

States with unfunded Federal mandates which are truly bad for every single State—not just mine but every State—from sea to shining sea.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Rosanna Malouf Peterson, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 6 o'clock shall be equally divided between the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, and the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS.

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, we are about to vote on the nomination of Rosanna Malouf Peterson to the District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

I am pleased to be able to support the nomination, as I have most of the nominations President Obama has submitted. I think we are moving in a rather expeditious way in the process to confirm Federal judges. Less than a week ago, we confirmed Judge Beverly Martin to serve on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Frankly, we failed to confirm her before Christmas because the Democratic leadership, for some reason, would not bring her nomination up. I cleared it on our side on several different occasions and made sure there were no objections. At any rate, she was confirmed and she is now on that bench.

Before the recess, we confirmed two judges, seven U.S. attorneys, and five U.S. marshals.

We are moving faster than we have previously—at least in comparison to President Bush's tenure. This chart shows the average number of days to confirm President Bush's circuit court nominations. We waited an average of 350 days for confirmation. President Obama's nominees are being confirmed

about 4½ months faster, which is a good bit faster. In addition, the Judiciary Committee has held hearings for every single circuit court nominee.

This chart shows that during President Bush's tenure, it was 350 days, and for President Obama, it is a little over 200 days. For President Clinton, it was under 250. The others in the past were quicker. But these are lifetime appointments. We have had some more intense scrutiny of nominees, which I think is appropriate. But most of the nominees are coming through well and should move on to confirmation at a reasonable pace.

I will note that if a judge who is about to obtain a lifetime appointment fails to convince Members of the Senate that they are committed to faithfully following the law, being a neutral umpire, not favoring one side in the "ball game" over the other—if they are not committed to that, then they should not be confirmed. Or if they have other weaknesses, such as lack of skill, or a demonstrated bias, or a lack of background and ability, then I think they should be examined closely and not confirmed.

On the district court nominees, you can see that President Obama's district court nominees are being confirmed, on average, a little over 100 days after being nominated. Whereas, President Bush's were at 180. Under President Clinton, it was about 130. So President Obama is doing well there as well—pretty close to President Bush 1—for nominations moving forward.

I am pleased with this nominee. I think she has the skills and gifts necessary to be a good Federal judge. I hope so. She has the support of her Senators. She has been moved through committee, and I believe she will be confirmed when we vote. I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate considers the nomination of Rosanna M. Peterson to fill a judicial vacancy in the Eastern District of Washington. While I am pleased that we will consider, and I am confident the Senate will confirm, this nominee, I remain disappointed by the Republican delays and obstruction.

This is only the 14th Federal circuit or district court nominee considered since President Obama was inaugurated over 1 year ago. By this date during President Bush's second year in office, the Senate had confirmed more than double that number, having confirmed 30 of his judicial nominees to lifetime appointments on the Federal courts.

Last Friday the majority leader tried to secure an agreement to take up the next judicial nominee on the Senate Executive Calendar, but Republican objection continued to stall consideration of Judge Joseph Greenaway's nomination to the Third Circuit. That is a shame. He is a good judge. His nomination was reported unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee al-

most 4 months ago, on October 1 last year. Senator SESSIONS praised him at his confirmation hearing. I do not know why he is being stalled, and no one has explained. His is one of the many outstanding judicial nominations reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee that remain stalled on the Senate Executive Calendar. They should have been confirmed last year, and would have been, but for Republican objection. When considered they will be confirmed, but not before being needlessly delayed for months.

I saw last week's statement by the Judiciary Committee's ranking Republican member, when the Senate finally considered the long-delayed nomination of Beverly Martin to the Eleventh Circuit. He was misinformed about that nomination, as he was about the history of other nominations. In fact, I expedited consideration of Judge Martin's nomination. The Senate Democratic leadership sought an agreement for prompt consideration of Judge Martin's nomination but was rebuffed by Republicans who were in no hurry to consider it. Indeed, we have been seeking time agreements for the consideration of both Judge Martin and Judge Greenaway for weeks and months. Republicans finally agreed at the end of last year to consider Judge Martin's nomination after the recess. I had pressed for Judge Martin and the many other judicial nominees who had been reported unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee to be considered and confirmed before Christmas last year. Republicans would not agree. I asked repeatedly that we act on all the judicial nominees on the Senate Executive Calendar in December. The reason the Senate did not was not because any Democratic Senator objected. It is solely because Republicans would not agree.

