



STATEMENT ON PRESIDENTIAL SIGNING STATEMENTS
BY THE COALITION TO DEFEND CHECKS AND BALANCES

AN INITIATIVE OF THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT

The Constitution Project
1025 Vermont Avenue, NW
Third Floor
Washington, DC 20005

202-580-6920 (phone)
202-580-6929 (fax)

info@constitutionproject.org
www.constitutionproject.org

STATEMENT ON PRESIDENTIAL SIGNING STATEMENTS BY THE COALITION TO DEFEND CHECKS AND BALANCES

We are members of the Constitution Project's Coalition to Defend Checks and Balances. We are former government officials and judges, scholars, and other Americans who are deeply concerned about the risk of permanent and unchecked presidential power, and the accompanying failure of Congress to exercise its responsibility as a separate and independent branch of government.

We write to express our concerns about certain uses of presidential signing statements that we believe greatly increase this risk. We applaud Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter for calling a hearing to focus attention on an issue that goes to the very heart of our system of government.

Presidential signing statements – formal expressions of the views of a President regarding legislation that he has just signed into law – are nearly as old as the Republic. There is nothing inherently troubling about them. The question is how they are used.

Throughout history, signing statements have been used to thank supporters, provide reasons for signing a bill, and express satisfaction or, on occasion, displeasure with legislation passed by Congress.

More recently, Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and Bill Clinton have used signing statements as a tool to express constitutional and other objections to legislation, influence judicial interpretation, and otherwise advance policy goals.

President George W. Bush has further transformed the use of the presidential signing statement, using it on numerous occasions to challenge or deny effect to legislation that he considers unconstitutional. Since 2001, President Bush has objected on constitutional grounds to over 500 provisions in over 100 pieces of legislation, a number approaching the 575 constitutional statements issued by all of his predecessors combined. One scholar has identified eighty-two instances in which President Bush has disputed a bill's constitutionality on the basis that Article II of the Constitution does not allow Congress to interfere with the President's "power to supervise the unitary executive," seventy-seven instances in which he has claimed that, as President, he has "exclusive power over foreign affairs," and forty-eight instances in which he has claimed "authority to determine and impose national security classifications and withhold information."

These bills cover not only the so-called war on terror, but also affirmative action programs, requirements of statistical compilations by executive agencies, and establishing basic qualifications for executive appointees.

Our government's system of checks and balances is guaranteed by the Constitution's separation of powers among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. This system has protected the people from tyranny, and the states from federal overreaching, since the earliest days of the Republic.

Article II of the Constitution requires the President to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The Constitution also gives the President the authority to veto laws that he finds constitutionally suspect. But

the fact that such vetoes may be overridden indicates that, in the final analysis, the Constitution gives greater weight to the collective opinion of congressional super-majorities than it does to the judgment of a sole individual. By signing a particular bill into law, but then issuing a signing statement that declares that he will not give effect to it, or to a provision of it, the President is effectively vetoing the law without affording Congress the opportunity to override the veto, as the Constitution requires. He is effectively asserting unilateral power to repeal and amend legislation. He also displaces the judiciary as the final expositor of the Constitution and undermines the principle of judicial review crucial to our system of checks and balances.

In a democracy, executive branch assertions of power, such as signing statements, should be debated in public, but often are not. As our initial statement declared, “The executive branch, which the Constitution requires ‘shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,’ should not withhold information from Congress, which needs such information to carry out its constitutional responsibility to enact legislation and to conduct oversight, nor from the public, unless legitimate national security concerns require it.”

To restore our system of checks and balances, Congress can, and must, exercise its responsibility as a separate and independent branch of government. Congress has a clear constitutional obligation to make the laws, and when it has made such laws, to ensure through oversight that the executive branch is enforcing those laws and is otherwise carrying out its responsibilities in a manner consistent with the laws and the Constitution.

The President and the Congress, as well as the courts, have a solemn constitutional obligation to protect and defend the system of separation of powers our country’s founders envisioned. We therefore urge the President to immediately abandon these uses of the presidential signing statement. We also urge Congress to make unmistakably clear the link between a President’s inappropriate use of signing statements and the costs of doing so. Congress can use its “power of the purse” to deny the President appropriations that he has requested; it can refuse to advance legislation that the President favors; or it can repeal legislation authorizing programs that the President supports.

We joined the Coalition to Defend Checks and Balances because:

[W]e agree that we face a constitutional crisis, not about whether the U.S. should do the things this or any other president proposes, but about who is empowered to make these decisions, and how those decisions are made. In an ongoing war against terror that will endure for decades, the answer to this question is even more important.

