

of our country to control the flow of immigrants.

AFBF supports the Chambliss-Kyl amendment and we urge your fellow Senators to vote for this proposal when it is considered in the Senate.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

Mr. KYL. Let me read the opening to give a flavor of what the American Farm Bureau Federation is saying:

The American Farm Bureau Federation strongly supports the Chambliss-Kyl amendment and urges its adoption when it is considered on the Senate floor. This amendment would provide U.S. agriculture a clear, simple, timely and efficient H-2a program to fill seasonal and temporary jobs for which there is a limited U.S. labor supply. . . .

This measure also deals sensibly and fairly with illegal immigrants who are now working in agriculture, who meet strict criteria and pose no security threat.

This amendment does not grant amnesty to illegal aliens. . . .

The Chambliss-Kyl proposal strikes a reasonable balance among employers, hard-working employees who are striving to better themselves and the need and obligation of our country to control the flow of immigrants.

The American Farm Bureau Federation supports the Chambliss-Kyl amendment and we urge your fellow Senators to vote for this proposal when it is considered in the Senate.

In summary, we are going to have two proposals before us, one offered by the Senators from Massachusetts and Idaho. We urge you reject that proposal because it is not something that is ever going to become law. It provides amnesty for illegal immigrants here. The other is our proposal, which enables us to have a good, workable system for agricultural labor. It can pass both bodies, and it does not include amnesty.

I note when we begin debate on the supplemental appropriations we will have more of an explanation of what we have offered to our colleagues, but at least this way we have opened up the subject.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

CHANGING SENATE RULES

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of working with the Senator from Arizona in the finest tradition of the Senate, in bipartisanship. We are working together on an issue that is of great concern to the country, and that is the estate tax and whether it should be eliminated; if not totally eliminated, we are working on the prospect of having a significant exemption and doing something about the balance of a taxable estate as to what would be the actual rate at which the remainder of the estate would be taxed.

I raise this issue, although this is not the subject of my statement to the Senate, because I am following the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona. It has been my privilege to work with him in trying to achieve a bipar-

tisan consensus. What I wish to talk about is achieving consensus in a town that is increasingly polarized by excessive partisanship and excessive ideological rigidity. This is a town in which it has gotten to the point, as told by Lesley Stahl, the CBS reporter, the other night, of an experience she had at a dinner party with nonelected officials—just normal folks at a dinner party in New York. The discussion turned to matters having to do with the subjects we are dealing with here in the Congress, and all of a sudden the mood in that salubrious dinner party turned hostile. People were starting to shout at each other, and any sense of civility was suddenly gone.

I worry about that here in the most collegial of all parliamentary bodies in the world—this one, right here, the Senate. It has been such a great privilege for me to be a part of it. Yet, as I see, as the debate is approaching, everything is so partisan and everything starts to take on the tinge of “it’s either my way or the highway.” That is not only not how this Nation has been governed under the Constitution for 217 years, that is, indeed, the very birth-right we have had in this Nation—compromise, compromise, and bringing together consensus in order to have a governing ability to function. That was how we came out with the Constitution that we did in that hot summer session of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia back in 1787. Yet I wonder if we are losing some of that glue that brings us together and has us start drawing up consensus by reaching out to the other Senators and molding our ideas together in order to govern a very large country, a broad country, a diverse country, a complicated country.

You can’t do it with just one opinion.

I have heard some of the statements when I have been interviewed on programs such as CNN and FOX. There were other Senators on these programs with me. I shake my head, wondering how someone could say those things.

It is this question this Senate is going to face, whether the rules of this body are going to be changed in order to cut off the ability of a Senator to stand up and speak for as long as he or she wants on a subject of importance to that Senator, and whether that ability, known as a filibuster, is going to be taken away from us.

What is the history of the filibuster? If you think about how the filibuster works in the Senate, 217 years ago there was no limitation on a Senator being able to stand up and speak. For over a century, the rules provided a Senator could not be cut off. Early in the last century, that was changed so that if 67 Senators voted to cut off debate, then the debate would be closed. That was a supermajority.