The efforts of the Democratic leadership to seek a time agreement for prompt consideration of Judge Martin's nomination were rebuffed by Republicans, just as they are now refusing to consider the nomination of Judge Greenaway.

The Republicans unsuccessfully filibustered the nomination of Judge David Hamilton last November, having delayed its consideration for months. Republicans insisted on hours of debate for the nomination of Judge Andre Davis, who was confirmed with more than 70 votes. They insisted on debate on the nomination of Judge Gerard Lynch, who was confirmed with more than 90 votes. As the Senate Democratic leadership was forced to work through a number of nominations denied consent for prompt consideration, the last Federal circuit court nominations considered before Judge Martin was Judge Hamilton in November. It is true that Judge Davis and Judge Hamilton were considered and confirmed by the Senate before Judge Martin, but they were also considered three months earlier by the Senate Judiciary Committee than Judge Martin. They had

been on the Senate Executive Calendar since before she was even nominated. I do not fault the Senate Democratic leadership for following that order of consideration.

What the ranking Republican member of Judiciary does not acknowledge, and perhaps is unaware of, is that it was his own Republican leadership that slowed consideration of Judge Martin. Even the ranking Republican member has no excuse for the delay after November 19, when both Judge Davis and Judge Hamilton had been confirmed. For the last 2 months, Judge Martin's nomination was stalled because Republicans would not agree to consider it before January 20.

Judge Martin's nomination offers a troubling example, as well, of the consequences of the Republican strategy of obstruction and delay. Even though Judge Martin was a well-respected district court judge with the strong support of both of her home State Republican Senators, Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator ISAKSON, and the highest possible rating from the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, it took over 4 months to reach agreement with the Republican leadership for the Senate to consider her nomination.

Regrettably, the nomination of Judge Greenaway of New Jersey to the Third Circuit is another example of these tactics. The Judiciary Committee favorably reported his nomination by unanimous consent last October 1, and he is now the longest pending judicial nomination on the Senate Executive Calendar. The Democratic leadership sought to build on our belated progress last week when we were allowed finally to consider and confirm Judge Martin. We asked for agreement to consider the nomination of Judge Greenaway. As the majority leader indicated last Friday: "[The Democratic] majority was in a position to agree to a vote on the nomination of Joseph Greenaway to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Third Circuit. However, I was advised the Republicans would not agree to such request." See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, S166, January 22, 2010, daily ed. Again, Senate Republicans have withheld consent and have objected to consideration of a nominee. Instead, they would consent only to consideration of a district court nominee, Professor Peterson. While it is appropriate that the Senate considers Professor Peterson's nomination today, we should also be able, in regular order, to consider other nominations without months of delay.

None of the eight remaining judicial nominations currently pending on the Senate Executive Calendar should be controversial. Many, like Professor Peterson and Judge Greenaway, were reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee without a single dissenting vote. We have wasted weeks and months having to seek time agreements in order to consider nominations that were reported by the Senate Judi-

ciary Committee unanimously and who are then confirmed unanimously by the Senate once they were finally allowed to be considered.

These obstructionist tactics from Republicans last year led to the lowest number of judicial confirmations in more than 50 years. Only 12 of President Obama's judicial nominations to Federal circuit and district courts were confirmed all last year. The 12 Federal circuit and district court nominees confirmed last year was less than half of what we achieved during President Bush's first tumultuous year. In the second half of 2001, the Democratic majority in the Senate proceeded to confirm 28 judges. In the 17 months that I chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first term, the Senate confirmed 100 of his judicial nominees.

The Judiciary Committee's ranking Republican member was also mistaken last week when he stated that Democrats sent 40 of President Bush's judicial nominations back to the White House in August 2001. It was the objections of the Republican minority, in fact objection by the Republican leader, Senator Lott, that resulted in the Senate returning over 40 of President Bush's nominations before the August recess to the White House.

Just before the Senate recessed in early August 2001, the Senate's Democratic leadership requested all pending judicial nominations be retained through the August recess. That is right; the Democrats in the Senate were asking that the judicial nominations not be returned but be allowed to continue in place. I know; I was the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee at the time. In fact, the only two nominations the Democratic leadership sought to return to the President were two controversial executive nominees: Mary Sheila Gall, nominated to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and Otto J. Reich to be an Assistant Secretary of State. The Commerce Committee had voted not to report the Gall nomination. The Reich nomination had become highly controversial and the Assistant Majority Leader sought to give the President an opportunity to reconsider the nomination. The proposal by the Democratic leadership would have continued in place every other nomination including every judicial nomination notwithstanding the Senate rule that nominations should be returned to the President when the Senate recesses for a period of more than 30 days.

