

the treatment afforded prisoners of war, regardless of the identity of the individuals or military units who have captured them; and Whereas the United States and the other coalition nations have complied, and will continue to comply, with international law and custom and the Geneva Convention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) expresses its outrage at the flagrant violations by the Government of Iraq of the customary international law of war and the Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, dated at Geneva August 12 1949, and entered into force October 21, 1950;

(2) supports in the strongest terms the President's warning to Iraq that the United States will hold the Government of Iraq, its officials, and military personnel involved accountable for any and all such violations;

(3) expects Iraq to comply with the requirements of the international law of war and the explicit provisions of the Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, which afford prisoners of war the proper and humane treatment to which they are entitled; and

(4) expects that Iraq will afford prisoners of war access to representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross, as required by the Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DEE D. DRELL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dee D. Drell, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the next two votes be 10 minutes in duration.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at this point to request the yeas and nays for both nominees; that is, Dee Drell and Richard Bennett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to requesting the yeas and nays at this time? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays on both nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dee D. Drell, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western

District of Louisiana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) would vote "Aye".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Ex.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Dodd	Lincoln
Alexander	Dole	Lott
Allard	Domenici	Lugar
Allen	Dorgan	McCain
Baucus	Durbin	McConnell
Bayh	Edwards	Mikulski
Bennett	Ensign	Miller
Biden	Enzi	Murkowski
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Bond	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Frist	Nickles
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Pryor
Bunning	Graham (SC)	Reed
Burns	Grassley	Reid
Byrd	Gregg	Roberts
Campbell	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Hatch	Santorum
Carper	Hollings	Sarbanes
Chafee	Hutchison	Schumer
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Clinton	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith
Coleman	Johnson	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Specter
Conrad	Kerry	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kohl	Stevens
Corzine	Kyl	Sununu
Craig	Landrieu	Talent
Crapo	Lautenberg	Thomas
Daschle	Leahy	Voinovich
Dayton	Levin	Warner
DeWine	Lieberman	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF RICHARD D. BENNETT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate shall proceed to consider Executive Calendar No. 107, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard D. Bennett, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard D. Bennett, of Maryland, to be a United States District Judge for the District of Maryland? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) would vote "Aye".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Ex.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Dodd	Lincoln
Alexander	Dole	Lott
Allard	Domenici	Lugar
Allen	Dorgan	McCain
Baucus	Durbin	McConnell
Bayh	Edwards	Mikulski
Bennett	Ensign	Miller
Biden	Enzi	Murkowski
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Bond	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Frist	Nickles
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Pryor
Bunning	Graham (SC)	Reed
Burns	Grassley	Reid
Byrd	Gregg	Roberts
Campbell	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Hatch	Santorum
Carper	Hollings	Sarbanes
Chafee	Hutchison	Schumer
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sessions
Clinton	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith
Coleman	Johnson	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Specter
Conrad	Kerry	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kohl	Stevens
Corzine	Kyl	Sununu
Craig	Landrieu	Talent
Crapo	Lautenberg	Thomas
Daschle	Leahy	Voinovich
Dayton	Levin	Warner
DeWine	Lieberman	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President shall be immediately notified of the Senate's actions on these nominations.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I am pleased today to speak in support of Dee Dodson Drell, who has been nominated to the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Alexandria Division.

Mr. Drell began his legal career with the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corp upon graduation from Tulane University School of Law in 1971. He began his tour of duty as a defense counsel for courts martial, handling both misdemeanor and felony-level cases. He next moved to the position of prosecutor, during which time he was named Chief of Military Justice. He remained in that position until he completed his military service in 1975, after which he entered private practice.

Mr. Drell then joined the law firm of Gravel, Roy & Burnes. His practice focused primarily on personal injury, criminal defense and general civil litigation. In 1981, Drell joined the law firm of Gold, Weems, Bruser, Sues & Rundell, where he is currently a member and director. His primary areas of practice are insurance defense, contracts, employment law, health benefits and civil litigation.

