

the floor to debate an important nomination for Secretary of State or Attorney General I don't think is being impudent. I think it is what we were elected to do.

The Constitution not only empowers us and authorizes us; it commands us to advise and consent—not just consent. If we want to spend a day or two debating something as serious as Judge Gonzales's involvement in rewriting the torture policy in America, I don't think that is inappropriate. In fact, I think our silence would be inappropriate.

Those on the other side—and even some on this side—may disagree with the conclusions reached earlier. I think you will find when the rollcall comes that there will be Senators on both sides of the aisle voting for Judge Gonzales. So be it. But to say we are somehow stepping out of line by even debating a nominee for the Cabinet is just plain wrong.

Second, this is exactly the same argument that was used on the issue of judges. If you listened to the commentaries, particularly from some sources on radio and television, you would think that the Democrats had found a way to stop most of the judges nominated by President Bush over the last 4 years. But look at the cold facts. Two-hundred and four of President Bush's judicial nominees were approved. They went through this Congress, under both Democratic and Republican committee leadership. Only 10 nominees were held up. The final score in that game was 204 to 10. It is clear the President won the overwhelming percentage of judicial nominees he sent to the floor of the Senate. If you listen to our critics, you would think it was the opposite—that we only approved 10 judges and turned down 204.

That wasn't the case at all. When people come to the floor critical of the Democrats for even wanting to debate a Cabinet nominee, I think they are overstating the case.

Let me address the last point made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 minute?

Mr. DURBIN. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DOMENICI. I don't want to take the Senator's right to the floor under any circumstances.

First, I ask to speak to ask the Senator a question right now, because I can't stay. I want the Senator to know that I always appreciate his remarks. They always stimulate me, whatever the Senator thinks that means. Maybe it stimulates me to answer; maybe it makes me get red in the face. I don't know.

Anyway, I don't think my remarks were principally devoted to—in fact, only mildly devoted to—the delay that may be taking place with regard to some nominees. I stand on that premise—that there have been delays that were uncalled for. But that was the principal point.

I hope that nobody would let the distinguished Senator kind of avoid the issue. That is not the issue Senator DOMENICI raises.

The issue is that this man is totally qualified; that those who know him best say he is qualified. It appears that those on the other side of the aisle want to see him defeated, or put upon by their arguments such that he doesn't go into that office strong and full of support but, rather, nicked by attacks that are meaningless and without any merit. That is the argument.

I tried to tell everybody who is for him. Frankly, they knew him a lot better than any Senators knew him. Many of them like Cisneros knew him for 15 years—and what he said about him on January 5, not 10 years ago, what he was, what he wasn't, how good he was.

That was my argument. My argument and question was, Why? Maybe that is my question. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I will make it a practice to always yield the floor whenever I possibly can because I think dialog between two Senators runs perilously close to debate which we have very little of on the floor of the Senate.

I welcome the comments of the Senator from New Mexico. I may disagree on this issue, but I hope we have respect for one another and what we bring to this Chamber.

The point I would like to make is this: I do not know him personally. I met him in my office for a brief meeting, the first time we ever sat down together.

I read his life story. I couldn't help but be impressed. Here is a man who came from a very modest circumstance, who served his Nation in the Air Force, who went to law school, who became general counsel to the Governor of Texas, a member of the Texas Supreme Court, and then legal counsel to the President of the United States. It is an amazing, extraordinary life story.

Some of my colleagues, including the Senator from Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR, have talked about their origins and their upbringing and how difficult it is to overcome with discrimination in many quarters. Thank goodness that is changing in America but not fast enough.

The point I would like to make is, I don't know a single Member of the Senate who has taken exception to Judge Gonzales because he is Hispanic or because he comes from humble origins. That is not the issue. The issue we believe, simply stated, is what did he do as general counsel to the President? Did it qualify him or disqualify him to have the highest law enforcement position in the United States of America? I think that is the issue.

When I came to the floor to speak earlier—and I will not recount my remarks—it related to the torture policy of which he was a part. I think in 10 or

20 years of history we will look at this war on terrorism and judge us harshly for having sat down to rewrite the policies and principles—the human principles—that guided this country for decades when it came to the treatment of prisoners and detainees. That is why I have reservations about Judge Gonzales. That is why I raised these questions, both in a public hearing and in written questions to him personally. That is why I am opposing his nomination, simply stated.

I have the greatest respect for what he has achieved personally in life, but I have a responsibility to go beyond that personal achievement and ask from a professional and governmental viewpoint, Is he the best person for this job? That is why many of us have risen in opposition to his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL APPRECIATION DAY FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize that today, February 2, 2005, is National Appreciation Day for Catholic Schools. As a proud graduate of Catholic schools, I am delighted to be able to meet some of these Catholic school student leaders to let them know what an investment in our future they are.

The spirit of Catholic schools has been present in the United States since the first settlers arrived in America. In 1606 the Franciscans opened a school in what is now St. Augustine, FL. During the next century, the Franciscans and Ursulines established Catholic schools throughout the American colonies: in Maryland, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, and even in non-British colonial locales, such as New Orleans. After the American Revolution, Catholic patriots worked to open the first official parochial school in the United States, St. Mary's School, established in 1782 in Philadelphia. In 1789 Georgetown University, the first Catholic college in the United States, was founded right here in the District.

Catholic schools have offered much more to the United States than just longevity, however; America's Catholic schools have offered an academic excellence that has helped to influence the moral, intellectual, physical, and social values of our youth for over 300 years. As Baltimore Archbishop Cardinal James Gibbons said, "Education must make a person not only clever but good." For more than three centuries, Catholic schools in this country