At that time it was the Republican leader, Senator Lott, who objected to the Democratic consent request and insisted on returning all nominations, including all judicial nominations, to President Bush in early August. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Vol. 147, No. 112, S8888 (Aug. 3, 2001). That Republican objection resulted in a strict application of the Senate rules which required needless paperwork and occa-

sioned more unnecessary delay in early September 2001.

I remember it well. In fact, in order to continue making progress on judicial nominations despite the action by the Senate Republican leader, I convened two unprecedented confirmation hearings during the August recess in 2001 for President Bush's nominees whose nominations were not technically pending before the Senate. They had been returned to the White House in accordance with Senator Lott's objection and were not renominated until the Senate reconvened in September. As Chairman, I convened those hearings as yet another indication of my commitment to filling vacancies on the Federal courts. We had already at that time been delayed for a month in reorganizing the Senate, as well as by President Bush's decision to turn away from a 50-year-old precedent to delay the American Bar Association's evaluation of a judicial nominee's qualifications until the nomination is made public. Even with the subsequent September 11 attacks, and the anthrax attacks in the Senate, we continued our work and ultimately confirmed 28 judicial nominees that year, including 10 confirmations in December 2001. By contrast, in December 2009, Senate Republicans would only allow consideration of three judicial nominations, returned two to the White House and carried over eight, including Judge Martin's, without final action.

There are currently more than 100 vacancies on the Federal courts around the country. Professor Peterson will fill one of those vacancies but we must do better. The American people deserve better. The cost will be felt by ordinary Americans seeking justice in our overburdened Federal courts.

I am pleased that today we will confirm Professor Peterson. When confirmed, Professor Peterson will be the first woman to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington. She earned her B.A. and her M.A. from the University of North Dakota and her J.D., with distinction, from the University of North Dakota School of Law, where she served as editor-in-chief of the law review and was chosen by her professors as the "Outstanding Graduate."

After graduation, Professor Peterson clerked for U.S. District Court Judge Fred Van Sickle, whom she would now replace on the district court. Over the course of her 18-year legal career, Professor Peterson has been a law professor and a lawyer with a diverse private practice. Professor Peterson has the strong support of both home state Senators, Senator MURRAY and Senator CANTWELL.

I congratulate Professor Peterson and her family on her confirmation today.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise this evening in support of Professor Rosanna Malour Peterson. She is a distinguished law professor and attorney.

She is a woman who enjoys broad bipartisan support, and she deserves a seat on the Federal bench.

I was very pleased to introduce Professor Peterson before the Judiciary Committee last November and meet her and her family. I thought it was telling of the type of nominee she is that so many of her current and former students were there to support her confirmation. Tonight I am honored to recommend that the Senate confirm Professor Peterson as a district court judge for the Eastern District of my home State.

Professor Peterson has strong bipartisan support with good reason. She has devoted her career to serving the interests of justice and to instilling those values in a future generation of leaders.

Professor Peterson is a graduate of the University of North Dakota, where she earned her bachelor's, master's and law degrees. After law school, she started her legal career in the chambers of Judge Fred Van Sickle in Spokane. This is the very same seat she has now been nominated to fill.

During her distinguished career, Professor Peterson has worked as an attorney in Spokane area law firms, for corporate and individual clients. She has worked in private practice, often representing teachers, and she has worked as a court-appointed representative for criminal defendants in State and Federal court. Since 1999, Professor Peterson has been a law professor at the Gonzaga Law School in Spokane, where she is assistant professor of law and director of the law school's externship program. At the same time, Professor Peterson has maintained her private practice, where she has continued to work with Federal defendants on a pro bono or reduced-fee basis.

Professor Peterson has also played a leadership role in the Washington legal community, including serving as president of the Federal Bar Association of the Eastern District of Washington, president of the Washington Women Lawyers Bar Association, and on the judicial selection committee that helped recommend a magistrate judge in 2003. In recognition of her service in 2006, she was awarded the Smithmoore P. Myers Professionalism Award, the Spokane County Bar Association's highest honor.

Professor Peterson's accomplishments stand for themselves, but I have also received numerous letters and e-mails testifying to her toughness, her work ethic, her understanding of the law, and her advocacy on behalf of her clients. I have also received many letters from her former students and the people she has mentored, taught, and befriended over the years, letters that all say she has made a difference in the lives of so many in my State.

