Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague Senator CASEY for those very generous remarks. He and I have worked together for the past 3 years plus, but beyond that we have worked during his tenure as a statewide officeholder, as Auditor General and Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I have not only worked with ROBERT CASEY, JR., but I have worked with Robert Casey, Sr., his distinguished father who was Governor of the State.

While we were waiting for the train to arrive—this is an unusual evening in the Senate because the Acela was late, and it had a number of Senators coming from New York and points north. The train was about an hour late, so the vote was kept open for their arrival, and we had a chance to reminisce about some of our experiences in the past, such as when I first met his father, who was a young State senator and a candidate for Governor, when I was District Attorney of Philadelphia, and reminiscing about the controversial report his father, as Auditor General, made in 1970 on welfare problems, and it was very controversial. Although we were of different parties at that time, I backed up Auditor General Casey because I was the DA and I knew he was right. When his father was Governor, I was a frequent recipient of calls on the need for some assistance for Pennsylvania, and the answer was always yes.

I am delighted to be his colleague in the Senate, and I thank him for those remarks.

While waiting for the past hour, I have been reflecting on the 10,000 votes I have cast. I said to Senator CASEY, it gave me a unique time where I had nothing else to do except to wait for some Senators to arrive on the late train to vote, and I made some notes about those reflections.

Senator MENENDEZ arrived on the train and has some comments to make, and I told him I would yield to him. When he has finished his statement, in the absence of any other Senator seeking recognition, I intend to reflect on those 10,000 votes. So I say to people who think C–SPAN is about to go off, if you are interested, wait.

I again thank Senator CASEY and defer to my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, let me first of all thank my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding before he reflects on the history of his 10,000 votes. I am sure there are many of great consequence he cast that he is going to reflect upon.

I want to echo my colleague from Pennsylvania as well, Senator CASEY's comments about Senator SPECTER. I will only focus on two points of the many he mentioned. One is the National Institutes of Health. The reality is, ARLEN SPECTER's advocacy and passion—partly from his own personal experience when he has had to overcome some of his own personal health challenges—has given him a real understanding of what the National Institutes of Health is all about and what it means. His advocacy and work there has made a huge difference in the lives of literally millions of people across this country based on the research that is done there that ultimately can save a life or can enhance a life. That is a legacy that any one of us in the United States would want to give.

Secondly, the other thing I respect about Senator SPECTER is that when he has had to cross the aisle in order to make sure he has stood on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania and in the Nation's best interests, he has done that. Nowadays, that is a lot more difficult to find. Senator SPECTER has a history of crossing the aisle when it is necessary on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania to stand by their side. That did not impede him from moving to whomever he could with whomever he could in this body and with administrations, both present and past, in order to achieve those goals. I salute him in that respect.

I appreciate Senator SPECTER letting me have a few minutes on an incredibly important issue.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE JOSEPH A. GREENAWAY, JR.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit of a distinguished jurist from New Jersey, Judge Joseph A. Greenaway, Jr., which seems to be blocked by some people in this Chamber yet unknown. I know it is not from my side of the aisle because I have checked. So it is on the Republican side of the aisle. Yet Judge Greenaway fully embodies the respect for justice and the rule of law that we demand of all of our judges. He has strong bipartisan support, and his nomination could easily have been taken care of this evening but for a few Republicans blocking the vote.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: End the obstructionism. Do what is right. Let us have a vote on this eminently qualified, noncontroversial nominee. It is clear the obstruction of this nomination is not about this nominee. He is eminently qualified. I will talk about that in a moment. And it is not about what is right for this Nation. It certainly is not about acting in the best interests of a badly overburdened Federal judicial system. In fact, oddly enough, it is not about ideology. It is not even about Judge Greenaway or the other seven nominees whom our friends are delaying. It is about the politics of having this President and this Congress fail, the politics of no, the politics of obstruction, of stopping any progress on any issue and almost every nominee. Our friends on the other side came to the floor in the last administration, the administration of President Bush, on countless occasions to argue for an up-or-down vote. I heard that many times: ''Give us an up-or-down vote,'' demanding that a simple majority of the President's nominees is all that is needed—a simple majority of this Chamber. That is a position diametrically opposed to their position today. In fact, they went so far at that time to proclaim that filibusters of the President's nominations were unconstitutional, and they threatened what became known then as the nuclear option—to undo the right of Senators to filibuster a nominee. Well, which is it? What do my friends on the other side believe is right or is the question: What do they believe will work? Where is the call for an up-or-down vote now from our Republican colleagues? Where is the argument on the unconstitutionality of filibusters now? You can't have it both ways.