Later on—sometime, I believe, in the 1960s—that threshold of 67 was lessened to 60. That is the rule we operate under now. A Senator can stand up and talk and talk and talk. The ability to speak

in this body is such that the filibuster helps to encourage compromise. It is saying to the majority that because they have an idea, they can’t force that idea unless they get 60 votes, and that causes the majority to have to listen to the minority. It brings about encouragement of compromise.

I don’t think we ought to do away with the filibuster. Yet that is what the Senate is about to do, if the rules are amended.

Interestingly, the rules of the Senate say it takes 67 Senators to amend the rules. But we all have been told of a plan whereby the Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States—and the majority leader would make a motion and the Chair, the Vice President, the President of the Senate, would rule, and a 51-vote majority would change the rules of the Senate. It is my understanding that the Parliamentarian of the Senate has in fact stated you can’t change the rules that way. Yet it looks as though the majority leader, encouraged by the majority, is going to try to change the rules—not according to the Senate rules. In other words, it seems the majority is breaking the rules in order to change the Senate rules.

I don’t think that is right. I don’t think we ought to be changing the rules in the middle of the game. I don’t think it is right to overrule the Parliamentarian of the Senate, who is not a partisan official.

I think this starts to verge on the edges of riskiness, if we start operating this Senate under those kind of rules, rules that are breaking the rules in order to change the rules.

Another way you could put it is that we talk about the majority is threatening to break the rules to win every time. Is that what the Senate is all about? Isn’t the Senate about the majority having to consult the minority, because under the rules of the Senate, minority rights are protected so the majority cannot completely run over the minority? Isn’t that what is the history and precedent of 217 years in the Senate? I think the history of this body would show that is the case, especially if we get to the point that this body is going to overrule the Parliamentarian. I think that is verging on an abuse of power of the majority.

Remember also a truth—that today’s majority will be tomorrow’s minority, and the minority should always be protected.

There is another reason; that is, this group of political geniuses who happened to gather in Philadelphia back in that hot summer of 1787 created a system that had indeed separation of powers—that no one institution or one person in the Government of the United States could become so all powerful as to mow over other persons in the institution.

In that separation of powers of the executive from the legislative and from the judicial, they also created checks and balances inherent in the Constitution so that power cannot accumulate

in any one person's hands. Thus, in the Congress they created a House of Representatives which represents the population, and a Senate, which was the Great Compromise in the Constitutional Convention of 1787—the Senate that represented each State equally with two Senators. In the rules that evolved from that body, the checks and balances arose to protect the minority.

Let us look in the separation of powers, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. What was created, and created over time, was the value of an independent judiciary, a judiciary that was going to be appointed in a two-step process. A one-step process that the Constitutional Convention rejected was that the appointment be only by the President. The Constitutional Convention created a two-step process in which the President nominates and the Senate confirms or rejects. That is part of the checks and balances.

I must say, as a senior Senator from Florida, I have been absolutely bewildered at statements I have heard on the floor of the Senate as well as I have heard from some of my colleagues when we have been interviewed on these news programs in which it is claimed we are rejecting all of these judges. Let me tell you what this Senator from Florida has done. Of the 215 nominations before the Senate, this Senator has voted for 206 of them. That means there are only 9 this Senator has not voted for. In other words, under the administration of President George W. Bush, I have voted for 206 of his 215 nominations. That is 96 percent I voted for.

Does that sound as though this Senator is not approving all of the conservative judges? Every one of those judges who have come forth to us was a conservative judge. I have voted for 96 percent of them. I can tell you that the 9 I have not voted for—by the way, I voted for one a majority of my party voted against, and that was Miguel Estrada. But I had reasons, because I called him in and asked him if he would obey the law as a court of appeals judge. He said he would. I said that is good enough for me. But the remaining nine, I have plenty of reasons why I do not think they are entitled to a lifetime appointment as a Federal judge.

That is my prerogative as a Senator, and it is also my prerogative as a Senator under the rules of the Senate to stand up and to speak as long as this Senator has breath in order to get that opinion across.

