

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