at the American Enterprise

Institute that nuclear modernization programs are absolutely critical.

So it was on the basis of the administration’s commitments to our nuclear modernization program that some Senators agreed to support or to ratify the New START treaty.

Let me turn now to the question of missile defense. During the consideration of the New START treaty, many of us made the fundamental point that with respect to missile defense, there was no meeting of the minds between Russia and the United States.

While the administration insisted that there were no restrictions on missile defense, either legal or otherwise, the Russian side believed that “the linkage to missile defense is clearly spelled out in the accord and is legally binding.” That was noted by Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov on April 6 of last year.

Of course, the administration was never willing to share with the Senate the negotiating record that the Russian negotiators obviously were aware of. Sharing the record with us might have cleared up just what understandings the Russians think they received during the negotiation of the treaty.

In order to secure Russian support for the New START treaty and assuage their misplaced concern about U.S. missile defense activities, the administration initiated talks with Russia to find common ground on missile defense cooperation, and it cancelled a third site deployment in Poland and the Czech Republic.

Or, as Under Secretary of State Ellen Tauscher characterized the purpose of missile defense cooperation in a speech of May 19, 2010: “to turn what has been an irritant to U.S.-Russian relations into a shared interest.”

Although administration officials might deny this, I believe Russian officials were under the impression that in return for Russian support for New START, the United States would provide Russia not only the opportunity for missile defense technical cooperation, but that Russia would also play a role in defining future U.S. and NATO missile defense plans. Thus, President Medvedev told the Russian General Assembly in December 2010:

I’d like to speak plainly about the choice we face in the next ten years: either we reach an agreement on missile defense and create a meaningful joint mechanism for cooperation, or if we fail to do so, a new round of the arms race will begin and we will have to make decisions on the deployment of new strike weapons.

As it turns out, we didn’t have long to wait until the Russians threatened this “choice.” In response to the recently concluded U.S. and Romanian agreement to base SM-3 block TB missiles in Romania in 2015, President Medvedev has again threatened the U.S. and NATO with an arms race if these planned deployments go forward.

On May 18, 2011, President Medvedev told a gathering of journalists in Mos-

cow that “if we don’t [forge a missile defense cooperation model], we will have to take retaliatory measures, which we do not want to have to do. This will mean forcing the development of our strike nuclear potential.

Medvedev went on to reiterate a warning issued by the Foreign Ministry that Moscow may pull out of the new START disarmament agreement in response to the United States’ position on missile defense.

This is precisely what many of us predicted would happen if we ratified the New START treaty in December. I didn’t think it would happen quite so quickly.

This point was reiterated by President Medvedev following the recent G-8 summit in Deauville, France when he said, “We’re wasting time . . . if we do not reach agreement by 2020, a new arms race will begin . . . I would like my partners to bear this in mind constantly.”

The Russians are of one point of mind at the top of their leadership. They are threatening a new arms race. What they mean by that is, the United States reduces our capability to defend against missiles that could theoretically come from Russia.

Is this the reset in relationships the administration promised? Did they manage to reset our relationship right back to the dark days of the Cold War?

It appears from the comments of the President of the Russian Federation that this is precisely what happened.

The Russian Foreign Minister has further said Russia needed “legal assurances,” that the proposed U.S. missile defense deployments were not aimed at Russian territory.

Presumably, even the administration would agree no such “legal assurance” can be made.

But, then again, could the administration include such an assurance in the Missile Defense Cooperation Agreement, MDCA, or the Defense Technology Cooperation Agreement, DTCA, the administration is discussing with the Russian Federation?

Again, no Senator nor Senate staffer has been able to see the document that the administration has shared with Russian counterparts. So, we are left to wonder.

Here we are, and the Senate, being part of the American Government, isn’t even privy to what our administration is talking to the Russians about—matters on which eventually the administration is likely to seek our consent to. Remember, the Constitution provides for Senate advice and consent. What I have said before is if the Senate is to give its consent, we need an opportunity to provide some advice before the administration negotiates its agreements with Russia.