I have been amazed to hear some of my colleagues say here on the Senate floor as well as in some of these television interviews that we have done—and sometimes done together—that utilizing the filibuster has never been used, they say, against a judge nominee. My goodness, all you have to do is look at history. In 1881, Stanley Matthews was nominated by President Hayes to be a Justice of the Supreme Court, and he was filibustered. In 1968,

Abe Fortas was nominated by President Johnson to be Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and he was filibustered.

Since the start of the George W. Bush administration in 2001, 11 judicial nominations have needed 60 votes for cloture in order to end a filibuster. That is before President Bush's term which started in 2001.

How people can come with a straight face and say a filibuster has not been used on judicial appointments, I simply don't understand. It defies the historical record of the Senate.

I think there are several principles that are very important as we consider this. It is my hope—and I have reached out to colleagues, dear personal friends who are friends regardless of party—that we can avoid this constitutional clash which should not be and changing the rules by breaking the rules.

Remember, a filibuster is to help encourage compromise. We shouldn't be changing the rules in the middle of the game. The underlying principle I want our Senators to remember as we get into this debate—hopefully it will be headed off by cooler minds. As the Good Book says, come now and let us reason together. Remember these principles.

The Constitution stands for an independent judiciary. There are very necessary checks and balances in our form of government to keep the accumulation of power from any one agency, or executive branch, or person's hands.

We should not be overruling the Parliamentarian. We must encourage compromise. To change the rules in the middle of the game is bordering on an abuse of power. Surely the Senate can rise above this partisan, highly ideological set of politics and come together for the sake of the Nation.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I will speak in morning business to the point discussed by my colleague from Florida. I understand another Senator was going to be here; when he arrives, I will yield the floor.

It is important for my colleagues and for the American people to appreciate a little bit of the background of this issue with respect to judges. My colleague from Florida makes a point that he has voted for most of the President's judicial nominees. Indeed, that has been the case with every Senator for every President.

But until the last 2 years, we have voted both for district court nominees and circuit court nominees. Two years ago, the Democratic minority began filibustering circuit court nominees. That is why President Bush has had a lower percentage of his nominees approved than any President since Franklin Roosevelt for the important circuit court positions. In fact, a third of President Bush's circuit court nominees were filibustered or could not be brought to a vote because they would

have been filibustered; fully 17 out of around 35.

So when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the large number of judges they have approved, they are folding in all of the Federal district court nominees everyone has always voted for. That is not the appropriate measure. The question is, how many circuit court nominees? Never before, in the history of our country, have we seen circuit court nominees or district court nominees, for that matter, but circuit court nominees filibustered in this manner—ten separate judges we could not come to a final up-or-down vote, seven more who would have had the same fate had they been voted for. That has never happened before in the history of the country.

Our colleague from Illinois was discussing the fact that a former Senator from New Hampshire had, in this Senate, talked about filibuster, following a couple of judges for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. In fact, that Senator had said that. The interesting point is, even though he, a single Senator, wanted to filibuster the nominees—their names were Berzon and Paez—the Republican leader, TRENT LOTT from Mississippi, made an arrangement with the then-Democratic leader, Daschle from South Dakota, that they would not be filibustered, and we filed cloture, which is the petition to bring the matter to a close so we could take a final vote. Senators on both sides of the aisle supported the cloture motion, so they supported getting to a final vote on those two judges. Of course, cloture was invoked, meaning they were not filibustered.

They were brought up for a vote. Some voted against them—I voted for Berzon and against Paez—but the net result is they are both sitting on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals today. They were not filibustered. So there is no case of a filibuster of the circuit court judge. None.

Second, the only other situation in which it is alleged a filibuster occurred was with Abe Fortas, whose name was withdrawn by Lyndon Johnson the day after a cloture vote failed to succeed. As Senator Griffin from Michigan, who was then leading that opposition to Abe Fortas, has told me and others, there was no effort to filibuster because they had the votes to kill the judge. They simply had not had time to debate him, which is why they voted against the cloture, but as a result of the President acknowledging he had no support in the Senate, his name was withdrawn.

There has never been a filibuster of a Supreme Court or circuit court judge in the United States—it simply is erroneous to suggest there has been—nor is it correct to say we have been voting on all of these different judges. If you take the district court judges out, about whom there is no controversy, there is a huge issue because fully a third of the President's circuit court

nominees were not voted on because of this new filibuster by the Democratic minority.