We can agree to disagree on some nominees on principle, and we have over the years. But the numbers this year belie any notion that the obstruction of Judge Greenaway and all the pending nominees is purely a matter of principle. In this past year, our Republican colleagues have obstructed virtually all the President's nominees, confirming only 12 Federal circuit and district court nominees, the lowest number in a half century. Let me repeat that: the lowest number in a half century. Contrast that to the 100 judicial nominees confirmed in the 17 months Chairman LEAHY chaired the Judiciary Committee during the Bush administration.

As Chairman LEAHY has pointed out on this floor, in December of 2001, the first year of George W. Bush's administration, Senate Democrats confirmed 10 of President Bush's nominees in December alone, leaving only 4 nominations on the calendar—in the first year. All four of those nominees were confirmed soon after the Senate returned the following year, in 2002. In stark contrast, this past December, our Republican colleagues left 10 judicial nominees without Senate action and insisted on returning 2 of them to the President for renomination.

So I urge my colleagues to reconsider, to end this obstructionism, and allow this body to exercise its constitutional authority of advice and consent and confirm the nomination of Joseph A. Greenaway to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He is eminently qualified and deserves consideration.

Let me close on that. At the age of 40, Justice Greenaway was appointed by then-President Clinton to the Federal bench, where he served for over a dozen years with distinction. By the way, he got put through by unanimous consent. It wasn't even—it was by unanimous consent of the Chamber when he was put on the Federal bench. He went through unanimously, out of the Judiciary Committee, for this position on the appellate division—unanimously out of the committee.

Joe Greenaway earned a Bachelor of Arts from Columbia University, where he was honored in 1997 with the Columbia University Medal of Excellence and with the John Jay Award in 2003. He was an Earl Warren Legal Scholar at Harvard University. He clerked for the late Honorable Vincent L. Broderick in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York. He became an assistant U.S. attorney in Newark and later received a promotion to become chief of the Narcotics Bureau. In the private sector, he was an associate with the firm of Kramer, Levin, Nessen, Kamin, and Frankel and served at Johnson & Johnson as in-house counsel. He has an incredible background. He is chair emeritus of the Columbia College Black Alumni Council and has been an adjunct professor at Rutgers Law School.

Currently, he is an adjunct professor at the Cordozo School of Law and at Columbia College, where he teaches courses on trial practice and a seminar on the Supreme Court.

But this is merely Judge Greenaway's impressive resume in one way—a distinguished resume to say the least—but it does not do justice to the man. There is an inscription over the 10th Street entrance to the Department of Justice a few blocks from here. It reads: ''Justice in the life and conduct of the State is possible only as it first resides in the hearts and souls of men.''

The two qualities of justice do indeed reside in the heart and soul of Joe Greenaway, and he deserves a vote.

He grew up in Harlem in the northeast Bronx. He is accomplished and successful, but he has always given much back. He has been instrumental in mentoring students and graduates, often taking them under his wing as law clerks or fellows. He once said:

> I tell my students to work hard and work smart. Our profession requires a drive to search for perfection; without that goal mediocrity becomes the norm.

He has always strived for excellence. He has always taught young lawyers to do the same.

So Judge Joseph Greenaway respects the law. For all that Judge Greenaway stands for—for justice served; for honor and decency; for the qualities and qualifications that have brought him to this place in his career; for his years of service and his judicial temperament; for his respect for the Constitution and precedent; for the fact that justice does, indeed, reside in the heart and soul of this man; for the fact that, in fact, he was unanimously passed out of the Judiciary Committee and previously, to become a district court judge, had the unanimous consent of this body—somehow, despite all that history and all that qualification, there are colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle holding up this nominee.

