

But I could really answer that question a little more after I look at the issue more and know what is involved.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if I might direct a question through the Chair to the Senator from Montana, he says he may well be able to have a hearing this month. It depends upon his analysis of the legislation or the complexity of it. Would it be a fair statement that the representation could be made to the court that there will be an effort made, if possible, to have a hearing in finance this month?

Mr. BAUCUS. That is a very fair representation.

Mr. SPECTER. I think that would be a yes.

Mr. BAUCUS. That is a yes.

Mr. SPECTER. Might I ask my colleague from Iowa, who will soon waive the gavel, if he concurs in what the Senator from Montana said?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I might modify it just a little bit, but understand that I am making this statement not having had a chance to think deeply on it. But it would be in relationship to the extent to which there should be a hearing just on this one company as opposed to a hearing on the pension problem generally and in the larger context because I did voice in my statement to the Senate that it seems to me that we do have to look into this area, and we have to look at it as a pension problem in a much broader context than just one company. Obviously, in that context, I have absolutely no opposition to looking at the problem of one company. But I also think it ought to be looked into only in the context of the others because of the extent to which it might lead to other companies making the same request.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if I may direct a question through the Chair to the Senator from Iowa, the substance of what I understand he said is that if it is possible to have a hearing this month, considering whether it be on a single company or the complexity of taking up a broader issue, that consideration would be given to having a hearing this month if it can be done in a practical sense.

Mr. GRASSLEY. In the context of what I stated, the answer to that is, I would agree.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I take that also to be a yes.

I thank my colleague from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I am disappointed that we were not able to get unanimous consent. I certainly understand the position of my colleagues from Montana and Iowa. But I just want to reemphasize that the reason we sought to submit this extraordinary act is because of the timing of the judicial submission a week from now. A revenue bill is being generated in the House. As an old House Ways and Means Committee member, I was very jealous of that prerogative and wanted to make sure that we enforced it with

regularity if the Senate got out of constitutional control. I thought it could act on these things unilaterally. But, again, I think there is a certain support on the Ways and Means Committee for dealing with this issue. The request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, hopefully, will not only be one communicated to the Finance Committee but also would be communicated to the Ways and Means Committee in the House to seriously look into this.

I know many of my colleagues from Pennsylvania and other Congressmen from other states are going to be adversely affected—potentially affected—by what happens next Thursday. I hope a request will be made to the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee to take a very significant look at this. I hope they will be moved to act in a way that would be beneficial to this situation, and again other situations around the country of pensions failing.

But the point I want to reiterate is if this legislation were passed there would be no cost to the Federal Government by picking up the pensions of the pilots and others in the union of US Airways. Without this legislation, the cost to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and, therefore, to the taxpayers of the United States would be about \$3 billion. So this is a measure that will save \$3 billion over a set number of years. That is not pocket change, even in Washington, DC.

I think there has been an attempt to try to address this issue in a way that does not—as the Senator from Iowa said—create an incentive for companies not to fund their legal obligation. I don't think this narrow provision is an incentive for any other corporation to not do what is required of them under the pension laws. But what we have is an extraordinary case where union and management come together to dramatically reduce the benefits of the pilots. And I underscore the words "dramatically reduce" the benefits to the pilots. The pilots signed off on it. They have signed off on this as a way for the company to continue to operate. It will save the taxpayers money, and it will save these airlines and all of the employers—as well as the traveling public in the Northeast and throughout the eastern part of the United States.

I think this is a narrow exception. I think this is a special circumstance. Whether we can effectually change something that would allow the kind of flexibility under very stringent rules—I would agree with the Senator from Iowa. It allows the flexibility of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation to look at the unique circumstances of these petitions of companies and unions.

I just remind everyone, this is not the management going in unilaterally saying: We are going to cut benefits and restructure the program. This is the union and the management saying: This is what we want to do. This is a

very rare circumstance, indeed. So I do think we have unique circumstances.

Again, I understand the precedent that this sets, but I am hopeful we can work out a change in the law that will give the PBGC the flexibility to look at these unique circumstances, and unique circumstances in the future with respect to other companies, to come up with a solution that is best for the taxpayer as well as best for the companies and unions involved in these very difficult times.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. 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. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I can proceed as in morning business.

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

The Senator from Utah.

#### IN DEFENSE OF THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the President has wasted no time in delivering his judicial nominations left behind in the last Congress. The President's judicial nominees have proven to be superb and among the best I have seen in all my years of service in this body.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I expect that my colleagues on both sides are eager to do the people's business and move as promptly as President Bush to fill judicial vacancies.

Of course, I realize that the distortions have begun.