Mr. Dell has a strong commitment to *pro bono* work that extends beyond his regular law practice. It includes work with organizations that provide services to people suffering from AIDS and AIDS-related illnesses. He provides legal services as a volunteer counselor for Central Louisiana AIDS Support

Services and AIDS Law of Louisiana, Inc. He has also served as a legal advisor to the board of Shepherd Ministries, an ecumenically-based religious organization that provides services to the disadvantaged.

Throughout his career, Mr. Drell has won many accolades, such as recognition in Outstanding Young Men of America, 1976; designation as a Louisiana Bar Foundation Charter Fellow, 1998; and receipt of the Professionalism Award from the Crossroads-American Inn of Court, 2000.

I am confident that Mr. Drell will serve on the bench with compassion, integrity and fairness.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I am also pleased today to speak in support of Richard D. Bennett, who has been nominated to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland.

Mr. Bennett is a distinguished practitioner whose career includes two terms of service with the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Maryland. His outstanding legal skills have been widely recognized, including mention in the 2003-2204 edition of *The Best Lawyers in America*.

Mr. Bennett began his legal career following his graduation from the University of Maryland School of Law in 1973. After graduation, he worked for the Baltimore law firm of Smith, Somerville & Case, where he specialized in insurance defense, as well as general civil and criminal litigation.

Mr. Bennett left private practice in 1976 to serve his first term with the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Maryland as Assistant U.S. Attorney. While there, he persecuted white collar crime, drug offenses, environmental violations, and virtually every kind of criminal case brought by the office. He served in that position until the end of 1980.

Next, Mr. Bennett and another former prosecutor formed a law partnership, Marr & Bennett, in early 1981. The practice specialized in federal and state litigation, with an emphasis on insurance and white collar criminal defense.

Mr. Bennett then merged his practice with the firm of Weaver & Bendos in 1989. He continued to specialize in Federal and State litigation.

In 1991, Mr. Bennett left Weaver, Bendos & Bennett to serve a second term with the U.S. Attorney's Office, this time as a U.S. Attorney, after being nominated by President George H.W. Bush and confirmed by the Senate. He served in that capacity until 1993.

Mr. Bennett has since returned to private practice as a partner with Miles & Stockbridge, one of Maryland's most prestigious law firms. His practice has increasingly focused on white collar criminal defense, government investigations, internal investigations, and grand jury practice. He served as Special Counsel to the Government Reform and Oversight Committee of the

U.S. House of Representatives from August 1997 until June 1998.

Mr. Bennett has the support of both Maryland Senators, along with a unanimous "Well Qualified" ABA rating. With his legal acumen and experience as both defense counsel and federal prosecutor, I am confident that Mr. Bennett will make a fine jurist on the Federal bench.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. With today's confirmation vote on the nominations of Dee Drell to the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana and Richard Bennett to the United States District Court of Maryland, Senate Democrats again demonstrate their bipartisanship toward consensus nominees.

With these confirmations the Senate will have confirmed 18 judicial nominees of President Bush so far this year and 118 overall.

During the entire four years of President Clinton's second term as President, Republicans never, not once, allowed the number of vacancies to dip below 50. The last time vacancies hit 49 was 7 years ago.

So far this year we have confirmed more judicial nominees of President Bush than the Republican majority was willing to confirm in the entire 1996 session when President Clinton was in the White House. That entire year only 17 judges were confirmed all year and that included none to the circuit courts, not one. In contrast, already this session two highly controversial circuit court nominees have already been confirmed among the 18 judges the Senate has approved to date. Those confirmations, including one that had more negative votes than the required number of be filibustered but who was not filibustered, never get acknowledged in partisan Republican talking points.

We are also ahead of the pace the Republican majority set in 1999 when it was considered President Clinton's judicial nominees—almost 6 months ahead. It was not until October that the Senate confirmed as many as 18 judicial nominees in 1999.