I urge my colleagues to end the obstructionism and to give us a vote up or down. I know when we get that vote, Judge Joseph A. Greenaway will be confirmed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. I will continue to come to the floor to dramatize this challenge. We cannot have a set of circumstances under which the judiciary labors, especially with eminently qualified, bipartisan candidates, because there are those who want to see this President or this Congress fail. It is about the Nation not failing. It is about our judicial system not failing. It is not about the politics of obstructionism.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, as I commented a few moments ago, I thanked Senator CASEY for the comments he made about my 10,000th vote and said that I would be speaking at the conclusion. But I yielded to the Senator from New Jersey because my speech will be somewhat longer, and Senator LAUTENBERG has now come to the floor. I don't want to keep him for a lengthy speech, so I would be glad to yield—if I may inquire as to how long the Senator from New Jersey will take.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would say about 10 minutes. Ten minutes would be more than adequate.

Mr. SPECTER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey. I had called some family, to be very personal about it—my wife, sister, aunt—and I don't want them to think I am not going to speak, but for 10 minutes I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, and I congratulate him for having cast 10,000 votes. We all know Senator SPECTER so well, and we know that 10,000 votes cast by him represents 10,000 thoughtful decisions. He is a lawyer of distinction. He came to the Senate and was accorded respect for his views. We have often listened to debates where Senator SPECTER participated and his views were always respected by others and carried much weight. He and I have gotten along over the years very well. I was pleased to see him have the courage to switch parties because of his beliefs in how this body ought to function, and we congratulate him for that as well. The only disagreement we have is whether the Philadelphia football team, the Eagles, is more loved by people in the southern part of our State, New Jersey, or whether their loyalty is better appreciated by those from Pennsylvania. It depends, with me, on what their record is. I am sorry, excuse me.

But it is a pleasure to serve with Senator SPECTER. I am somewhat behind him for the number of votes cast, but it is easy and particularly when I am asked: Well, what was the vote 8,003 that you cast? I say: Well, I will have to check the RECORD. Thousands of votes are a lot of votes. They require a lot of decisionmaking. Once again, I congratulate Senator SPECTER for his good decisionmaking.

GREENAWAY NOMINATION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, tonight I wish to highlight what my colleague, Senator MENENDEZ, talked about in getting on with the business of the Senate and defining what takes place in this body, this place of the people, where some say we shouldn't move quickly—we shouldn't move, period—on decisions that matter because, politically, our colleagues on the other side are determined to do whatever they can to bring down this administration's ability to function, including the majority's ability to function.

I rise to talk about a target that our Republican friends have in their sight and that is Judge Joseph A. Greenaway, Jr., of New Jersey. He exemplifies the dreams so many have about what can be accomplished in life. He is the son of a nurse and a carpenter. He rose from humble beginnings to attend Columbia University and Harvard Law School.

Joseph Greenaway is a well-qualified judge. He served on our district court for over a decade with distinction. His credentials and qualifications are beyond reproach, and there is no opposition to his nomination to the Third Circuit Court. Yet the Republicans blocked a vote—not cast a vote but blocked a vote—on his confirmation tonight. It is unconscionable. Let the Senate make its decision. Those on the other side who don't want to vote for him, let them say so. Let them say it with a vote. But, no, they insist on tying things up, which has been the manner of things here for some time now, since President Obama has taken office. This man and our country deserve better than what we are seeing.

Some of us in this Chamber came to Congress to move the country forward because we are so grateful to this Nation of ours that we want to make sure—and I speak for myself, but I am sure I speak for others—that we are so grateful for the opportunities that befell us and our families. I speak from personal experience. I come from parents who were brought here as immigrants when they were infants and had the opportunity to do well in business for a number of years after coming and being here for 25 years.

I want to do this job because I wish to help people. I know what it is like to be deprived of resources. It is painful. I saw it through my entire childhood. My father died when he was 43, without any insurance, without any help from the government to help my mother carry on while I was in the Army.

Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues have a different agenda. They are focused on bringing this Chamber to a standstill. They are focused on delay and stopping progress on nearly every issue. The filibuster used to be reserved for only the most controversial issues and was meant to allow enough time for debate. Now it is being abused, hijacked by Republicans who are more interested in political and procedural games than in legislating.