The usual special interest lobbies, pursuing their political and economic interests, have already been busy painting a very scary picture with the usual shrillness and tired old tactics.

The President of the United States has nominated men and women who, whatever their personal politics or views, are constitutionalists who are committed to enforcing the law as the people's elected representatives have adopted, and who will interpret the Constitution, not rewrite it as if they were in the room with the founding fathers—Constitutionalists, not Republican or Democrat, not liberal or conservative, who will approach their roles in a common sense manner.

But today, I rise to right one particular wrong. A recent report by People for the American Way, with, oddly enough, a remarkably biblical title, paints President Bush's nomination as an Armageddon. In reading the report, one would well think the President is choosing judges from the ranks of the Raelians.

But they especially go out of their way to malign the thousands of honest, smart and hard-working lawyers and law students who are members of the Federalist Society as if these fine men and women wear the mark of the devil.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Federalist Society and I am proud of it. Last year, the Federalist Society celebrated its 20th anniversary, and we are all proud of that.

Of course, the childish games played against the Federalist Society are not new. Over the past 2 years, members of the Federalist Society have been much maligned by some even in this body. The Federalist Society has even been presented as an "evil cabal" of conservative lawyers. Its members have been subjected to questions which remind one of the McCarthy hearings of the early 1950s. Detractors have painted a picture which is surreal, twisted and untrue.

The truth is that liberal orthodoxies reign rampant and often unchecked in a majority of this country's law schools and in the legal profession, and that the left is shocked that an association of honest, non-partisan, constitutionalist lawyers would exist, much less include the notable legal minds it does.

During the mid-1990s, Professor James Lindgren of Northwestern University Law School conducted a survey of law school professors and came to the following conclusion. At the faculties of the top 100 law schools 80 percent of law professors were Democrats or leaned left and only 13 percent were Republicans or leaned right. These liberal professors promulgate their ideology in and outside the classroom.

Mr. President, anyone associated with America's campuses or law schools knows that non-liberal views are regularly stifled and those espousing those views are often publicly shunned and ridiculed. It was this environment of hostility to freedom of expression and the exchange of ideas in universities that set the stage for the formation of the Federalist Society. And given my Democrat colleagues' reaction to the Society, it appears to be fighting against narrow-mindedness still.

In 1982, the Federalist Society was organized, not to foster any political agenda, but to encourage debate and public discourse on social and legal issues. Over the past 20 years, the Federalist Society has accomplished just that. It has served to open the channels of discourse and debate in many of America's law schools.

The Federalist Society espouses no official dogma. Its members share acceptance of three universal ideas: One, that government's essential purpose is the preservation of freedom; Two, that our Constitution embraces and requires separation of governmental powers; and, three that judges should interpret the law, not write it.

Tell me if you disagree with any of these ideas. Most Americans do not, but it seems like some in this town do.

For the vast majority of Americans, these are not controversial issues. Rather, they are basic constitutional assertions that are essential to the survival of our republic. They are truths that have united Americans for more than two centuries.

Recently we have seen the emergence of some groups that seek to undermine the third of these ideas—that judges should not write laws. These groups have attempted to use the judiciary to circumvent the democratic process and impose their minority views on the American people.

This judicial activism is a nefarious practice that seeks to undermine the principle of democratic rule. It results in an unelected oligarchy—government by small elite. Judicial activism imposes the will of a small group of politicized lawyers upon the American people and undermines the work of the people's representatives.

Indeed, if the radical left, the abortion on demand lobby, and some predatory businessmen who happen to hold law degrees and call themselves trial lawyers are successful; if we appoint judges that are committed to writing the law and Constitution and not interpreting it only, then all of us can just go home. We can resign ourselves to live under the oligarchic rule of lawyers—or should I say judges.

I happen to know a few lawyers, and please trust me when I say, this is not a good idea.

Not surprisingly in an association of lawyers, the truth is that beyond acceptance of the Federalist Society's three key ideas: freedom, separation of powers, and that judges should not write laws, it is challenging, if not impossible, to find consensus among Federalist Society members. Its members hold a wide array of differing views. They are so diverse that it is impossible to describe a Federalist Society philosophy.

The assertion that members are ideological carbon copies of each other is at the very least ludicrous.

The Society revels in open, thoughtful, and rigorous debate on all issues. It rests on the premise that public policy and social issues should not be accepted as part of a party line but, rather, warrant much thought and dialog. Any organization that sponsors debate on issues of public importance, as opposed to self-serving indoctrination, is healthy for us all and it is good for this body as well.