Why not share these documents with the Senate—and the House—and remove any cause for concern, if, in fact, there is none?

I also note Russian President Medvedev has sent a letter to the

NATO-Russia Counsel outlining Moscow's position on a common missile defense system—which differs significantly from NATO's conception of two independently operated missile defense systems sharing some form of early warning data. These are two very different things.

And, it is not as if Members of Congress have been ambiguous about our concerns.

Following a 14 April letter to the President signed by 39 Senators, 4 Senators met with Senior Defense and State Department officials on May 15 to again express our concerns about sharing sensitive missile defense technical and sensor data with the Russians, and to better understand the content and legal authority of the draft Defense Technology Cooperation Agreement and Missile Defense Cooperation Agreement being discussed with the Russians.

Moreover, the House Armed Services Committee just incorporated the New START Implementation Act into its version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as well as the amendment offered by Representative BROOKS that will prohibit the sharing of sensitive missile defense technology and data.

How will the United States and NATO respond to this latest Russian intimidation?

Will NATO alter its plans to accommodate the Russian objective of a “sectoral” defense system?

Will the United States and NATO curtail deployment of phases III and IV of the European Phased Adaptive Approach? Phase IV is, of course, still just a paper missile, not something we developed, but it is part of our ultimate plan.

Will the United States agree to share sensitive information or technology with Russia for the sake of a missile defense agreement?

The administration informs us that these Russian threats are mere rhetoric, associated more with the upcoming presidential elections in Russia than with any true threats. And that Russia will not pull out of New START or begin a new arms race in response to U.S. missile defense plans. The administration assures us the United States will not alter its missile defense plans to accommodate Russian concerns.

Nevertheless, the Congress needs better insight into administration plans for missile defense cooperation and missile defense talks with Russia than has thus far been the case.

At the very outset, the administration created a separate venue from New START to discuss missile defense cooperation with Russia—this was the so-called Tauscher-Ryabkov track; despite repeated inquiries from Congress, the administration still refuses to provide meaningful details about the nature of these discussions.

Likewise, we are interested to know where the administration will recommend basing a new missile defense

early-warning radar, called a TPY-2 radar. Will it put the radar in the Caucasus, as the Bush administration planned to do, or will it seek instead to base the radar in a location less advantageous to the missile defense of the United States homeland, but more acceptable to the Russians—even if that means that an ally like Israel will be denied access to the data generated, by the radar, as Turkey has said it requires?

To this end, and as I referenced earlier, 39 Senators sent a letter to the President on April 14 to inquire whether, contrary to the President's December 18, 2010 letter, we will make our missile defense decisions “regardless of Russia's actions.”

The letter expresses serious concerns about reports the administration may provide Russia with access to sensitive satellite data and U.S. hit-to-kill missile defense technology, and urges the administration to share with Congress the materials on U.S. missile defense cooperation that have been provided, or will shortly be provided, to the Russian government. We still await these materials.

Lastly, the administration owes Senators information about what national security staff member Michael McFaul, whom I understand has been recently nominated by the President to be the U.S. Ambassador to Russia, meant when he briefed the press on May 26 that “we got a new signal on missile defense cooperation that as soon as I'm done here I'll be engaging on that with the rest of the U.S. government.”

I am concerned that my staff asked the National Security staff about this almost a week ago and have heard nothing back.

I hope to hear back from the administration soon, especially if the administration expects the Senate to act promptly on Mr. McFaul's nomination.

Mr. President I am deeply skeptical about the course the United States and Russia are on concerning missile defense.

I think it should be abundantly clear that Senators and House Members will be paying very close attention to the development and deployment of the European phased adaptive approach to make sure it is done in a manner consistent with the security of the United States, without consideration to Russian “understanding” of what they think has been agreed to between the United States and Russia.

I will be working with my House colleagues to ensure that it is very clear that the United States will accept no limitations on its missile defenses. But I note, as I said at the outset, it is interesting that things that were told to us at the time the Senate was debating the New START agreement have turned out not to be true, just as many of us predicted, starting with the proposition that the United States would be drawing our weapons down while Russia would not. It turns out that is what happened because the Russians were al-

ready at the level they negotiated us down to.

