

the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601;

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Edward Hanlon, Jr., 0000.
NAVY

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Surgeon General and for appointment to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5137:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Michael L. Cowan, 0000.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be Vice Admiral

Vice Adm. Patricia A. Tracey, 0000.

AIR FORCE

PN536 Air Force nominations (59) beginning STEVEN L. ADAMS, and ending JANNETTE YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2001

ARMY

PN29 Army nominations (108) beginning KEITH S. * ALBERTSON, and ending ROBERT K. ZUEHLKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 3, 2001

PN434 Army nominations (169) beginning ERIC D. * ADAMS, and ending DAVID S. ZUMBRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2001

PN435 Army nominations (8) beginning GREGGORY R. CLUFF, and ending STEVEN W. VINSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2001

PN485 Army nominations (16) beginning GILL P. BECK, and ending MARGO D. SHERIDAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2001

PN486 Army nominations (179) beginning CYNTHIA J. ABBADINI, and ending THOMAS R. * YARBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2001

PN517 Army nominations (3) beginning JAMES E. GELETA, and ending GARY S. OWENS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 12, 2001

PN518 Army nominations (6) beginning FLOYD E. BELL, JR., and ending STEVEN N. WICKSTROM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 12, 2001

PN537 Army nominations (11) beginning ROBERT E. ELLIOTT, and ending PETER G. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2001

PN538 Army nominations (9) beginning BRUCE M. BENNETT, and ending GRANT E. ZACHARY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2001

MARINE CORPS

PN519 Marine Corps nomination of Donald E. Gray, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 12, 2001

PN520 Marine Corps nominations (1291) beginning JESSICA L. ACOSTA, and ending JOSEPH J. ZWILLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 1, 2001

NAVY

PN438 Navy nomination of Charlie C. Biles, which was received by the Senate and ap-

peared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2001

PN439 Navy nominations (235) beginning JAMES W. ADKISSON, III and ending MIKE ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2001

PN487 Navy nomination of William J. Diehl, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2001

PN521 Navy nomination of Christopher M. Rodrigues, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 12, 2001

PN522 Navy nominations (19) beginning ROGER T. BANKS, and ending CARL ZEIGLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 12, 2001

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

ORGANIZATION OF THE SENATE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 120, the organizing resolution submitted earlier today by myself and Senator LOTT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 120) relative to the organization of the Senate during the remainder of the 107th Congress.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that three letters with reference to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2001.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We write as Chairman and Ranking Republican Member of the Judiciary Committee to inform you of a change in Committee practice with respect to nominations. The "blue slips" that the Committee has traditionally sent to home State Senators to ask their views on nominees to be U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals and federal judges, will be treated as public information.

We both believe that such openness in the confirmation process will benefit the Judiciary Committee and the Senate as a whole. Further, it is our intention that this policy of openness with regard to "blue slips" and the blue slip process continue in the future, regardless of who is Chairman or which party is in the majority in the Senate.

Therefore, we write to inform you that the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, with the full support of the former Chairman and Ranking Republican Member, is exercising his authority to declare that the blue slip process shall no longer be designated or treated as Committee confidential.

Sincerely,

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman.
ORRIN G. HATCH,
Ranking Republican
Member.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2001.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are cognizant of the important constitutional role of the Senate in connection with Supreme Court nominations. We write as Chairman and Ranking Republican Member on the Judiciary Committee to inform you that we are prepared to examine carefully and assess such presidential nominations.

The Judiciary Committee's traditional practice has been to report Supreme Court nominees to the Senate once the Committee has completed its considerations. This has been true even in cases where Supreme Court nominees were opposed by a majority of the Judiciary Committee.

We both recognize and have every intention of following the practices and precedents of the Committee and the Senate when considering Supreme Court nominees.

Sincerely,

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman.
ORRIN G. HATCH,
Ranking Republican
Member.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON RULES
AND ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, DC, June 29, 2001.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On June 29, 2001, the Senate passed the organizing resolution which states, in part, that subject to the authority of the Standing Rules of the Senate, any agreements entered into regarding committee funding and space prior to June 5, 2001, between the chairman and ranking member of each committee shall remain in effect, unless modified by subsequent agreement between the chairman and ranking member.