In the prior 17 months I chaired the Judiciary Committee, we were able to confirm 100 judges and vastly reduce the judicial vacancies that Republicans had stored up by refusing to allow scores of judicial nominees of President Clinton to be considered. We were able to do so despite the White House's refusal to consult with Democrats on circuit court vacancies and many district court vacancies.

There is no doubt that the judicial nominees of this President are conservatives, many of them quite to the right of the mainstream. Many of these nominees have been active in conservative political causes or groups. Democrats moved fairly and expeditiously on as many as we could consistent with our obligations to evaluate carefully and thoroughly these nominees to lifetime seats in the Federal courts. And we continue to do so.

Unfortunately, many of this President's judicial nominees have proven to be quite controversial and we have had serious concerns about whether they would be fair judges if confirmed to lifetime positions. Those controversial judges take more time and raise more concerns.

So, despite the fact that we are considering more controversial nominees from this President than with President Clinton, and despite the progress we have made in reducing judicial vacancies to the lowest level ever attained while President Clinton was in office and despite the pace of the lowest level ever attained while President Clinton was in office and despite the pace of confirmations, which exceeds that maintained by the Republican majority in 1999, Republicans still do nothing but criticize and castigate Senators if every judicial nominee is not confirmed by the Senate after a short debate.

The question I have been asking and the American people should ask is why are the Senate Republicans picking fights rather than working with us to make additional progress. The best example of that is the Republican insistence on seeking to proceed on the most controversial among the President's nominees instead of the circuit court nominations that Democratic Senators have supported and will support to the Fifth Circuit, the nomination of Judge Edward Prado of Texas. Judge Prado's nomination was unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee. To date, there has been no effort by the Republican leadership to allow the Senate to consider and vote on that nomination. I do not believe the cynical comments of some that Republicans will not allow us to turn to the Prado nomination because he is Hispanic and when the Senate confirms him it would demonstrate yet again that the outrageous charges of anti-Hispanic sentiment that Republicans have tried to make against Democrats were and are ridiculous.

When Senator HATCH was chairman of the Committee and a Democratic President occupied the White House, Senator HATCH denied that even 100 vacancies was a vacancies crisis, according to a column he wrote for the September 5, 1997 edition of *USA Today*. During the Clinton administration, Senator HATCH repeatedly said that 67 vacancies was the equivalent of "full employment" in the Federal judiciary. As of these confirmations, there are not 49 judicial vacancies.

By Senator HATCH's standards we have reached well beyond "full employment" on the Federal bench.

Vacancies have dropped to this level in large part because during 17 months of Democratic control of the Senate, we confirmed 100 of President Bush's judicial nominees, even though Republicans averaged only 38 confirmations per year during their prior 6½ years of control of the Senate. We inherited 110 vacancies by the time the committee

was permitted to reorganize in the summer of 2001, and we confirmed 100 judicial nominees.

This historic number of confirmations in less than a year and a half, cut the number of vacancies to 60. There were 40 new retirements in this period. Chairman Hatch never acted as quickly on Clinton nominees.

The Democratic leadership also moved to confirm 17 circuit court nominees, some of them quite controversial, in those 17 months, even though Chairman HATCH averaged only 7 circuit court confirmations per year during the Clinton administration. This year, two more circuit nominees of President Bush have been confirmed, although other controversial ones have not.

These 19 confirmations of Bush circuit court nominees have reduced the number of circuit vacancies to 23. During the Clinton administration, Chairman HATCH and Senate Republicans blocked the confirmation of 22 circuit court nominees through anonymous holds, blue slips, and other procedures. Had those nominees been confirmed, and had Bush won the confirmation of 19 circuit nominees to vacancies that arose during his Presidency, the current number of circuit vacancies would be 1.

Republicans caused what they call the circuit vacancy crisis. The number of circuit vacancies more than doubled from 16 in January 1995 when Republicans took over the Senate to 33 in the summer of 2001, when the committee was permitted to reorganize under Democratic control. Still, the Senate has already confirmed 19 of his circuit court nominees in less than 2 years. By comparison, President Reagan had 19 circuit nominees confirmed in his first 2 years in office as did President Clinton. The difference is that in both of those administrations, the Presidents were working with Senate majorities of the same political party.