So the question is, What did we get for our unilateral concessions? It appears to me that the only thing we got is an understanding by Russia that they are also going to be able to talk us down from our missile defense plans that could protect both the United States and allies in Europe or that as an alternative Russians would be part of a cooperative missile defense program which would, of necessity, require the sharing of economic data that would be inimical to the U.S. national interests.

I express these concerns in the hope that we can receive information from the administration that might allay our concerns, persuade us that it is not involved right now in negotiations, in effect, behind the Senate's back, and the best way to assure us is to share the information with us that we requested in letters we sent previously. I hope the administration will, next time it asks for our consent, be able to say it had already asked for our advice because I am afraid, if it does not, the Senate is much less likely to provide its consent to any agreements that might be submitted.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From RealClearPolitics.com, June 6, 2011]

OBAMA TUNES OUT, AND BUSINESS GOES ON  
HIRING STRIKE

(By Michael Barone)

Last week, I noted that various forms of the word “unexpected” almost inevitably appeared in news stories about unfavorable economic developments.

You can find them again in stories about Friday's shocking news, that only 54,000 net new jobs were created in the month of May and that unemployment rose to 9.1 percent.

But with news that bad, maybe bad economic numbers will no longer be “unexpected.” You can only expect a robust economic recovery for so long before you figure out, as Herbert Hoover eventually did, that it is not around the corner.

Exogenous factors explain some part of the current economic stagnation. The earthquake and tsunami in Japan caused a slowdown in manufacturing. Horrendous tornadoes did not help. Nor did bad weather, though only a few still bitterly cling to the theory that it's caused by manmade global warming.

But poor public policy is surely one reason why the American economy has not rebounded from recession as it has in the past. And political posturing has also played a major role.

Barack Obama and the Democratic congressional supermajorities of 2009-10 raised federal spending from 21 percent to 25 percent of gross domestic product. Their stimulus package stopped layoffs of public employees for a while, even as private sector payrolls plummeted.

And the Obama Democrats piled further burdens on would-be employers in the private sector. Obamacare and the Dodd-Frank financial regulation bill are scheduled to be followed by thousands of regulations that will impose impossible-to-estimate costs on the economy.

That seems to have led to a hiring freeze. The Obama Democrats can reasonably claim not to be responsible for the huge number of layoffs that occurred in the months following the financial crisis of fall 2008. And

Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke did manage to help stabilize financial markets.

But while the number of layoffs is now vastly less than in the first half of 2009, the number of new hires has not increased appreciably. Many more people have been unemployed for longer periods than in previous recessions, and many more have stopped looking for work altogether.

It's hard to avoid the conclusion that the threat of tax increases and increased regulatory burdens have produced something in the nature of a hiring strike.

And then there is the political posturing. On April 13, Barack Obama delivered a ballyhooed speech at George Washington University. The man who conservatives as well as liberal pundits told us was a combination of Edmund Burke and Reinhold Niebuhr was widely expected to present a serious plan to address the budget deficits and entitlement spending.

Instead, the man who can call on talented career professionals at the Office of Management and Budget to produce detailed blueprints gave us something in the nature of a few numbers scrawled on a paper napkin.

The man depicted as pragmatic and free of ideological cant indulged in cheap political rhetoric, accusing Republicans, including House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan, who was in the audience, of pushing old ladies in wheelchairs down the hill and starving autistic children.

The signal was clear. Obama had already ignored his own deficit reduction commission in preparing his annual budget, which was later rejected 97-0 in the Senate. Now he was signaling that the time for governing was over and that he was entering campaign mode 19 months before the November 2012 election.

People took notice, especially those people who decide whether to hire or not. Goldman Sachs' Current Activity Indicator stood at 4.2 percent in March. In April—in the middle of which came Obama's GW speech—it was 1.6 percent. For May, it is 1.0 percent.