In the assignment of office space to Senate committees, pursuant to Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is the practice of the Committee on Rules and Administration to assign all such space to the chairman of each committee. Further, the Rules Committee does not traditionally intervene in the internal space allocation decisions of the committees and therefore is not a party to any agreements between the chairman and ranking member regarding space allocations. It is the intent of the Committee on Rules and Administration to continue such practice.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Chairman.
MITCH MCCONNELL,
Ranking Member.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. 120) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 120

Resolved, That the Majority Party of the Senate for the 107th Congress shall have a one seat majority on every committee of the Senate, except that the Select Committee on Ethics shall continue to be composed equally of members from both parties. No Senator shall lose his or her current committee assignments by virtue of this resolution.

SEC. 2 Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXV the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate are hereby authorized to appoint their members of the committees consistent with this resolution.

SEC. 3 Subject to the authority of the Standing Rules of the Senate, any agreements entered into regarding committee

funding and space prior to June 5, 2001, between the Chairman and Ranking member of each committee shall remain in effect, unless modified by subsequent agreement between the Chairman and Ranking member.

SEC. 4 The provisions of this resolution shall cease to be effective, except for Sec. 3, if the ratio in the full Senate on the date of adoption of this resolution changes.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, the resolution we have just adopted is one that provides for the reorganization of the U.S. Senate.

This is a unique time of transition for the Senate, and I understand that it is a difficult time for many of my Republican colleagues.

If there is one thing that supercedes the status of any Senator or any party, it is our desire to do the work we were sent here to do. That, of course, requires getting the Senate organized to do it.

By passing this resolution, our colleagues can retake their rightful places on committees, committees can take action on legislation, and importantly, we can move forward with Presidential nominations.

This organizing resolution is the result of thorough bipartisan negotiations over the last several weeks.

Many people deserve credit. First and foremost, I thank Senator LOTT. Senator LOTT and I have been through many challenges together. Each of those challenges has strengthened our friendship, and our working relationship, and this is no exception.

I also thank Senators MCCONNELL, DOMENICI, GRAMM, HATCH, and SPECTER. Their good faith in the negotiating process, and their patience as the process played out, were instrumental in helping us reach this point.

This resolution provides for a one-seat margin on Senate committees, which is consistent with Senate precedent.

It clarifies that—subject to the standing rules of the Senate—the agreements on funding and space that were made between chairmen and ranking members early in this Congress will remain in effect for the duration of this Congress.

This resolution also makes it clear that all of these provisions will sunset if the ratio in the Senate changes during this Congress.

I especially commend Senator LEAHY. Senator LEAHY, in his typically fair and wise way, played a critical role in solving the most difficult questions we faced in these negotiations: those involving Supreme Court and other Presidential nominees.

Together, he and Senator HATCH were able to find a truly constructive solution to the way in which we handle “blue slips,” and the way in which we consider nominees to the Supreme Court.

On the subject of blue slips, Senators LEAHY and HATCH have agreed that these forms—traditionally sent to home-state Senators to ask their views on nominees to be U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals, and federal judges—will now be treated as public information.

I share their belief that this new policy of openness will benefit not only the Judiciary Committee, but the Senate as a whole. I also share their hope that this policy will continue in the future, regardless of which party is in the majority.

In the course of our negotiations, a number of our Republican colleagues also raised concerns about how Democrats would deal with potential Supreme Court nominations, should that need arise.

A second letter to which Senators LEAHY and HATCH agreed says clearly that all nominees to the Supreme Court will receive full and fair consideration.

This is the same position I stated publicly many times during our negotiations, and I intend to see that the Senate lives up to this commitment.

It has been the traditional practice of the Judiciary Committee to report Supreme Court nominees to the Senate floor once the committee has completed its consideration. This has been true even for a number of nominees that were defeated in the Judiciary Committee.

Now, Senators LEAHY and HATCH have put in writing their intention that consideration of Supreme Court nominees will follow the practices and precedents of the Judiciary Committee and the Senate.

In reaching this agreement, we have avoided an unwise and unwarranted change to the Standing Rules of the Senate and a sweeping revision to the Senate’s constitutional responsibility to review Supreme Court nominees.

In sum, this is a good, balanced, resolution—one that will enable us to run this Senate in a spirit of fairness.

In a letter to Thomas Jefferson, James Madison explained that the Constitution’s Framers considered the Senate to be the great “anchor” of the Government.

For 212 years, that anchor has held steady. The Senate has withstood Civil War and constitutional crises. In each generation, it has been buffeted by the winds and tides of political and social change.

Today I believe we are proving that this great anchor of democracy can withstand the forces of unprecedented internal changes as well.

I am confident that this resolution is the right way to keep the Senate working. I am appreciative of the support given by all our colleagues today as we now adopt it.

