

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those kinds of questions, what had my experience been, they were obviously part of the dialog always.

The CHAIRMAN. In this case, I must respectfully suggest that nothing is obvious in this hearing. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, in any event, they were surely part of the dialog. That was always very much on the table in every conversation. Do I remember particular conversations and the content thereof? No. No. It has been a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he ever go to a rally with you, a meeting with you? There must have been some things happening on campus.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We were at rallies inevitably, but for a purpose that is a little different, which was that as officers of the university we were responsible for making sure that things didn't get out of hand. So, yes, I am sure we were at rallies. Whether we were sympathetic or not and so forth, who can read the heart of a man? But, in any event, I am heartened by the fact that he was concerned about the issues—and remains so, apparently—and deeply concerned and always listening.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I appreciate my colleagues allowing me the indulgence of questioning one witness before the other two have spoken. Hopefully, I will be back, gentlemen, before the questioning of the two of you is over.

Let's proceed with Mr. Beck's testimony now. Again, I apologize. I am going to have to leave.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. BECK

Mr. BECK. No apology necessary, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for your comments.

My name is Robert L. Beck, and I am the immediate past chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

In 1982, I joined MADD following the death of my son, Michael, and his fiance, Lori, at the hands of a drunk driver.

As many of you know, this is the most frequently committed crime in America today. Some 22,000 people will die at the hands of drunk drivers this year. That is about 60 people a day, and several people will die while I give this testimony.

The mission of MADD is to stop the death and destruction from drunk driving and to be the voice of the victims of that crime. Our membership numbers approximately 3 million members and supporters, and we have some 400 chapters across the United States and operations in five foreign countries. This makes MADD today the largest organization of its kind, grassroots organization.

The education and public awareness programs of MADD have played a leadership role in changing public attitudes about drunk driving. Drunk driving is no longer considered an accident. It is seen for what it is: a violent crime, committed willfully, and in total disregard of the rights of an innocent public.

This change in attitude has permitted the enactment of stronger laws and more law enforcement. The law raising the minimum drinking age to 21 has saved thousands of young lives. MADD, with the help of Federal incentive grants authorized in the 1988 Omni-

bus Anti-Drug Abuse Act, is working to enact administrative license revocation in all States where it does not exist, along with Senators like Senator Biden and Senator Thurmond, who have helped try to sponsor legislation to change the loopholes in the Federal bankruptcy statutes which have permitted convicted DWI criminals to avoid their debts in dealing with bankruptcy to victims. You have also sponsored legislation to increase penalties for drunk driving in cases involving young children.

As America has learned from MADD over the past 10 years, so, too, has MADD learned. We have learned that tougher laws and more enforcement is useless without a strong, independent, and fearless judiciary to ensure that these laws are carried out. MADD understands that the courts need to keep a balance between the rights of our citizens as a society and as individuals. MADD faces a similar challenge. We seek to enforce the laws to protect all citizens from the criminal drunk driver. This is a right of society as a whole. Yet MADD is also an advocate for the individual rights of victims.

In no place is this more important than in our picture of the judiciary and presented in the U.S. Supreme Court. This is particularly true in the last term of that Court. It saw the Court wrestle with the balancing of rights in the sobriety checkpoint case, *Michigan v. Sitz*, and the use of video cameras to examine the condition of an alleged drunk driver in *Pennsylvania v. Muniz*. We, therefore, see the selection of Justices for the U.S. Supreme Court as extremely vital to the interests of MADD as well as the vital interest of our Nation.

As we view the selection process, we took a two-pronged approach in making an evaluation of candidates. The first test was we looked at the historical clarity and consistency of the thought process followed by the candidate in his or her judicial decisions. The second test looked to the results reached from those decisions and whether they were supportive of the mission and goals of MADD.

We asked ourselves about Judge Souter: Did he evidence an open mind toward drunk driving and related cases? Did he demonstrate mental acuity and a superior grasp of the Constitution and its history? Was there a quality of excellence in his legal analysis? And did he demonstrate judicial independence? There was a consistent application of all of this, in our opinion. We looked at some 200 of Judge Souter's opinions and decisions.

I think in the interest of time I will let you read through the analysis of the *State of New Hampshire v. Koppel*, which we have selected as a typical case to demonstrate the five points that I have just outlined.

I think the last thing that I would like to point out this morning is that MADD has not attempted to predict how Judge David Souter would act in the future. I think this is an impossible task. We have evaluated how he has acted in the past. We have looked for insight. We have looked for sensitivity to the rights of victims of drunk driving and the rights of society to be protected from the drunk driver. We like what we have seen. MADD is proud of its role in changing society's view regarding drunk driving, the drunk driver, and their victims. We have looked at the record of Judge

Souter and find that, on balance, he understands the true magnitude of this crime. We have concluded that Judge Souter and MADD share a common view of this particular crime and its consequences. He has demonstrated an ability to balance the historical values inherent in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights with the fact that those documents must be relevant to current history.

We, therefore, respectfully recommend your favorable consideration of David Souter as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Beck follows:]