We need to have some perspective. Who is changing the rules? Until 2 years ago, all the judges got up-or-down votes. Judges that could not even get out of the Judiciary Committee with a majority vote were granted the privilege or courtesy of a vote in the Senate. During the debate when Clarence Thomas was being confirmed, several leading Democratic Senators came to the Senate to oppose Judge Thomas. They said they actually had thought about trying to filibuster his nomination but that would be wrong because filibustering judicial nominees is wrong. Senator LEAHY, Senator KENNEDY, and others came to this floor and said, we do not know whether we will defeat Clarence Thomas or not, but we are not going to defeat him with a filibuster because that would be wrong.

Sure enough, they were correct. They lost the vote, 48-52. He was confirmed. I admired them because they stood for principle. The rule and the tradition of this body had always been we give the nominees an up-or-down vote, but if they could get 51 votes for confirmation, they became a circuit court judge or a Supreme Court justice. That is what happened in the case of Clarence Thomas.

Now, all of a sudden, it has been turned around, and the Democratic minority, almost to a person, has said they believe judges should be filibustered, and the President's nominees are not going to get an up-or-down vote if they decide they want to filibuster a particular nominee.

As I said, at least a third of these circuit court nominees so far have been filibustered. It is our understanding that practice will continue unless we can get back to the way it has always been, the traditional role of the Senate in providing advice and consent with a majority vote, up or down.

It has also been suggested the President is nominating a new, wild variety of lawyers and judges to be circuit court judges, way out of the mainstream kind of people. This, of course, is absolutely ludicrous. The kind of people that President Bush has nominated are respected jurists or lawyers.

The American Bar Association, which used to be the Democrat's gold standard for approving the judicial nominees, has judged all of these candidates qualified. Yet somehow some of our colleagues on the left say they are out of the mainstream. My colleague on the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from New York, for example, has made this charge on several occasions.

I ask, who is probably more representative of the mainstream? A single Senator from a State, for example, like New York? Or the President of the United States who had to get elected with support from all over this country? I don't think anyone would say George Bush is out of the mainstream, that President Bush is out of the mainstream of this country.

Who are some of the people he has nominated? Some are judges who have had to stand for election, for example, in California and Texas, and have received supermajorities, 70 or 80 percent. I have forgotten the exact numbers of support from the citizens of their States. One is a blue State. One is a red State. When well over 50 or 60 percent of the citizens in this State vote to support these judges to continue in office on their State supreme court, you would hardly say these nominees are out of the mainstream. Yet those two particular judges, Janice Rogers Brown from California and Percilla Owen from Texas, are the ones for whom this filibuster has been applied.

It does not make sense to suggest a tradition of this Senate to give people an up-or-down vote is going to be overturned because all of a sudden a President is proposing people who are wildly out of the mainstream.

What has the Republican majority at least considered doing? Simply returning to the way it has always been, to going back to the 200 years—before 2 years ago—and giving people an up-or-down vote. Members can still vote against the nominee. Members do not have to vote for the nominee, but at least give them an up-or-down vote. We do that based upon the precedence that has been set by the then-majority leader of this Senate, the Senator from West Virginia, who, on not fewer than four separate occasions, utilized the precedence of this body to ensure that dilatory tactics could not prevail in this Senate and that we could move forward with the business of the Senate.

It is the very same precedent that would be used to reestablish the up-or-down vote which has been the tradition of this Senate all along. That is not rubberstamping. That is giving due consideration to these nominees and giving them an up-or-down vote at the end of the day.

When Americans look at this sort of intramural battle occurring in the Senate, they have to wonder why this is happening, why it is so important. I suspect it may have something to do with the fact there might be a vacancy on the Supreme Court, and our friends on the other side of the aisle are so afraid President Bush might nominate someone who could gain majority support they are prepared to actually refuse that nominee an up-or-down vote. That would be unprecedented in the history of this body. I don't think it is right.