Now, how does the Federalist Society accomplish its goal? Not by lobbying Congress, writing amicus briefs, or issuing press releases. And, no, it does not threaten members with withdrawal of support in campaigns or running negative smear ads, which some of the special interest groups that smear this President's good judges engage in. The Federalist Society seeks only to sponsor fair, serious, and open debate about the need to enhance individual freedom and the role of the courts in saying what the law is rather than what it

should be. The Society believes that debate is the best way to ensure that legal principles that have not been the subject of sufficient attention for the past several decades receive a fair hearing.

The Federalist Society's commitment to fair and open debate can be seen by a small sampling of some participants in its meetings and symposiums. I venture to say the Federalist Society's meetings and symposiums are among the most well attended and among the most widely attended and among the most diversely attended and among the best symposiums held by anybody in the judicial field. But those participants who have participated—maybe we should look at some of them. They have included scores of liberals such as Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer, Michael Dukakis, BARNEY FRANK, Abner Mikva, Alan Dershowitz, Laurence Tribe, Steve Shapiro, Christopher Hitchens, and Ralph Nader, to name a few.

I would like to include for the RECORD a list of 60 participants in Federalist Society events that demonstrates the remarkable diversity of thought of Federalist Society events. One of them is Nadine Strossen, president of the ACLU, who many of us know, respect, and have worked with, and who has participated in Federalist Society functions regularly and constantly since its founding, and who attended the recent 20th anniversary dinner.

The ACLU's president has praised the Society's fundamental principle of individual liberty, its high-profile on law school campuses, and its intellectual diversity, noting that there is frequently strenuous disagreement among members about the role of the courts. Ms. Strossen has said that she cannot draw any firm conclusion about a potential judicial nominee's views based on the fact that he is a Federalist Society member.

It seems to me that an organization that includes such a wide array of opinion serves this Nation well and does not deserve the vilification it gets from the usual suspects here in Washington.

There are many notable conservatives that also affiliate with the Federalist Society. But as the members of the Senate demonstrate, even amongst those that are often labeled "conservatives" there is much disagreement on most social and political issues. Some, unfortunately, often portray the Federalist Society as a tightly knit, well-organized coalition of conservative lawyers who are united by their right-wing ideology. This is far from true. Allow me to illustrate further.

Three years ago the Washington Monthly published an article entitled "The Conservative Cabal That's Transforming American Law," which cited a 1999 decision by a panel of the D.C. Circuit's Court of Appeals as the "network's most far-reaching victory in recent years." The decision overturned some of the EPA's clean-air standards

on the grounds that it was unconstitutional for Congress to delegate legislative authority to the executive branch. C. Boyden Gray, a former White House Counsel for the first President Bush and a member of the Federalist Society's Board of Visitors, filed an amicus brief making the winning argument.

However, this is not the smoking gun case that opponents of the Federalist Society would have us believe it to be to prove that it is part of the vast right wing conservative conspiracy. First, the case was overturned on appeal by the Supreme Court, in a decision written by Justice Antonin Scalia, a frequent participant in Federalist Society activities who was the faculty advisor to the organization when he taught at the University of Chicago.

Second, the Washington Monthly piece also attacked Boyden Gray as a water carrier for the Federalist Society for advancing Microsoft's effort against antitrust enforcement.

Of course, Mr. Gray serves on the Society's Board of Visitors with Robert Bork, who has been Microsoft's chief intellectual adversary. They are on opposite sides.

There is not quite the vast right wing conspiracy hobgoblin some of the special interest groups in this town would have the American people and members of this body believe in. Indeed, I urge my colleagues to be extra careful when and look at the record before they attack this fine organization or its members.

A close examination of the Federalist Society reveals not a tight-knit organization that demands ideological unity, but an association of lawyers, much like the early bar associations that first appeared in this country in the late 19th century, made up of individuals from across the political spectrum who are committed to the principles of freedom and the rule of law according to the Constitution.

As a co-chairman myself, I am not surprised that the President has sought out its members to appoint for position on the bench and in the government. I applaud his foresight and wisdom. I am proud that its members are solid constitutionalists, whether they are liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican.

Mr. President, contrast that with People for the American Way, which has waged every obnoxious rotten fight against President Bush's nominations that has been waged in the last year. This is a very well-heeled organization. It is totally ideological. If you disagree with their far left liberal viewpoints, then they vilify you and try to impugn your motives. That is not what I call fairness in the debates that we should have around this body. Yet it is amazing to me how some in this body seem to be absolutely in tune, or should I say marching to the drumbeat of People for the American Way.