If I may, I will say one other thing about this particular resolution. There is a member of my staff whose name is Mark Childress; our colleagues know him. I am indebted to him for many reasons, as I am to all of my staff. But no one deserves more credit and more praise for the job done in reaching this successful conclusion than Mark Childress. Publicly, I acknowledge his contribution, his incredible work and effort. I thank him from the bottom of my heart for what he has done to make this possible.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a memo from the Congressional Reference Service. As this memo makes clear, the Senate has a long record of allowing the Supreme Court nominees of the President to be given a vote on the floor of the Senate. No matter what the vote in committee on a Supreme Court nominee, it is the precedent of the Senate that the individual nominated is given a vote by the whole Senate.

The letter inserted in the RECORD as a part of the agreement accompanying the organization resolution refers to the “traditional” practice of reporting Supreme Court nominees for a vote on the floor. This memo from CRS shows that since 1881, there is only one case where the nominee was not given a floor vote. In that case, there was no opening on the Court for the nominee to fill and thus the nominee was withdrawn. So this precedent is even purer than the ‘99 and 44/100ths’ soap test.

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

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Washington DC, June 28, 2001.

Senate Consideration of Supreme Court Nominations since 1880

Hon. TRENT LOTT,

Senate Republican Leader,

This memorandum is in response to your request, made during our telephone conversation earlier today, for a short written answer to the specific question, “Is it the case that since 1880 all Supreme Court nominations, irrespective of Judiciary Committee recommendation, have received consideration by, and a vote of, the full Senate?”

Research by CRS has found that from President James A. Garfield’s nomination of Stanley Matthews on March 14, 1881 to the present, every person nominated to the Supreme Court except one has received Senate consideration and a vote on his or her nomination. Nonetheless, it should be noted, during the time frame of 1880 to the present, there also have been two other instances, besides the already mentioned exception, in which Supreme Court nominations failed to receive consideration; in both cases, however, the individuals in question were re-nominated shortly thereafter, with one receiving Senate confirmation and the other Senate rejection.

The one instance when the Senate did not consider and vote on an individual nominated to be a Supreme Court Justice involved President Lyndon B. Johnson’s nomination of federal appellate judge Homer Thornberry in 1968. Judge Thornberry was nominated to be an Associate Justice on June 26, 1968, the same day on which President Johnson nominated then-Associate Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice. Judge Thornberry was nominated to fill the Associate Justice vacancy that was to be created upon Justice Fortas’s confirmation as Chief Justice. However, after being favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee, the Fortas nomination failed to gain Senate confirmation. On October 1, 1968, the fourth day of Senate consideration of the Fortas nomination, a motion to close debate on the nomination failed by a 45–43 vote. Three days later, on October 4, 1968, President Johnson withdrew both the Fortas and Thornberry nominations.

Prior to Senate action on the Fortas nomination, the Judiciary Committee held hearings simultaneously on Fortas and Thornberry, but upon conclusion of the hearings

reported out only the Fortas nomination. One detailed history of the Fortas nomination reported that it was apparent "that the committee would take no action on Thornberry until the Fortas nomination was settled."

As noted in the second paragraph of this memorandum, there also have been two instances in which Supreme Court nominations failed to receive Senate consideration, only to be followed by the individuals in question being re-nominated shortly thereafter and then receiving Senate consideration. The earlier of these instances involved President Rutherford B. Hayes's nomination of Stanley Matthews on January 26, 1881 in the final days of the 46th Congress. According to one historical account, the nomination did not enjoy majority support in the Senate Judiciary Committee and was not reported out by the Committee or considered by the full Senate before the end of the Congress. However, Matthews was renominated by Hayes's successor, President Garfield, on March 14, 1881. Although the second nomination was reported with an adverse recommendation by the Judiciary Committee, it was considered by the full Senate and confirmed on May 12, 1881 by a vote of 24-23.

A second instance in which a Supreme Court nomination failed to receive Senate consideration, only to have the individual in question be re-nominated, involved Grover Cleveland's nomination of William B. Hornblower in 1893. Hornblower was first nominated on September 19, 1893, with no record of any Judiciary Committee action or Senate consideration of the nomination indicated in *Journal of the Executive Proceedings of the Senate* volume for that (the 53rd) Congress. Hornblower was re-nominated by President Cleveland on December 6, 1893. After his second nomination was reported adversely by the Judiciary Committee on January 8, 1894, Hornblower was rejected by the Senate on January 15, 1894 by a 24-30 vote.