Lately I have heard Republicans complaining that not all of this President's circuit nominees have yet been confirmed, but he has had so many vacancies due to the massive obstruction of circuit seats by Republicans in the Clinton administration, doubling the number of circuit vacancies, as opposed to keeping the rate of vacancies steady or reducing them. Republicans now can be heard to complain that some circuit court nominees did not get a vote in 1992, but that situation does not compare to the long stall of Clinton's circuit court nominees, and her is why:

Only 10 of the circuit nominees of President George H.W. Bush did not get a vote by the committee. Twenty-two of Clinton's circuit nominees did not get votes by the committee during Republican control. That is more than twice as many. Additionally, President George H.W. Bush won the confirmation of 67 percent of his circuit nominees between 1991 and 1992, a Presidential election year, which was consistent with prior Presidential election

year congresses for President Reagan. In contrast, President Clinton won confirmation of only 15 of 34 circuit nominees in 1999-2000, about 44 percent.

Thus, because of the Republican success in blocking appellate judges, President Clinton's circuit court nominees were actually more likely than not to not be confirmed, an indignity not suffered by Bush's nominees. This was nothing compared to 1996, the first election year in modern history and recollection in which not a single circuit nominee was confirmed all year, with Republicans in charge. Plus, I would note that 6 of President Clinton's circuit nominees in 1999-2000 were actually re-nominees, like Judge Richard Paez who even Chairman HATCH admitted was "filibustered" in 2000 and who waited more than 1,500 days to be confirmed.

In fact, when you look at the actual percent of confirmations by session rather than the combined figure for two years, the percent of Clinton nominees blocked by Republicans is even more shocking. During 1999, only 7 of 25 Clinton circuit nominees were confirmed, or 28 percent, and 1999 was not a Presidential election year. In contrast, in 1991, the first President Bush won the confirmation of 9 of 17 nominees, or 53 percent. In 2000, Clinton won confirmation of 8 out of 25 nominees, including those not acted on in 1999, or 32 percent. In contrast in 1992, Bush won the confirmation of 11 of 21 circuit nominees, including those not acted on in 1991, which again was more than 52 percent.

Despite the wide-scale obstruction or filibustering of Clinton circuit vacancies—filibustering after all comes from the Dutch word for piracy or taking things that do not belong to you—Democrats worked hard to turn the other cheek and fill vacancies that were allowed to go unfilled due to Republican holds.

For example, under Democratic leadership, the Senate held the first hearing for a nominee to the Fourth Circuit in 3 years and confirmed him and another most controversial nominee, even though seven of President Clinton's nominees to that circuit never received hearings from Republicans. We proceed with the first hearing for a nominee to the Fifth Circuit in 7 years and confirmed her, even though three of President Clinton's nominees to that circuit never received hearings. In fact, we held hearings for all three of President Bush's nominees to that circuit even though three of President Clinton's nominees, Enrique Moreno, Jorge Rangel, and Alston Johnson, were never allowed hearings by Republicans.

We proceeded with the first hearing on a nominee to the Sixth Circuit in almost 5 years and confirmed her and another controversial nominee to that circuit even though three of President Clinton's nominees to that circuit never received a hearing. We proceeded with the first hearing on a nominee to the Tenth Circuit in 6 years and con-

firmed three, even though two of President Clinton's nominees to that circuit were never allowed hearings. With the confirmation of the controversial Tim Tymkovich to the Tenth Circuit last week we have now filled a total of four vacancies on that court. The seat to which he was nominated had been vacant for more than 4 years despite President Clinton having nominated two qualified nominees, neither of whom was ever accorded a hearing.

Had President Clinton's circuit court nominees been confirmed, the circuit courts would have been evenly balanced, with six circuits with a majority of Democratic appointees and six circuits with a majority of Republican appointees and one circuit with an even number of Democratic and Republican appointees.