She clearly meets the standards of fairness, of evenhandedness, and adherence to the law that we expect of our Federal judges.

Outside of her many professional credentials, I have been impressed by her

professionalism and decency. I know I speak on behalf of a large number in the Washington State legal community in supporting the nomination of Rosanna Peterson to be the next district judge for the Eastern District of Washington.

I do think it is also important to note, for all my colleagues, that Professor Peterson's nomination was the product of a bipartisan selection committee that we use in my State of Washington to get to where we are with this confirmation vote. The commission was formed and did much of its work on Professor Peterson under the previous administration. It has proven that it works, even as we have moved from one administration to the next. I am proud to have created that selection commission and believe it is something that has served our State and our Federal judiciary well.

Therefore, it is my pleasure to recommend my colleagues confirm a great lawyer, a teacher, and a mentor who I believe will make an exceptional Federal judge. I urge my colleagues, this evening, to vote for the confirmation of Professor Rosanna Peterson as the next district judge for the Eastern District of Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today along with my colleagues, Senator LEAHY and Senator MURRAY, to express support for the confirmation of Professor Rosanna Peterson.

Professor Peterson has been nominated to be a U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington. I have no doubt that she will be an excellent Federal judge.

It is important to ensure that all branches of our government, including the judiciary, reflect diversity. If confirmed, Professor Peterson would be the first woman to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

Rosanna Peterson is currently an Assistant Professor of Law at Gonzaga University. She teaches Evidence, Federal Jurisdiction, and Trial Advocacy. She also runs the law school's externship program. Previously, she worked as an attorney in private practice at a number of Spokane law firms. She also clerked for U.S. District Court Judge Fred Van Sickle, whom she will now replace.

Professor Peterson has long been recognized by her peers for her intellect, dedication to the law, and commitment to equal justice.

She has been an active member of Washington State's legal community, having served as President of the Federal Bar Association for Eastern Washington, President of Washington Women Lawyers State Bar Association and President of the Spokane County Washington Women Lawyers Bar Association.

I urge the Senate to confirm Professor Peterson this afternoon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we go out of executive session and that I be allowed to speak for up to 3 minutes.

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

HONORING SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER ON HIS
10,000TH VOTE

Mr. REID. Madam President, in just a few minutes, as soon as I finish my remarks, we will move to vote on a judge. This will be the 10,000th vote of ARLEN SPECTER. I congratulate our distinguished colleague, Senator SPECTER, as he is about to cast his 10,000th vote as a Senator. He is only the 30th Senator to reach this number of five digits.

I have known Senator SPECTER for more than a quarter of a century. I have read his book. The book on his life is a remarkably impressive travel through his political career. He was a crime fighter as a district attorney. As far as lawyers go, the Specter genes are pretty good. The largest judgment in the history of the State of Nevada was a judgment his son received. His son is a prominent trial lawyer. Nevada knows the Specter name from more than Arlen.

Arlen has always been a man of honor and integrity and a tremendous public servant. The State of Pennsylvania, of course, is home to some of our Nation's most significant political history—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were drafted in Senator SPECTER's hometown of Philadelphia. No one has served that State longer than Senator SPECTER.

I congratulate my friend ARLEN SPECTER on making this historic milestone. It will make Pennsylvania proud. No one with whom I have served in the Senate has a better legal mind than ARLEN SPECTER. We always look to him when there is a complex legal issue to give one of his renowned statements.

I am sorry to hold up everybody, but I wanted this night not to go forward without saying something about our friend, ARLEN SPECTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Rosanna Malouf Peterson, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington?

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr.

INOUE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 3 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Akaka	Enzi	Menendez
Alexander	Feingold	Merkley
Barrasso	Feinstein	Mikulski
Baucus	Franken	Murray
Bayh	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Begich	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Grassley	Pryor
Bingaman	Gregg	Reed
Bond	Hagan	Reid
Boxer	Harkin	Risch
Brown	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bunning	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Johanns	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Sessions
Cardin	Kaufman	Shaheen
Carper	Kerry	Shelby
Casey	Kirk	Snowe
Chambliss	Kohl	Specter
Coburn	Kyl	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Lautenberg	Thune
Conrad	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Corker	LeMieux	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Levin	Vitter
Crapo	Lieberman	Voinovich
DeMint	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	Lugar	Whitehouse
Dorgan	McCain	Wicker
Durbin	McCaskey	Wyden
Ensign	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—11

Bennett	Hutchison	Murkowski
Brownback	Inhofe	Roberts
Burr	Inouye	Warner
Byrd	Klobuchar	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER CASTS HIS 10,000TH VOTE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak of my colleague, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, who tonight cast his 10,000th vote as a Member of the Senate. We watched history tonight. Sometimes we have a chance to witness history. Of course, we look forward to his many more votes, but we also look behind us at some of his own personal political history as well his service here in the Senate.

