

WILLIAM PRYOR ON THE ENVIRONMENT

Highlights:

- William Pryor opposed federal protection of endangered species.

Pryor Opposed Federal Protection Of Endangered Species

PRYOR OPPOSED FEDERAL PROTECTION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES

As An Attorney General, Pryor Filed An Amicus Brief Urging the Supreme Court To Reverse A Case That Determined The Commerce Clause Gave The Federal Government Authority To Protect An Endangered Wolf Species. According to the Alliance for Justice, “During his tenure as attorney general, Pryor filed an amicus brief on behalf of the State of Alabama urging the Supreme Court to review and reverse a case that had upheld, against a Commerce Clause challenge, a regulation protecting an endangered species of wolf.” [Alliance for Justice, Accessed [9/19/20](#)]

The Court Ruled That The Federal Government Fairly Exercised The Use Of The Commerce Clause. According to the Coastal Review “Red wolves in North Carolina and Tennessee also led to an important court case in 2000: Gibbs v. Babbitt. Counties and private entities contested the federal government’s ability to restrict takes of red wolves on private lands. And the court ruled that this was a fair exercise of federal power under the Commerce Clause.” [Coastal Review, [4/21/23](#)]

Pryor Was The Only Attorney General To File An Amicus Brief Arguing That The Federal Government Did Not Have The Authority To Regulate Intrastate Waterways That Served As A Habitat For Migratory Birds. While appearing at Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Chuck Schumer said, “The environment, same concerns. Bill Pryor was the lone State Attorney General to file an amicus brief arguing that the Constitution does not give the Federal Government the power to regulate intrastate waters that serve as a habitat for migratory birds. The Attorney General took this position despite decades of Supreme Court precedent and the Federal Clean Water Act standing for the contrary proposition.” [Committee On The Judiciary, U.S. Senate, [6/11/03](#)]