If President Bush succeeds in winning the confirmation of nominees to every circuit vacancy he inherited plus the ones that have arisen since then, only two circuits will have a majority of Democratic appointees and 11 will have a majority of Republican appointees. In many of those circuits, the Republican appointees will have at least a 2-1 majority on every panel on average. More than 67 percent of the appointments to those courts will be by Republicans.

It is also important to remember when comparing what Republicans did to President Clinton's circuit nominees to what happened in 1992 that Chairman BIDEN moved through 66 of President Bush's judicial nominees in 1992, President George H.W. Bush's best year for confirmations, despite it being a Presidential election year. However, the Senate could not get through all of the nominees following the bipartisan judgeship bill of 1990 which increased the size of the Federal courts by more than 100 seats.

In the 102nd Congress, Chairman BIDEN got through 124 of President George H.W. Bush's nominees, including his nominee to the Supreme Court, Clarence Thomas. In fact, the Republicans did not allow President Clinton to win the confirmation of a many judges in 1999 and 2000 combined as Chairman BIDEN got through for President Bush in 1992 alone.

Finally, I would note that Chairman BIDEN moved through 20 circuit court nominees for President Bush in the 102nd Congress. As a consequence, the first President Bush was able to appoint 42 circuit judges in his one term as a President. Because of Republicans' blockade of any circuit court nominee to be confirmed in 1996, President Clinton was able to appoint only 30 circuit judges in his first term, more than 25 percent fewer than his predecessor, President George H.W. Bush, who had a Democratic Senate during his entire Presidency. In President Clinton's two full terms, Republican obstruction limited him to 65 circuit court appointment in those 8 years.

In contrast, President George W. Bush has already appointed 19 circuit

judges and, as I have indicated, the 20th confirmation, that of Judge Prado is stalled only because Republicans have refused to proceed to his consideration.

President Bush is poised to appoint at least one-quarter of Federal appellate courts in just one term, due to the large number of circuit court vacancies he inherited from President Clinton which were the result of widespread Republican obstruction.

The solution to the current logjam over circuit court judges is not to move them through more quickly with less scrutiny. The solution is for this President to consult with Senators from both parties in finding mainstream, consensus nominees, rather than this parade of activists and extremists that we have witnessed over these past few months. This President wants a clean slate on judicial nominees, but he refuses to do any of the work necessary to clean that slate. Instead of being a uniter in his judicial choices, he has divided this Senate and the American people by deferring to the far right wing of his party in the only lifetimes appointments in our entire government.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has been ridiculed, and I am sad to say, rightly so, for becoming a rubberstamp, an assembly line for these important nominations to the second highest courts in our Federal Government. The solution is genuine consultation and accommodation rather than this race to pack the courts and tip the balance with nominees who have shown a lack of respect for individual rights.

I am pleased to say, however, that not all of his nominees have been extremists. Particularly for the district court nominees when there has been bipartisan consultation, some of the judicial nominees have been conservative but within the mainstream.

Since the Republican majority will not allow the Senate to consider Judge Prado, let me turn briefly to the nominees before the Senate. Mr. Drell has been a lawyer's lawyer, rather than a political or judicial activist as so many of President Bush's circuit nominees are. Dr. Drell has been a member and a leader of numerous State and Local bar associations. He served on the State Committee or Post-Conviction Representation for 5 years and assisted the State bar with attorney disciplinary matters. Dr. Drell has been active in the Family Mediation Council of Louisiana, where he served as a board member from 1986 to 1992.

He also served as board member of the Rapides Parish Indigent Defender Board from 1987 to 1994. He served on the Louisiana Task Force on Racial and Ethnic Fairness in the Courts.

Mr. Drell has also devoted a considerable amount of time to helping individuals suffering with AIDS on a pro bono basis. He is directly involved as volunteer counsel for Central Louisiana AIDS Support Services and AIDSLaw

of Louisiana, Inc. These two organizations provide services to persons with AIDS and AIDS-related complex. He has also devoted time to the Delta Region AIDS Education and Training Center. In 1997, he received the Pro Bono Publico Award in 1997 from AIDSLaw of Louisiana.