I started off by mentioning criticisms by the People for the American Way of the Federalist Society, and I have to

say, if you add it all up, this is a well-heeled, very liberal organization that is as partisan, combative, obnoxious in many ways, and false in its arguments and accusations as any organization I have seen in this country.

In almost every case where there has been any type of conservative of stature nominated to the courts, they have come in and completely done their best to deliver body blows to that nominee. It all seems to come down to basically one issue, and that is, if they suspect that a nominee is pro-life, then that is just an absolute no-no to them. It isn't just that. They have taken other nominees nominated by this President and others in the past, have taken their records and, in my opinion, have distorted in many ways their record. I don't think People for the American Way should be in a position to criticize the Federalist Society which primarily conducts the best symposia in law in America today. That is a fact.

I will never forget; I was invited to the University of Chicago by the Federalist Society members—150 members at that time—to speak at the law school at the behest of the Federalist Society. I figured there would be 100 or 150 people there. They had this one hall rented. They had to take me in the back way because of the protesters out front. Although I was willing to go through the protesters, they were afraid some of them were violent. We went inside the hall, and they were absolutely jampacked, people hanging from the rafters. Almost all of those who disagreed with the Federalist Society principles—in other words, principles that were not the left-wing principles—had a heavy piece of parchment paper. As I went to speak, they would stand up and rattle that paper. And that sound was deafening. You could not be heard. I have to say that what was going to be about a 20-minute speech turned out to be 145 minutes, or 2 hours by the time I could complete it.

I have to say I enjoyed the experience. But it was disconcerting that people at a major university—these were not people from the law school, in my opinion. And I am not sure they were even students at the university, many of them—would try to stop discourse from a U.S. Senator or anybody else, for that matter, who came there in good faith to deliver points of view that certainly I felt were worthy of consideration in this field of law.

I have to say there was one young lady three or four rows down who kept yelling epitaphs at me throughout my remarks. I tried to humor her, and I tried to go along and be reasonably thoughtful and kind to her. But, finally, I could tell she was getting on the nerves of almost everybody because she was really out of line and loud. I kind of enjoyed the confrontation to a degree. But it was getting old. Finally, after about an hour and 15 minutes, I looked at her, and, I said, I finally figured it out. You could not possibly be a member of this great law school, be-

cause, No. 1, you are so rude. I said, No. 2, you are so stupid. Of course, even at that point, even those who were there to oppose me and to rattle their parchment so I couldn't be heard started to cheer and applaud. I was able to end my remarks, which I felt were remarkably good for anybody in the field of law, whether they were from the left or the right or the center. I think in the end they were good for everybody there.

That is what is going on in the debate on judges today. We have some of these well-heeled left-wing groups that don't care what the facts are and distort anybody's life by coming in and utilizing their economic swat because they have all kinds of left-wing money behind them to malign and to slander and sometimes libel very good nominees.

I know a number of people in People from the American Way, and I have respect for some of them, but I have to tell you I hope they will elevate their discourse so that we will have true debates and not distortions and slander and libel and complete ignorance of what people stand for and what their records are.

I think we are getting down to where we are getting very close in this country to where single litmus tests are going to determine whether we can have judges. And we are getting to the point where the great jurists of the future might not arise because we might have to go to the lowest common denominator.

Having said all of that, I look forward to working with every group in this coming year. Hopefully, we can get a greater sense of discourse and a greater sense of responsibility, and that when we raise objections we hope they will be legitimate and honorable objections rather than objections geared to trying to smear somebody because of their disagreement. I think it is time we elevate the discourse around judges in this country, and I hope this year we can prove we can do that. But, in any event, my hopes have not been fulfilled today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD 60 diverse participants who have participated in Federalist Society events at this point.

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

60 DIVERSE PARTICIPANTS IN FEDERALIST SOCIETY EVENTS

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

1. Justice Stephen Breyer
2. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg
3. Justice Anthony Kennedy
4. Justice Antonin Scalia
5. Justice Clarence Thomas

CABINET MEMBERS

6. Griffin Bell
7. Abner Mikva
8. Bernard Nussbaum
9. Zbigniew Brezinski
10. Alan Keyes

ELECTED

11. Barney Frank

- 12. Michael Dukakis
- 13. George Pataki
- 14. Eugene McCarthy
- 15. Charles Robb
- 16. Jim Wright
- 17. Mayor Willie Brown

JUDGES

- 18. Robert Bork
- 19. Guido Calabresi
- 20. Richard Posner
- 21. Alex Kozinski
- 22. Pat Wald
- 23. Stephen Williams

LAW SCHOOL DEANS

- 24. Robert Clark—Harvard
- 25. Anthony Kronman—Yale
- 26. Paul Brest—Stanford
- 27. John Sexton—NYU
- 28. Geoffrey Stone—Chicago

LAW SCHOOL PROFESSORS

- 29. Alan Dershowitz—Harvard
- 30. Laurence Tribe—Harvard
- 31. Cass Sunstein—Chicago

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in my first act after taking the oath of office for my second term, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

Each day we are in session I have taken the opportunity to make sure another example of a hate crime is published in the RECORD in an effort to sway my colleagues about the need for expanding current hate crimes law to include sexual orientation, gender and disability and to expand the definition of what is a hate crime.