I will offer a few remarks tonight about his service. I can say, after knowing him for many years, and especially after serving with him for now more than 3 years, if you go down that list of votes—all those rollcall votes over many years, serving the people of Pennsylvania—he has had one priority with those votes: Those votes were cast on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania.

He has always been an independent voice for the people of our State. He has fought a lot of battles for the people of Pennsylvania. I know the people of our Commonwealth are proud of his service.

His public service began after he became a lawyer. He went to the University of Pennsylvania, and then to Yale Law School, and then eventually he joined the District Attorney's Office in Philadelphia. He rose through that office and became the District Attorney of Philadelphia. He was elected twice to that office and served 8 years.

He was elected to the Senate in 1980 and was reelected four times after that. He was reelected in 1986, 1992, 1998, and 2004. So he has performed those years of service as a Senator. Of course, it is more than about years and about votes. It certainly is about the substance of those votes, fighting those battles, such as on behalf of the veterans of Pennsylvania.

We have had a million or more veterans, for many years, in our State. Those who fought our wars, those who worked in our factories, those who went on to build Pennsylvania gave their first measure of devotion to the country fighting on battlefields. He has always fought for them. He chaired the Veterans' Affairs Committee here in the Senate. He continues those battles on behalf of the veterans of Pennsylvania.

On health care, we could talk for a long time about the battles he has fought over and over again; not only the battles he fought in the last year or two as the issue was being debated in the Senate, but especially the battles he fought over many years, battles on behalf of children and women, battles for health care for the vulnerable, those who were poor and may not have a strong advocate other than their Senators or Members of Congress. So he has fought battles on health care.

You could isolate a lot of different issues under that general heading, but one that comes to mind for me is the National Institutes of Health. No one I know of in the Senate has fought more battles for the National Institutes of Health and all of the research that comes from the great work done there, and all the cures, all the ways people are saved because of that research at NIH.

He has fought battles on job creation, not only to preserve and protect and create more jobs at a time of recession—such as the horrific recession we have been living through and our workers and families have been suffering

through—but battles over many years, battles to protect the rights of workers to organize and collectively bargain, battles to make sure jobs are kept in Pennsylvania instead of going overseas or somewhere else. He has fought those battles to protect our workers and our jobs.

He has fought battles on national defense, making sure we are doing everything possible to keep the people of our Commonwealth and our country safe from foreign enemies, safe from terrorists, and safe from those who seek to do us harm. Over many years, ARLEN SPECTER has cast those votes as well, keeping us safe and keeping us strong.

His independence is something that is critically important to any State, but especially a State such as Pennsylvania. We have a State of over 12 million people. We have a lot of different regions in our State, a lot of different constituencies, and a lot of different challenges all across the State.

What the people of Pennsylvania expect their Senators to do is to try their best to fight their battles, to try to remain an independent voice for them, not for some special interests in Washington. ARLEN SPECTER has done that for years, being that strong, consistent, independent voice for the people of our State.

He has had a strong sense of justice from the time he was a young lawyer, through his service as a prosecutor making sure our streets were safe in Philadelphia, and through what he has done here in the Senate, fighting battles for justice every day in his service in the Senate.

Finally, in a very broad sense, but a very important sense, not only when times are tough, as they are now economically, but even when times seem good, even when the budgets are better and people do not seem to be as concerned about what the Federal Government can do to help them through a difficult period—even in those times of prosperity, he has always fought for our workers and our families.

It is very easy for me to stand here, as someone who has watched him over the years in his service in this Senate—and I know as someone who has served with him for more than 3 years—it is very easy for me to say, without any effort at all, that those 10,000 votes he has cast have been votes on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania, and I believe for the best interests of the people of the United States of America.

I commend ARLEN on that tremendous vote total. I commend him also for his public service, his enduring public service for the people of Pennsylvania. I also commend his wife Joan and his family who I know have supported him for many years to make sure he could help us serve the people of Pennsylvania.

Congratulations, ARLEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.