Mr. Drell has a record of accomplishment and compassion as a lawyer of which we can all be proud. He has the full support of both of his home-State Senators. His record has generated no controversy or criticism. If only, our circuit court nominees had records such as his. This nomination is a good example of the kind of candidate who engenders bipartisan support.

I congratulate Mr. Drell, his family and the Senators from Louisiana on his nomination and confirmation.

The other nominee confirmed today is Richard Bennett of Maryland. There is no doubt that Mr. Bennett is a conservative and a Republican, yet he has the support of his home-State Senators and the support of Senate Democrats.

In 1991, Mr. Bennett was chosen by President George H.W. Bush to be the United States Attorney for the District of Maryland and the Senate confirmed him without dissent. He has also run for State office as a Republican. He has litigated more than 100 cases, civil and criminal, most of which were in the Federal court to which he is nominated.

He has received an AV rating from Martindale-Hubbell, been selected to The Best Lawyers in America, and also received a meritorious service medal for his work in the military as a staff judge advocate.

Mr. Bennett served as special counsel to the Government Reform and Oversight Committee in 1997 and 1998 with Republican U.S. Representative Dan Burton, who was investigating campaign contributions during the 1996 election. He heads the Miles & Stockbrige Foundation, a charitable foundation.

I congratulate Mr. Bennett and his family on his confirmation.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

U CONN HUSKIES NCAA WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DODD. Madam President, with a sense of parochial pride—although I note the Presiding Officer is from my region of the country, and I presume she may enjoy a sense of regional pride as well—I rise to address the victory last evening of the University of Connecticut women's basketball team in the national championship game. I don't want to take a long time today,

but I send my congratulations to the team, the fans, and Coach Geno Auriemma, who is a wonderful friend of mine, his family, his remarkable coaching staff, and the tremendous team, led by Diana Taurasi, who is a junior, along with other underclassmen, who did what no one predicted they would be able to do following last year's national championship victory, and that is to follow on with a record of only one loss this season and to beat a great Tennessee team.

I note the Senator from Tennessee is in the Chamber, but I want my colleagues to know there are a couple of lobsters that are today enjoying life somewhere along the bottom of Long Island Sound because they did not end up on the dinner plate of the majority leader. Last evening at a gathering of friends, I wagered two New England lobsters versus some barbecue from Tennessee. So two lobsters on Long Island Sound are enjoying their freedom tonight; they are obviously pleased as well that the University of Connecticut team did as well as it did.

Congratulations to our State and their fans and the wonderful team. A resolution will be adopted later this evening commending this fine team and the staff of the University of Connecticut.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. DODD. Madam President, we lost a young man from Connecticut in the Iraq conflict a few days ago. I want to take a few minutes to pay tribute to Marine SSGT Phillip Jordan of Enfield, CT, who was killed in action while on a combat mission in Iraq.

All Americans have been closely following our troops in Iraq since the war began 2 weeks ago. Every day we hear lots of facts and figures about the war, the number of sorties in the air, the number of tanks in the field, and the locations of various divisions throughout Iraq. We must never forget that behind those statistics are people. These people are our constituents, young men and women in uniform from all across this great land of ours, some who are not even citizens of this country but who have green cards and want to demonstrate their commitment to America by serving in the Armed Forces and commit themselves to do a job in the Persian Gulf because they have been asked to by the President.

We must never forget that each and every one of the more than 225,000 brave service men and women fighting in Iraq have family and friends at home to fight for our country overseas. Each of these heroes is making a tremendous contribution, a personal sacrifice, so all of us can be more secure in the United States.

Inevitably, in a conflict such as this, there are those who will make the ultimate sacrifice, some who will never return to their family and friends and communities. I would like to share the story of one of those fine Americans for a few moments this evening.