Hate crimes legislation will benefit our Nation as a whole, our country is a diverse one, made up of Muslims, Christians, and countless other religious faiths. Our society finds great strength in its Black and Hispanic communities as well as its gay and Jewish communities. Groups such as these represent not divisions but diversity, and that distinction has built a great Nation. However, hate crimes touch all our communities and tear the very fabric that binds our Nation together.

Passage of a hate crimes bill will assure all Americans that the violence done by a hate crime will not go unpunished. It will ensure that the violence done to an American because of the color of his or her skin will not go unpunished and will make it easier to punish on the Federal level. It will ensure Muslim Americans that they will not be harassed because of their faith and make it easier to punish on a Federal level. It will ensure that sexual orientation and identity are not reasons for a violent crime that goes unpunished.

As we move through these early weeks of the 108th Congress, I call on all my colleagues to consider hate crime legislation as a way to move forward on civil rights issues that are so important in our democratic society.

So, I rise today to describe yet another terrible crime that occurred January 1, 2003 in Miami, FL. After leaving a New Year's Eve party in South Beach, a gay man was shot by two attackers. Earnest Robinson, 23, was walking home when he was approached by two men, one of whom tried to pick him up.

Upon realizing that Robinson was not a woman, one of the men shot him and left him on the street. Police say one of the assailants shouted anti-gay slurs before shooting the victim. Robinson was treated at a local hospital and is in good condition.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. Hate crimes legislation like the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is now 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.

POLICE OFFICERS ARE BEING KILLED

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, late last year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation released its annual report on Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted in 2001. According to the report, there were 136 law enforcement officers killed in 30 States. The tragic events of September 11, 2001, claimed the lives of 72 officers. Excluding these 72 lives, the number of officers killed in 2001 increased over 37 percent, from 51 officer fatalities in 2000 to 70 in 2001. A closer examination of data shows that firearms were used in 61 of the officer murders, and of those, handguns were responsible for 46. The handgun of choice was the 9 millimeter. In my home State of Michigan, Clinton Township, the city of Detroit, and the Federal Protective Service in Detroit each lost an officer in 2001. One of these officers worked in the building in which my Detroit office is located.

In 1994, the Brady law established the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, NICS. The creation of this check system allows federally licensed gun sellers to quickly determine whether an individual is eligible to purchase a firearm. Since its inception, NICS checks have prevented more than 156,000 felons, fugitives, and others not eligible from purchasing a firearm without infringing upon any law-abiding individual's ability to buy a firearm. However, a loophole in the law allows unlicensed private gun sellers to sell guns without conducting a NICS background check.

During the last Congress, Senator REED introduced the Gun Show Background Check Act. I cosponsored that bill because I believe it is a critical tool in preventing guns from getting into the hands of criminals and other ineligible buyers. This bill would simply apply existing law governing background checks to individuals buying firearms at gun shows. As reflected in the FBI report, preventing easy and

unchecked access to guns is critical in preventing police deaths and gun violence. That is why it is supported by major law enforcement organizations including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Troopers Coalition, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Major Cities Chiefs, the National Association of School Resource Officers, the National Black Police Association, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and the Hispanic American Police Command Officers Association.

We must stand by our Nation's law enforcement community and take this commonsense step to reduce gun violence. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation when it is reintroduced during this Congress.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred on November 3, 2002, in Atlanta, GA. Gregory Love, a junior at Morehouse College, was beaten with a baseball bat in a college shower. He was treated at a local hospital where doctors removed a blood clot from the lining of his brain. The assailant, Aaron Price, a sophomore, admitted to the beating and will be charged with a hate crime based on his perception of the victim's sexual orientation.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come 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.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MOUNT UNION FOOTBALL TEAM

● Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Mount Union Purple Raiders football team, from Alliance, OH, on a number of outstanding achievements. The Purple Raiders recently won the Division III National Championship for the sixth time in 7 years. Maintaining a perfect record of 14 victories this season, Mount Union's team is 109 and 1 in the last 11 regular seasons, and since 1990 the Raiders