"That is a major drop in no time at all," wrote Business Insider's Joe Weisenthal.

After April 13, Obama Democrats went into campaign mode. They staged a poll-driven Senate vote to increase taxes on oil companies.

They launched a Mediscare campaign against Ryan's budget resolution that all but four House Republicans had voted for. That seemed to pay off with a special election victory in the New York 26th congressional district.

The message to job creators was clear. Hire at your own risk. Higher taxes, more burdensome regulation and crony capitalism may be here for some time to come.

One possible upside is that economic bad news may no longer be "unexpected." Another is that voters may figure out what is going on.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture

motion with respect to the Verrilli nomination be withdrawn, and at 5:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on Calendar No. 118, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order with respect to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session, with the other provisions of the May 26 unanimous consent agreement remaining in effect.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR., TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time until 5:30 will be equally divided.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I don't believe there is going to be a huge number of people lined up to speak on this nomination, but I will first use part of my reserve time on the Verrilli nomination to speak of another matter within the purview of the Judiciary. So I ask unanimous consent, with the time being charged to my half hour, that I be recognized to speak as in morning business.

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

JUDGE RICHARD LINN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on the first day of this millennium, January 1, 2000, the newest Federal judge, and the first of the millennium, was sworn in. Richard Linn became a member of the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals at the stroke of midnight, standing in the Federal Circuit's courthouse, with a view of the Washington Monument lit behind him, and the oath being administered by Chief Judge H.R. Mayer.

President Clinton had been told of the hundreds of nominations he would make during his Presidency, one he would never regret would be that of Judge Linn. How true that prediction. Judge Linn has brought dignity, expertise, and judicial excellence that could set the model for all our Federal courts. His calm but brilliant analyses of our most complex intellectual property cases reflect the extensive experience he had before going on the bench.

This experience now benefits all Americans.

My wife Marcelle and I and our children have been privileged to have known Dick and Patti Linn for over a generation, as well as their wonderful daughters, Debbie and Sandy, and all their family. This weekend, their children, son-in-law Erik, and grandchildren, Jaret and Dakota, as well as other members of their family, will gather to unveil a portrait of Judge Linn. I hope that as people visit the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals building or are there on business, that they will pause and look. It will give them a chance to see the face of justice and a man I admire greatly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we go back on the matter before us, with the time still being reserved to me.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the majority leader and the Republican leader for reaching an agreement for the Senate to debate and vote on the nomination of Don Verrilli to be Solicitor General of the United States. By doing so, we were able to vitiate the cloture motion and avoid another unnecessary filibuster. Had agreement not been reached, this would have been the first filibuster in history of a Solicitor General nomination.

Mr. Verrilli is by all accounts one of the finest lawyers in the country, whose extensive experience as an advocate for a wide variety of clients will serve him well as Solicitor General, the top advocate for the United States. In a long and distinguished career, Mr. Verrilli has argued numerous cases before the Supreme Court, Federal appeals courts and State appellate courts. He clerked for Judge J. Skelly Wright on the DC Circuit and for Justice William Brennan on the U.S. Supreme Court. Mr. Verrilli's impressive breadth of experience both in Government and in private practice led the Judiciary Committee to report his nomination by a vote of 17-1 nearly a month ago. Seven of the eight Republican members of the committee joined in supporting Mr. Verrilli's nomination.

The Judiciary Committee heard from many respected lawyers from across the political spectrum in support for Mr. Verrilli's nomination. Eight former Solicitors General from both Republican and Democratic administrations, among them Republicans Charles Fried, Kenneth Starr, Ted Olson, Paul Clement and Gregory Garre, concluded: "Mr. Verrilli is ideally suited to carry out the crucial tasks assigned to the Solicitor General and to maintain the traditions of the Office of the Solicitor General."

More than 50 prominent Supreme Court practitioners urged the Senate to confirm Mr. Verrilli's nomination, including conservatives like Maureen Mahoney, Peter Keisler, and Miguel Estrada. They wrote: