

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2010, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Exxon Valdez to Deepwater Horizon: Protecting Victims of Major Oil Spills."

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2010, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Deepwater Drilling Moratorium: A Second Economic Disaster for Small Business?"

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2010, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs' Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2010, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "High-Risk Logistics Planning: Progress on Improving Department of Defense Supply Chain Management."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND WILDLIFE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 27, 2010, at 2:30 p.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Office Building.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Robert Maes, Cory Mack, and Elizabeth Schwab of the office of Senator BINGAMAN be granted the privileges of the floor for today.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Starz, a fellow in my office, be granted the

privilege of the floor for the remainder of the 111th Congress.

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

UNITED STATES MANUFACTURING ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2010

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4380, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4380) to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 4380) was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5849, received from the House and at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5849) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 5849) was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WEEK

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 595.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 595) designating the week beginning September 12, 2010, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 595) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 595

Whereas there are 105 historically Black colleges and universities in the United States;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities provide the quality education essential to full participation in a complex, highly technological society;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities have a rich heritage and have played a prominent role in the history of the United States;

Whereas historically Black colleges and universities allow talented and diverse students, many of whom represent underserved populations, to attain their full potential through higher education; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of historically Black colleges and universities are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 12, 2010, as "National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week"; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for historically Black colleges and universities in the United States.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3657

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I understand that S. 3657, introduced earlier today by Senator WYDEN, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3657) to establish as a standing order of the Senate that a Senator publicly disclose a notice of intent to object to any measure or matter.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time during the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2010

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 28; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be

approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 5297, the small business jobs bill.

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

PROGRAM

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, tonight cloture was filed on the small business jobs bill. As a result, the filing deadline for first-degree amendments is 1 p.m. tomorrow. Senators should expect roll-call votes to occur throughout the day in relation to amendments to the bill, if an agreement can be reached to consider amendments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator SPECTER.

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

Mrs. HAGAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to continue the discussion of the erosion of the very important principle of separation of powers.

Our Constitution was devised with three branches: article I, the Congress; article II, the Executive, the President; article III, the judiciary. A very important concept in the operation of our constitutional government has been the separation of powers to provide checks and balances.

During the course of the past two decades, we have seen a substantial erosion of the power of Congress. Congress's authority has been taken away in significant measure by the Supreme Court of the United States, which has, in effect, entered into the legislative process by disregarding the finding of fact that the Congress has undertaken and changed the standard for determining constitutionality of legislation.

There had been in effect the rational basis test which had been in existence for decades. But then in 1995, in a case captioned "United States v. Lopez," involving the bringing of guns onto

school property, the Supreme Court overturned 60 years of precedent.

In the case of *United States v. Morrison*, when the Congress had legislated to protect women against violence, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a 5-to-4 decision—as was the *Lopez* case, 5 to 4—decided that because of the "method of reasoning" of the Congress, the act was unconstitutional, notwithstanding a mountain of evidence, as noted by Justice Souter in his dissent.

Then in a third case, *Kimel v. Florida Board of Regents*, an age discrimination case, the Court again undertook to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional on a new standard, and the standard is "proportionate and congruent," which is really a virtual impossibility to understand.

This evening, I propose to discuss two other cases: the case of *Alabama v. Garrett*, which interpreted the legislation to protect Americans with disabilities, and the case of *Lane v. Tennessee*, also to protect people with disabilities.

In the case of *Alabama v. Garrett*, the Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, decided that the legislation was unconstitutional because it did not fit this illusive congruent and proportionality test. That was an employment discrimination case.

In the case of *Lane v. Tennessee*, it involved a paraplegic who could not gain access to a courtroom. There was no elevator in the courtroom, and he could not walk up the steps. There, the same statute, the Americans with Disabilities Act—a voluminous record, hearings held all over the United States—by a 5-to-4 decision, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that application of the Americans with Disabilities Act was constitutional. The shifting vote was the vote of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. But the standard which was applied was this test of congruence and proportionality. Justice Scalia, in his dissenting opinion in that case, said the test was a flabby test which, in effect, enabled the court to engage in legislation. This subject of the standard to be applied was a significant concern in the recently concluded hearings for Solicitor General Elena Kagan for the Supreme Court of the United States. We are faced in these confirmation hearings, regrettably, with the fact that we can't get answers on judicial philosophy or judicial ideology.

I am not talking about how the case is going to be decided; that is a matter for the Court and, as a matter of judicial independence, that is for the Court to decide. The questions directed to nominees—directed to Ms. Kagan and directed to others—have not been about how they would decide a specific case. But in the confirmation hearing with Ms. Kagan, if we really couldn't get answers from her, it is hard to see any nominee from whom we could get answers in light of the fact that she had written extensively on the nomina-

tion procedure in a now famous University of Chicago Law Review where she criticized specifically Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer for stonewalling the Senate and criticized the Senate for not doing its job in getting information. But her confirmation proceeding was, in effect, a repeat performance. So we are really searching for ways to make a determination as to ideology to have some accountability for what the Justices are doing.

In a later floor statement, I will address the separate issue as to what, if anything, is possible when the nominees do a 180-degree U-turn, as Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Alito did when they decided the case of *Citizens United*, upsetting 100 years of precedent and a 100,000-page record in allowing corporations to engage in political advertising.

One of the suggestions which has been made following the proceedings for confirmation of Justice Scalia in 1986 where he would answer virtually nothing, Senator DeConcini and I considered a resolution to establish Senate standards. Then, in the next year, Judge Bork answered a great many questions as he, in fact, had to because he had such an extensive paper trail and had such an unusual interpretation of the Constitution on original intent. So after the Bork hearings, Senator DeConcini and I decided we didn't need to proceed. Perhaps we were too precipitous because the following nominations since Judge Bork in 1986 produced the same result: failure to really answer questions.

Another possibility was suggested by later Justice Louis Brandeis in a famous article he wrote in 1913 talking about sunlight being the best disinfectant and that publicity was the way to deal with society's ills. That raises the possibility of finding accountability through informing the public as to what is going on. The Supreme Court flies under the radar. It is pretty hard to get an understanding as to what is going on.

A noted commentator on the Supreme Court, Stuart Taylor, has made a comment that the way to get accountability is to infuriate the public. That was his standard. He said until the public is infuriated, the Supreme Court will be able to continue to take power from the other branches of government and, most importantly, from my point of view, institutionally from the Senate of the United States and from the House of Representatives, in some cases where they leave the Executive with extensive authority. By refusing to decide a case, as they refused to decide the conflict between the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which is the congressional determination that the only way to get a warrantless wiretap is through a court order showing the probable cause and the President's assertion of article II power as Commander in Chief or the court's refusal to take up the issue of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act