Some people have called this the nuclear option because they threatened to blow the Senate up if we try to return to the traditional rule of an up-or-down vote in the Senate. That is a very unfortunate name and a very unfortunate threat. No one should be threatening to go nuclear or blow the place up or prevent the Senate from doing its business. Our constituents sent us here for a reason, to get work done, to pass

a budget, to pass the appropriations bill, to pass the bill that is before the Senate right now, the supplemental appropriations bill that will literally fund our troops' effort in Afghanistan and Iraq, to pass an energy bill, to pass a defense authorization bill, all of the other important things they want us to do here.

Yet we have some colleagues suggesting, if they do not get their way on these judges, like a school-yard bully who has a call go against him by the referee and picks up his ball and goes home so the rest of the kids cannot play. Is that the threat here; pick up your ball and go home so the rest of us cannot do the business we were sent here to do?

Let me make one final prediction. Last time we met as members of the Judiciary Committee, we could not get a quorum to do business. Not one member of the minority party showed up. We have to have at least one for a quorum. This was not the last meeting but the penultimate meeting. They said there were three members going to the funeral of the Pope; 3 out of 9. I predict, at another meeting on Thursday—and we need to pass the judges out to consider them on the floor—they will not give a quorum then, they will not show up or, if they do show up, they filibuster it so we cannot get the judges adopted. I predict right now the judges that are on the agenda for that meeting this coming week will not be passed out. They might pass out one or two, but they are not going to allow us to pass all of those judges so they can be considered by the full Senate.

It was Members of the minority party who complained, while Republicans never filibustered, they did keep some of President Clinton's judicial nominees bottled up in committee. We will see whether they are willing to pass these nominees—I think there are 6 or 7 pending—we will see whether or not they are willing to show up for the meeting so there is a quorum and enabling the committee to pass them out to the full body so we can debate the nominees or whether they talk and talk and talk until the meeting has to end, no one else is around, and we no longer have a quorum or they simply do not show up for a quorum.

We will see what they do. I predict right now my colleagues are not going to allow us to get those judges to the Senate so we can begin the debate and the consideration of whether they should be confirmed. That will be a real shame and, again, a violation of what this Senate has always done in the past, even when we did not particularly think a nominee should receive an affirmative vote on the floor. I believe Clarence Thomas was in this situation. The committee passed him to the Senate to see what the full body would do to give its advice and consent which is what the Constitution calls upon us to do.

I close by urging my colleagues not to confuse this discussion with erroneous information or talk about things

that are in a history that never was but, rather, to approach it on the basis of moving forward, in a bipartisan way, to fill our constitutional responsibilities to grant these judges an up-or-down vote by our advice and consent so we can put people on the court in these very important positions to serve the American people.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for not to exceed 14 minutes.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

MARLA RUZICKA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is a matter which I and my friend from California, Senator BOXER, will be speaking about later this afternoon, and that is the tragic death of a remarkable young Californian, Marla Ruzicka.

Marla was the founder of a humanitarian organization devoted to helping the families of Afghan and Iraqi civilians who have been killed or suffered other losses as a result of U.S. military operations. She died in Baghdad on Saturday from a car bomb while she was doing the work she loved and for which so many people around the world admired her.

In fact, Tim Rieser, in my office, has worked closely with her. We received e-mails about the work she was doing, and even photographs of people she was helping arrived literally minutes before she died.

I will speak later today about this. But she was a remarkable person. When I spoke with her family in California yesterday, I told them this was a life well worth living, that most people would not accomplish in their lifetime what this 28-year-old wonderful woman accomplished in hers.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am going to speak on another matter. We have learned that those who are intent on forcing confrontation, breaking the Senate rules, and undercutting our democratic checks and balances plan to take their previous outrageous allegations of religious McCarthyism one step further and accuse Democrats of being “against people of faith” because we object to seven—seven—of the President’s more than 200 judicial nominations.

If you followed the sick logic of this venom being spewed by some of the

leaders in this Chamber, we would have to say that 205 judicial nominees forwarded by the President, whom the Democratic Senators have helped to confirm, would seem not to be people of faith, even though that is as false and ridiculous on its face as is the charge leveled at Democratic Senators.

