

## DOING THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I support the memorandum of understanding. It took the nuclear option off the table. It is gone for our lifetime. We don't have to talk about it anymore. I am disappointed there are still the threats of the nuclear option. Let's move on. We need not go over this, but there were 218 nominees of the President and we turned down 10.

All filibusters are extraordinary. There will be filibusters of judges and of other things. That is what the Senate is all about. That is what the 14 Senators acknowledged. I admire and respect what they did. I am thankful they kept me advised as to what they were doing. It is too bad there were not other opportunities to make a "deal" between the majority leader and me.

We have to understand that the Senate needs to operate. I say to my friend, the distinguished majority leader, there was an agreement made on three judges. We feel the merits of those three judges are not good and that we need time to talk about those three judges. We will continue to do that. The rules of the Senate have not been changed. That is what is so good about the agreement of these 14 Senators, who rose above the battle and did the right thing.

I am willing to work with the majority leader. I have said that publicly and privately. But we have to be realistic. Unless we work into next week, we cannot do all these judges. If that is the order—that we are going to work into next week—people should be told that now. We are willing to work within the confines of the rules of the Senate. If cloture is invoked today, the rule is you get 30 hours. We are happy to work on that to shorten it a little bit and to have a vote sometime tomorrow and then go to other matters. I would think we could go to another judge—a controversial judge. We have indicated that the judges from Michigan are not controversial. They were held up on procedural things because of longstanding problems with the Michigan Senators. We would need to debate that for a while.

We are here to work the will of the Senate. Again, I am somewhat disappointed that we still hear threats of nuclear option. That is gone. Let's forget about it. I am happy that one of the things the 14 talked about is having some consultation with the President. I am confident that will work out better for the White House and the Senate. I hope that transpires. We here want to move forward. We have so much that needs to be done.

The distinguished majority leader has talked about things that need to be done, such as the Bolton nomination, which is also controversial. We will be happy to try to work to some degree to make that as easy as possible for everybody. It is a difficult issue. I have spoken to Senator BIDEN early this morning. He has a plan as to what he feels should be done on Bolton. None of

this is going to take an hour or two. There are things we have to talk about with Bolton.

As I indicated last night, last night was a good day for the Senate and today is a good day. Let's move forward and work as the Senate feels it should work. There have been no rule changes. We are here to do the will of the people of this country.

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## NOMINATION OF PRISCILLA RICHMAN OWEN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Priscilla Richman Owen, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11:40 shall be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I will say a few things about the compromise that was reached last night. It has a lot of good things in it. I think, first and foremost, it represented a consensus of a group of Senators who would represent the majority, saying that filibusters are not to be routinely utilized in the confirmation process. As a matter of fact, they said only in "extraordinary circumstances" should a filibuster be utilized.

This was a rejection of what we have seen for over 2 years in the Senate. It was a movement toward the historical principles of confirmation that I think are very important. I think it is worthy of note that the majority leader, Senator BILL FRIST, who just left the floor, moved so ably on this issue. He spent nearly 2 years studying the history, seeking compromises, working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and as of a few weeks ago had, I believe, quite clearly achieved a majority of the Senators who were prepared to exercise the constitutional option to establish the rule that we would not filibuster judicial nominees. We have not had a judicial filibuster in 214 years and we should not have one now. A majority in this Senate was prepared to act to ensure that we would not have one.

It was only at that point that serious discussions began on a compromise and, as a result of those discussions,

seven Senators on each side agreed they would act in a certain way and issued the statement they did. It does not reflect the majority of either party, but it does reflect, in my view, the fact that a majority of this Congress does not believe that filibusters are the way to go and should not occur except in extraordinary circumstances.

Frankly, I think that is not the principle we need to adhere to. When President Clinton was President and he sought nominees that he chose for the Federal bench, and people on the Republican side discussed whether a filibuster was appropriate, the Republicans clearly decided no and allowed nominees such as Berzon and Paez to have an up-or-down vote. They were given an up-or-down vote and both were confirmed, even though they were controversial. I think that was significant.

I have to tell you how thrilled I am that Judge Bill Pryor will be able to get an up-or-down vote. He is one of the finest nominees who has come before this body. The hard left groups out there, who have been driving this process, attacked him early on and misrepresented his positions, his character, his integrity, and his legal philosophy. They called him an activist, when he is exactly the opposite of that, and they created a storm and were able to generate a filibuster against him. He had a majority of votes in the Senate, if he could have gotten an up-or-down vote. But he was denied that through the inability of the majority to cut off debate and have a vote.

I am so glad the group of 14 who met and looked at these nominees concluded he was worthy of being able to get a vote up or down. I have to say that has colored my pleasure with the agreement, even though I know some other good judges or nominees were not part of the agreement.

I want to point this out. The minority leader seems to suggest that filibusters are here to stay and they are normal and logical, and get over it and accept it, and that, oh, no, the constitutional option can never be used. That was not in that agreement and that is not what is in the hearts and minds of a majority of the Senators in this body. If this tactic of filibustering is continued to be used in an abusive way, or in a way that frustrates the ability of this Congress to give an up-or-down vote to the fine nominees of President Bush, there has been no waiver of the right to utilize the constitutional option.

As I understand it, even yesterday Senator BYRD, on the Senate floor, admitted the constitutional option is a valid power of the Senate majority. I would say this. It ought not to be abused; it ought not to be used for light or transient reasons. It ought to be used only in the most serious circumstances—the most serious circumstances of the kind we have today when, after 200 years of tradition, 200 years of following the spirit of the Constitution to give judges up-or-down