

take action today and allow a vote on the Senate-passed bill. I hope that every Member of the Republican Party who says that what the President is doing is terrible will also ask when House Republicans are going to vote one way or the other on the Senate's bill. Our bill would make everything the President is doing unnecessary. Remember that.

The President has the legal authority to take this action. Every President since Eisenhower has exercised this authority. Some, such as President George H.W. Bush, did so on a sweeping scale. We make laws in Congress. The President sets enforcement policies. He clearly has the power to take the scarce resources we have given him and identify and deport those people who pose a danger to our communities, and he can limit the deportation of those who are law-abiding, tax-paying members of the community.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Next week, millions of families in this country will gather around a table to give thanks for the many blessings they have received. I know my family and I and our children and our grandchildren will. The President's actions will be counted among those blessings for the millions of loved ones who worry that their mother, father or grandparents could be deported at any moment. The security the President's action will give these families on Thanksgiving is powerful and indispensable.

For some, it is about something even more urgent. It is about seeking safety. While I applaud the President's announcement today, I remain deeply disappointed by his decision to build a large new detention facility to hold vulnerable women and children fleeing violence in Central America. Many of these individuals are asylum seekers, not criminals, and their ongoing detention is unacceptable. I urge him to revisit this policy.

The action the President will announce today is going to draw criticism from those who sought to stop immigration reform at every turn. As a grandson of immigrants, I say that after years and years of obstruction, the President is right to take action. I am married to a woman who is the daughter of immigrants. At the heart of it all, this is about keeping America's communities strong and vibrant. We benefit from immigration. That has been our history. Let it be our future.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF PAMELA PEPPER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

NOMINATION OF BRENDA K. SANNES TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NOMINATION OF MADELINE COX ARLEO TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

NOMINATION OF WENDY BEETLESTONE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

NOMINATION OF VICTOR ALLEN BOLDEN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

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

The bill clerk read the nominations of Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin; Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York; Madeline Cox Arleo, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey; Wendy Beetlestone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; and Victor Allen Bolden, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we will vote on five outstanding judicial nominees to our Federal district courts. I thank the majority leader for filing for cloture on these nominees so we can clear the backlog that still remains on our executive calendar as we move toward the end of the 113th Congress. After we vote on these nominees today, however, we will still have 21 judicial nominees pending on the executive calendar to serve on district courts, the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, and the U.S. Court of International Trade.

The five nominees the Senate will vote on today are all well-qualified lawyers and there should be no controversy about their confirmation. Four of these nominees: Pamela Pepper to the Eastern District of Wisconsin, Brenda Sannes to the Northern District of New York, Madeline Arleo to the District of New Jersey, and Wendy

Beetlestone to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania were reported by the Judiciary Committee by unanimous voice vote and have the support of their home State senators.

The fifth nominee, Victor Bolden, who has been nominated to the District of Connecticut, also has the strong support of his home State Senators, Mr. BLUMENTHAL and Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Bolden's credentials are impeccable. Since 2009, he has served as corporation counsel for the city of New Haven, CT. Prior to joining city government, Mr. Bolden served as general counsel and assistant counsel for the NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund. He has also served in private practice as an associate and counsel at the law firm of Wiggin & Dana in New Haven, CT. After graduating from Harvard Law School, Mr. Bolden began his legal career at the American Civil Liberties Union as a staff attorney and as the Marvin Karparkin Fellow.

During the Judiciary Committee executive business meeting where Mr. Bolden's nomination was considered, the ranking member commented that he was troubled by the nominee's views on racial classifications and his advocacy on affirmative action. The ranking member also noted that he did not agree with the nominee's criticisms of the Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*. Finally, the ranking member criticized Mr. Bolden because he argued the nominee "took a narrow and legally incorrect view of individual rights under the Second Amendment in an amicus brief in *Heller*." The committee voted to report Mr. Bolden's nomination favorably on a 10-to-8 party-line vote.

Let me address each of the issues raised by Ranking Member GRASSLEY. First, in cases where Mr. Bolden has advocated for a specific position in which a Senator may disagree, Mr. Bolden was representing a client and not expressing his own personal views. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I have stated repeatedly that attorneys should not be equated with the position of their clients. Our legal system is predicated upon zealous advocacy for both sides of an issue or matter. Without this, our justice system would not function. Victor Bolden understands the difference between the role of an advocate versus the role of a judge. In response to a question for the record from Senator GRASSLEY on applying Supreme Court and Circuit Court precedents, Mr. Bolden testified: "I am fully committed to following the precedents of higher courts faithfully and giving them full force and effect, regardless of any personal feelings I might have."

Second, not only has Mr. Bolden testified under oath about this distinction, but he has shown that he would apply and implement orders from a higher court. In *Ricci v. DeStefano*, Mr. Bolden represented the city of New Haven as corporation counsel. In that case, several White firefighters and one