This disgusting spectacle, this smear of good men and women as “against faith” is expected to happen, in of all places, a house of worship, according to a front-page article last week in the New York Times. It will involve twisting history, as well as religion, because according to the report, those involved will claim that Democratic Senators are using the filibuster rule to keep people of faith off of the Federal bench.

This slander is so laden with falsehoods, so permeated by the smoke and mirrors of partisan politics, and so intertwined with one man’s personal political aspirations that it should collapse of its own weight. But too many who should speak out against it remain violent.

Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee began blatantly to invoke obscene accusations like this one earlier in the Bush administration. They hurled false charges against Senators saying they were anti-Hispanic or anti-African American, anti-woman, anti-religion, anti-Catholic, and anti-Christian for opposing certain judicial nominees.

They never bothered to mention the same Senators who were making these slanderous statements had blocked, themselves, many, many, many—over 60—Hispanics, women, certainly people of faith. And they never bothered to say the Senators they were slandering had supported hundreds of nominees, including Hispanics, African Americans, women, and people of faith—Catholic, Christian, and Jewish. They never hesitated to stoke the flames of bigotry, and to encourage their supporters to continue the smear in cyberspace or on the pages of newspapers or through direct mail.

Actually, to the contrary, they seemed to like the way it sounded. Maybe it tested well in their political polls. Now they have decided to up the ante on such “religious McCarthyism,” as a way to help them tear down the Senate and do away with the last bastion against this President’s most extreme judicial nominees. It is crass demagoguery, and it is fueled by the arrogance of power.

They now seek to make a connection between the dark days of the struggle for civil rights, when some used the filibuster to try to defeat equal rights laws, and the situation we find ourselves in today when the voice of the minority struggles to be heard above the cacophony of daily lies and misrepresentations. This tactical shift follows on the rhetorical attacks aimed at the judiciary over the past few weeks in which Federal judges were likened to the KKK and “the focus of evil.”

In the last few weeks, we have heard that, at an event attended by Repub-

lican Members of the Congress, people called for Stalinist solutions to problems, referring to Joseph Stalin’s reference to killing people he disagreed with, and calling for mass impeachments. Wouldn’t you think the Members of Congress, who have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, would speak up or at least leave with their heads bowed in shame, instead of, apparently, enjoying it?

Last week, the Senate Democratic leadership called upon the President and the Republican leadership of Congress to denounce these inflammatory statements against judges. This week, I renew my call to the Republican leader and, in particular, to Republican moderates, to denounce the religious McCarthyism that is again pervading their side of this debate.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to follow the brave example of one of Vermont’s greatest Senators, Republican Ralph Flanders. Senator Flanders recognized a ruthless political opportunist when he saw one. He knew Senator Joseph McCarthy had exploited his position of power in the Senate to smear hundreds of innocent people and win headlines and followers, and campaign contributions, with his false charges and innuendo, without regard to facts or rules or human decency.

Senator Flanders spoke out during this dark chapter in the history of this great institution. He offered a resolution of censure condemning the conduct of Senator McCarthy. Now, in our time, a line has again been crossed by some seeking to influence this body. I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to follow Senator Flanders’ lead in condemning the crossing of that line.

I have served with many fair-minded Republican Senators. I am saddened to see Republican Senators stay silent when they are invited to disavow these abuses. Where are the voices of reason? Will the Republicans not heed the clarion call that Republican Senator John Danforth sounded a few weeks ago? And he is an ordained Episcopal priest. What has silenced these Senators who otherwise have taken moderate and independent stands in the past? Why are they allowing this religious McCarthyism to take place unchallenged? The demagoguery that is so cynically and corrosively being used by supporters of the President’s most extreme judicial nominees needs to stop.

Not only must this bogus religious test end, but Senators should denounce the launching of the nuclear option, the Republicans’ precedent-shattering proposal to destroy the Senate in one stroke, while shifting the checks and balances of the Senate to the White House.

I would like to keep the Senate safe and secure and in a “nuclear free” zone. Even our current Parliamentarian’s office and our Congressional Research Service has said the so-called nuclear option would go against Senate