

documents that have only recently been released by the Centers for Disease Control find him in endorsement of needle exchange programs, and urging that there be large amounts of Federal money to support needle exchange programs.

I don't believe that we need a family doctor for America who says we ought to subsidize the drug culture by providing free needles, by saying to the drug dealers, you can get all the needles you want, and when you want to go and tell our young people that they should get involved in your drug culture, you can have the authority of the Government with you to say it must be OK; surely, the Government wouldn't provide us with these free, clean, sterile needles to use in shooting up drugs if it weren't in your best interest.

I think that sends the worst message possible to young people that the Government is a subsidizer of and a promoter of an environment in which drugs can be used with lowered risk.

My own sense is that it makes no more sense to provide clean needles to drug dealers than it would be to provide bulletproof vests to bank robbers. We could surely make bank robbing a safer occupation by providing bulletproof vests, but we wouldn't want to do it. Neither should we make intravenous drug use a sort of project of the Government because we might be able to provide some safety to some user.

I won't go into the details; we have already done that. We already know that people who don't care enough about themselves to use good needles or clean needles in drug use won't take care of the needles once they have used them. One town found over 300 needles in the course of 1 week after a privately funded clean-needle program was implemented there. I don't think we want our playgrounds and our streets and our cities to be littered with once-used free needles supplied by the Government that could later infect our children.

All of these things that relate to a disregard for the right health strategy for America are disqualifying events for this candidate: partial-birth abortion, the African AIDS studies, the domestic blind HIV tests on newborns, where we persisted in this practice even after we discovered an effective therapy for these infants, and last but not least, the clean-needle exchange program, which basically wants to accept drug culture as a way of life instead of calling America to its highest and best and saying that the real problem is heroin, the real problem is drug addiction, the real problem is not the absence of a needle program funded by the taxpayers. The taxpayers do not want us to destroy their neighborhoods by subsidizing drug dealers who will not only use the clean needles, but leave them in places where they can infect the children of America.

For those reasons, I believe it would be appropriate for us to reject the nomination of Dr. David Satcher to be Sur-

geon General. We do need a Surgeon General, but we don't need one so badly that we need to welcome one who doesn't really call us to the highest and best health that America ought to have.

Mr. President, I thank you very much for the opportunity to make these concluding remarks. With that, I yield back the remainder of my time on today's debate, reserving, obviously, the time to be a participant in the debate tomorrow on this issue. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

#### NOMINATION OF MARGARET MORROW

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we will soon debate the confirmation of Margaret Morrow to be a United States District Judge. Her qualifications are exemplary; her commitment to public service is impressive; and her supporters are many.

Despite the high regard of a broad and bipartisan group of attorneys and judges, Ms. Morrow has had to wait over 19 months for a vote of the full Senate. But this long delay is finally coming to an end. I am very pleased Senator LOTT has promised that, before the February recess, this fine nominee will get her day on the Senate floor.

The Alliance for Justice, which represents a whole host of organizations interested in a strong judiciary, sent a letter to me yesterday outlining their many reasons for supporting the nomination of Margaret Morrow as well as their concern about the time it has taken for the Senate to act. As a supplement to the voluminous information already on the record in support of this nomination, I submit the Alliance for Justice's letter for my colleagues' review. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1998.

Senator TOM DASCHLE,  
*Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: We write to express our concern over a series of developments that continue to unfold in the Senate that are undermining the judicial confirmation process. These include calls for the impeachment of judges, a slowdown in the pace of confirmations, unjustified criticisms of certain nominees, and efforts to leave appellate vacancies unfilled. Some court observers

have opined that collectively these are the most serious efforts to curtail judicial independence since President Roosevelt's plan to pack the Supreme Court in 1937.

In the past year nominees who failed to meet certain ultraconservative litmus tests have been labeled "judicial activists." While these charges are unfounded, they nonetheless delay confirmations and leave judicial seats unfilled. We note that of the 14 individuals whose nominations have been pending the longest, 12 are women or minorities. This disturbing pattern is in striking contrast to those 14 judges who were confirmed in 1997 in the shortest period of time, 11 of whom are white men. For example, Margaret Morrow, a judicial nominee to the United States District Court for the Central District of California, was nominated more than a year and a half ago. Not only is she an outstanding candidate, but her credentials have earned her enthusiastic and bipartisan endorsements from leaders of the bar, judges, politicians, and civic groups.

An honors graduate from Harvard Law School, a civil litigator for more than 20 years, winner of numerous legal awards, and the first female president of the California Bar Association, Morrow has the breadth of background and experience to make her an excellent judge, and in the words of one of her sponsors, she would be "an exceptionally distinguished addition to the federal bench." Morrow has also shown, through her numerous pro bono activities, a demonstrated commitment to equal justice. As president of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, she created the Pro Bono Council, the first of its kind in California. During her year as bar president, the Council coordinated the provision of 150,000 hours of previously untapped representation to indigent clients throughout the country. Not surprisingly, the American Bar Association's judicial evaluation committee gave her its highest rating.

Republicans and Democrats alike speak highly of her accomplishments and qualifications. Robert Bonner, a Reagan-appointed U.S. Attorney and U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California and head of the Drug Enforcement Administration during the Bush Administration, has said Morrow is a "brilliant person with a first-rate legal mind who was nominated upon merit, not political affiliation." Los Angeles County Sheriff Sherman Block wrote that, "Margaret Morrow is an extremely hard working individual of impeccable character and integrity. . . . I have no doubt that she would be a distinguished addition to the Court." Other supporters include local bar leaders; officials from both parties, including Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan; California judges appointed by the state's last three governors; and three Republican-appointed Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals judges, Pamela Rymer, Cynthia Holcomb Hall, and Stephen Trott.

Despite her outstanding record, Morrow has become the target of a coordinated effort by ultraconservative groups that seek to politicize the judiciary. They have subjected her to a campaign of misrepresentations, distortions and attacks on her record, branding her a "judicial activist." According to her opponents, she deserves to be targeted because "she is a member of California Women Lawyers," an absurd charge given that this bipartisan organization is among the most highly respected in the state. Another "strike" against her is her concern, expressed in a sentence from a 1988 article, about special interest domination of the ballot initiative process in California. Her opponents view the statement as disdainful of voter initiatives such as California's term limits law; however, they overlook the fact that the article outlines a series of recommended reforms to preserve the process.