

allies to undermine environmental protections is to set policy by failing to defend against industry lawsuits or by reaching "sweetheart" settlements with industry.

Among the top contributors to the 2000 Bush Presidential Campaign were the very industries oil—and gas, logging, ranching and large-scale real estate development—that stand to benefit most from the weakening of federal wildlife policy. The court cases discussed above [regarding the Endangered Species Act] were virtually all filed by developers, ranchers and loggers, so it is clear that these industries have already benefited from their generosity to the campaign and their otherwise close ties with the Bush Administration. The oil and gas industry similarly has enjoyed favored treatment, even when its activities would despoil some of the most important remaining habitats of imperiled species.

Unfortunately, in the current Administration, science is often shortchanged when it gets in the way of favored corporate interests. Secretary Norton's Interior Department has repeatedly suppressed, distorted or scuttled the science, even when it comes from biologists within the Department.

Let's see if I've got this straight. The entire Bush administration is nefarious, corrupt, and bribed by corporate interests. Secretary Norton distorts science to benefit the administration's corporate contributors. But it's Bill Myers who is contemptible and "extreme" because he dared suggest that frivolous environmental lawsuits are increasing?

I think everyone ought to be honest about what's going on here. Groups like this, which I'm sure many Democrats would defend as "mainstream," and whose bidding Senators will be doing by refusing to vote on Bill Myers, are the ones spewing contempt.

I would like to respond to some of the rhetoric about Bill Myers' record as Solicitor at the Department of the Interior, a position to which this Senate confirmed him without opposition in 2001.

I understand that Mr. Myers's opponents believe that association with the Bush/Norton Interior Department is a disqualifier for service on the Federal bench I wonder if they will mind when such a standard is applied to the detriment of officials from the Clinton/Babbitt Interior Department, or any future Democratic administration, who might be nominated to the Federal bench. Regardless, let me point out just one example of where the Bush Interior Department clearly got a policy issue right, an issue on which Bill Myers himself has been extensively criticized.

The issue was decided just last month in the case of *Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance* [124 S. Ct. 2373 (2004)]: The Bush Interior Department's position in this case, for which Bill Myers laid the legal foundation, was upheld by a unanimous Supreme Court. The Court rejected environmental activists' challenges to a land use plan that was duly issued under authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The Court endorsed the Interior Department's "multiple use management" concept, describing it as "a de-

ceptively simple term that describes the enormously complicated task of striking a balance among the many competing uses to which land can be put. . . ." The Court also held that while a ruling in favor of the environmental activists:

might please them in the present case, it would ultimately operate to the detriment of sound environmental management. Its predictable consequence would be much vaguer plans from BLM in the future—making coordination with other agencies more difficult, and depriving the public of important information concerning the agency's long range intentions.

The fact that Bill Myers defended such policies cannot, in a rational confirmation process, disqualify him from service on the Federal bench. In fact, the endorsement of multiple use management policies by a unanimous Supreme Court in this case is compelling evidence against the absurd allegations that Bill Myers is somehow "out of the mainstream" with respect to public lands and environmental law.

I would also like to address a point raised earlier about some statements that Bill Myers made in articles that he wrote on behalf of his clients—cattlemen, ranchers and farmers who opposed Federal Government mismanagement of public lands.

In a July 1, 2004 article entitled "Ronald Reagan, Sagebrush Rebel, Rest in Peace," William Pendley of the Mountain States Legal Foundation wrote: "I am, former Governor Ronald Reagan proclaimed in 1980, 'a Sagebrush Rebel.'"

Now, at his hearing, Bill Myers was attacked merely for having used this same term, in an advocacy piece he wrote for his farming and ranching clients. In fact, he was mocked at this hearing, and after it, for merely channeling the concerns of his clients, who, like Ronald Reagan, considered themselves "Sagebrush Rebels."

Mr. Pendley's article goes on:

When Ronald Reagan was sworn in, he became the first president since the birth of the modern environmental movement a decade before to have seen, first hand, the impact of excessive federal environmental regulation on the ability of state governments to perform their constitutional functions; of local governments to sustain healthy economies; and of private citizens to use their own property. . . . Reagan thought federal agencies in the West should be "good neighbors." Therefore, Reagan returned control of western water rights to the states, where they had been from the time gold was panned in California until Jimmy Carter took office. Reagan sought to ensure that Western states received the lands that they had been guaranteed when they entered the Union. Reagan responded to the desire of western governors that the people of their states be made a part of the environmental equation by being included in federal land use planning.

I would also like to note that Reagan criticized "excessive" regulation, not any regulation at all—neither Bill Myers nor anyone else thinks there is no role for the Federal Government in environmental regulation. And Bill Myers emphasized this at his hearing, in response to very hostile questioning by Democratic Senators:

A centralized government—i.e. Congress—has an important role to play in environmental protection. And the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act—there are probably 70 environmental statutes that give evidence to that truth.

But the Reagan approach, which is also the Bush Interior Department's approach, which Bill Myers did his best to defend, is inimical to the environmental activist groups that oppose Mr. Myers' nomination. Any attempt to give the people who actually make their living on and around Western lands a stake in how those lands are regulated is violently opposed by these groups. And then these groups label their enemies "enemies of the environment," or "friends of polluters." It is unfortunate that such labels are uncritically accepted by some Senators, and because these liberal groups have similarly labeled Bill Myers, he won't get the up or down vote he deserves.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ALEXANDER).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM GERRY MYERS III TO BE A UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 603, William Gerry Myers III of Idaho, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Bill Frist, Orrin Hatch, Christopher Bond, Chuck Hagel, Ted Stevens, John Cornyn, Wayne Allard, Lindsey Graham, Sam Brownback, Gordon Smith, Lisa Murkowski, Lamar Alexander, Robert Bennett, Elizabeth Dole, Don Nickles, James Inhofe, and Conrad Burns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of William Gerry Myers III to be U.S. circuit judge for the Ninth Circuit shall be brought to a close?

The yeas are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.