



CONCERNED WOMEN FOR AMERICA
JAN LARUE, CHIEF COUNSEL
STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE HONORABLE JUDGE SAMUEL A. ALITO JR.
AS ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C.
JANUARY 5, 2006

As an attorney who has appeared before many judges, let me say as clearly as I can: If my life, liberty or property, or that of a loved one, were in jeopardy in a court of law, I would want Samuel Alito to be the judge.

Do I think that would guarantee that I would win? No. But I am confident that my constitutional rights would be upheld, that I would receive a fair trial and “Equal Justice Under Law.”

Judge Alito will be favorably reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee along partisan lines. He will win confirmation by the full Senate. Indeed, if every member of the Senate believed in justice half as much as they claim to, Judge Alito would be confirmed by unanimous consent of the Senate. That is what this great judge deserves.

The American Bar Association did just that by giving him a unanimous well-qualified rating—the same rating it gave him in 1990. It is a validation of his 15-year paper trail on the Third Circuit.

One can hope for the right and just thing, but if the past is prologue and expressed intentions are realized, there will not be a unanimous vote. Partisan politicians will defer

to the unreasonable demands of special interest groups. Truth, justice and constitutional oaths will be trampled underfoot along with Judge Alito's reputation and record.

Thankfully, however, despite distorting his record, maligning his character and impugning his integrity, the truth about this eminently qualified, exemplary judge will carry the day. That is because the American people are good judges of people. They are too smart to fall for the same old, unfounded claims that have been made about past nominees. The left has cried wolf far too many times.

For example, take NOW then and now:

"Justice for Women will be ignored," exclaimed NOW President Wilma Scott Heide opposing the nomination of Lewis Powell to the Supreme Court in 1971.

"Women of this nation will view a vote to approve Judge John Paul Stevens as a vote to limit the rights of many women to choose whether to have a child," cried NOW President Margaret Drashler in 1975.

"A total lack of commitment to equality and justice under law," as NOW President Molly Yard vilified Supreme Court Nominee Anthony Kennedy in 1988.

Then there's my favorite: "Stop Souter or Women Will Die," the rallying cry of NOW in 1990 opposing Supreme Court Nominee David Souter.

NOW's Web site today has the same old script: "Contact your senators and in no uncertain terms urge them to vote 'NO' on Supreme Court nominee Samuel Alito. Women's lives and women's rights are at great risk with this nominee, who will surely vote to erode women's access to abortion, and eventually overturn *Roe v. Wade*."

It is quite telling that those who were willing to let nine justices vote on abortion are not willing to allow nine other justices or the American people the opportunity to vote on it.

The left says that Alito is not “mainstream” and, for the most part, defines mainstream by whether or not he voted for a particular class of claimants, against the government, against the death penalty, for the environment, against employers and business, for abortion rights, against religious expression, and against states rights. Sadly, the rightness or wrongness of the particular claim matters not to those who want judicial enforcement of a political agenda. But it matters greatly to Americans looking for justice and the rule of law.

Judge Alito should be and will be confirmed because his rulings demonstrate that he impartially applies the law to the facts before him and because his philosophy is mainstream America. He said it best:

I believe very strongly in limited government, federalism, free enterprise, the supremacy of the elected branches of government, the need for a strong defense and effective law enforcement, and the legitimacy of a government role in protecting traditional values. In the field of law, I disagree strenuously with the usurpation by the judiciary of decision-making authority that should be exercised by the branches of government responsible to the electorate.