We are united in our belief that America’s greatness is due in no small measure to our system of government in which power and authority are deliberately divided. The separation of powers is not a mere ‘technicality.’ It is the centerpiece of our Constitution and our freedoms depend upon it.

No matter what their political affiliation and philosophy, Americans must never forget these lessons or our freedoms will become a thing of the past, impossible to recover.

The Coalition to Defend Checks and Balances
Endorsing the Constitution Project's:
STATEMENT ON PRESIDENTIAL SIGNING STATEMENTS

MEMBERS

Bob Barr, Former Member of Congress (R-GA); CEO, Liberty Strategies, LLC; the 21st Century Liberties Chair for Freedom and Privacy at the American Conservative Union; Chairman of Patriots to Restore Checks and Balances; practicing attorney; Consultant on Privacy Matters for the ACLU

David E. Birenbaum, Of Counsel, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP; Senior Scholar, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; US Ambassador to the UN for UN Management and Reform, 1994-1996

Christopher Bryant, Professor of Law, University of Cincinnati; Assistant to the Senate Legal Counsel, 1997-99

David Cole, Professor, Georgetown University Law Center

Phillip J. Cooper, Professor, Mark O. Hatfield School of Government, Portland State University

John J. Curtin, Jr., Bingham McCutchen LLP; former President, American Bar Association

John W. Dean, Counsel to President Richard Nixon

Mickey Edwards, Lecturer at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; former Member of Congress (R-OK) and Chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee

Richard Epstein, James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law, the University of Chicago; Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow, the Hoover Institution

Bruce Fein, Constitutional lawyer and international consultant at Bruce Fein & Associates and The Lichfield Group; Associate Deputy Attorney General, Reagan administration

Eugene R. Fidell, President, National Institute of Military Justice; Partner, Feldesman Tucker Leifer Fidell LLP

Melvin A. Goodman, Senior Fellow, Director of the National Security Project, Center for International Policy

Morton H. Halperin, Director of U.S. Advocacy, Open Society Institute; Senior Vice President, Center for American Progress; Director of the Policy Planning Staff, Department of State, Clinton administration

Philip Heymann, James Barr Ames Professor of Law, Harvard Law School; Deputy Attorney General, Clinton Administration

Robert E. Hunter, U.S. Ambassador to NATO, 1993-1998

David Kay, Former Head of the Iraq Survey Group and Special Adviser on the Search for Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction to the Director of Central Intelligence

David Keene, Chairman, American Conservative Union

Christopher S. Kelley, Visiting Assistant Professor of Political Science, Miami University (OH)

Robert A. Levy, Constitutional Scholar

Thomas Mann, Senior Fellow and W. Averell Harriman Chair, Governance Studies Program, the Brookings Institution

Norman Ornstein, Resident Scholar, the American Enterprise Institute

Thomas R. Pickering, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs 1997-2000; United States Ambassador and Representative to the United Nations, 1989-1992

Jack Rakove, W. R. Coe Professor of History and American Studies and Professor of Political Science, Stanford University

Peter Raven-Hansen, Professor; Glen Earl Weston Research Professor, George Washington University Law School

William S. Sessions, Former Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; former Chief Judge, United States District Court for the Western District of Texas

Jerome J. Shestack, Partner, Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen LLP; former President, American Bar Association

David Skaggs, Executive Director, Colorado Commission on Higher Education; former Member of Congress (D-CO)

Suzanne E. Spaulding, Principal, Bingham Consulting Group; former Chief Counsel for Senate and House Intelligence Committees; former Executive Director of National Terrorism Commission; former Assistant General Counsel of CIA

Geoffrey Stone, Harry Kalven, Jr. Distinguished Service Professor of Law, the University of Chicago

James A. Thurber, Director and Distinguished Professor, Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies, American University

Charles Tiefer, General Counsel (Acting) 1993-94, Solicitor and Deputy General Counsel, 1984-95, U.S. House of Representatives

Don Wallace, Jr., Professor, Georgetown University Law Center; Chairman, International Law Institute

John W. Whitehead, President, the Rutherford Institute

Sean Wilentz, George Henry Davis 1886 Professor of American History and Director of the Program in American History, Princeton University

Roger Wilkins, Clarence J. Robinson Professor of History and American Culture, George Mason University; Director of U. S. Community Relations Service, Johnson Administration

Affiliations Listed for Identification Purposes Only