I trust the above information is responsive to your request. If I may be of further assistance please contact me at 7-7162.

DENIS STEVEN RUTKUS

*Specialist in American
National Government*

CHANGING THE NAME OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO "COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP"

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 123, submitted earlier today by Senators KERRY and BOND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 123) amending the Standing Rules of the Senate to change the name of the Committee on Small Business to the "Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I would like to take a few minutes to explain the historic importance of the Resolution I am putting forward with Senator BOND to change the name of the Senate Committee on Small Business to the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship. This is the first piece of legislation I am put-

ting forward as the new Chairman of the Small Business Committee. I am pleased that it is a bipartisan Resolution, continuing the tradition of the Committee.

I would like to thank Senator BOND for cosponsoring this Resolution, and the Majority Leader and Republican Leader for their cooperation and support in bringing it to the floor of the Senate so quickly.

As many of my colleagues may know, the needs and circumstances of today's entrepreneurial companies differ from those of traditional small businesses. For instance, entrepreneurial companies are much more likely to depend on investment capital rather than loan capital. Additionally, although they represent less than five percent of all businesses, entrepreneurial companies create a substantial number of all new jobs and are responsible for developing a significant portion of technological innovations, both of which have substantial benefits for our economy.

Taken together, an unshakable determination to grow and improved productivity lie at the heart of what distinguishes fast growth or entrepreneurial companies from more traditional, albeit successful, small businesses. Early on, it is often impossible to distinguish a small business from an entrepreneurial company. Only when a company starts to grow fast and make fundamental changes in a market do the differences come into play. Policies that support entrepreneurship become critical during this phase of the business cycle. Our public policies can only play a significant role during this critical phase if we understand the needs of entrepreneurial companies and are prepared to respond appropriately.

I believe that adding "Entrepreneurship" to the Committee on Small Business's name will more accurately reflect the Committee's valuable role in helping to foster and promote economic development by including entrepreneurial companies and the spirit of entrepreneurship in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution. Thank you.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was agreed to.

(The resolution is located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Submitted Resolutions.")

COMPLIMENTING SENATORS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, let me just say this before I make my final comments. Senator KENNEDY is on the floor and I want to acknowledge, as I did just now upstairs and as I did a couple of weeks ago as we completed our work on the education bill, a his-

toric and landmark piece of legislation, how grateful I am, once again, to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Health, Education, and Labor Committee.

I have said privately and publicly that I believe he is one of the most historic figures our Chamber has ever had the pleasure of witnessing. We saw, again, the leadership and the remarkable ability that he has to legislate over the course of the last couple of weeks. I didn't think that what he had to endure in the education bill could have been any harder. In many respects, I think the last 2 weeks were harder. It was harder reaching a consensus. We had very difficult and contentious issues to confront, amendments to consider. In all of it, he, once again, took his responsibilities as we would expect of him—with fairness, with courtesy, and with a display of empathy for all Members, the likes of which you just do not see on the Senate floor.

So on behalf of all of our caucus, I daresay on behalf of the Senate, I thank Senator KENNEDY, our chairman, for the work he has done.

I also acknowledge and thank our colleague from North Carolina, Senator JOHN EDWARDS. Senator EDWARDS has done a remarkable job. In a very short period of time, he has demonstrated his capabilities for senatorial leadership. He came to the Senate without the experience of public service, but in a very brief period of time he has demonstrated his enormous ability to adjust and adapt to Senate ways. He has become a true leader. I am grateful to him for his extraordinary contribution to this bill.

Let me also thank Senator JOHN MCCAIN. This bill is truly bipartisan in many ways, but it is personified in that bipartisanship with the role played by Senator MCCAIN, not unlike other bills in which he has participated. I will mention especially the campaign finance reform bill.

Senator MCCAIN has been the key in bringing about the bipartisan consensus that we reached again today. On a vote of 59-36, we showed the bipartisanship that can be displayed even as we take on these contentious and difficult issues. That would not have been possible were it not for his effort.

Let me thank, as well, Senator JUDD GREGG and many of our colleagues on the Republican side for their participation. They fought a hard fight; they made a good case; they argued their amendments extremely well; and they were prepared to bring this debate to closure tonight. I am grateful to them for their willingness to do so.

Finally, I thank Senator HARRY REID. He wasn't officially a part of the committee, but Senator REID has made a contribution once again to this bill, as he has on so many other bills, that cannot be replicated. This would not have happened were it not for his remarkable—and I would say incredible—efforts on the Senate floor each and