



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2005

No. 123

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty Father, the giver of gifts, help us to live in purity. Make all our thoughts so pure that they will bear Your scrutiny. Make all our desires so pure that they will be rooted in Your purposes. Make all our words so pure that You will find pleasure in hearing them. Make all our actions so pure that people will know that we are Your children.

Guide our lawmakers through the challenges of this day. Keep them from words that harm and do not help, from deeds that obstruct and do not build, from habits that shackle and do not liberate, and from ambitions that take and do not give.

Give to us all the blessings of asking and receiving, of seeking and finding, and of knocking and opening.

We pray in Your sovereign name.
Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable SAM BROWNBACK led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 28, 2005.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BROWNBACK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JOHN G. ROBERTS, JR., TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 317, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John G. Roberts, Jr., of Maryland, to be Chief Justice of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time from 10 a.m. until 11 a.m. will be under the control of the majority leader, or his designee.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today the Senate resumes consideration of the nomination of John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States. Tomorrow

at 11:30 we will vote on this nomination. Again, I remind all Senators to be at their desks for that vote. This is among the most significant votes that most of us will cast in our Senate careers, the approval of the nomination of Chief Justice of the United States. We ask Senators to come to the Chamber around 11:20 to be seated for the 11:30 vote.

Following the confirmation on Judge Roberts, the Senate will take up the Defense appropriations bill. Senators should expect votes on Thursday, and we will be voting on Friday on the appropriations bill or any other legislative or executive items that are cleared for action.

I was talking to the Democratic leader to make sure that we are voting on Friday of this week.

We also have a continuing resolution that we must act on this week before the end of the fiscal year. Therefore, I ask that Senators adjust whatever plans they have for the weekend or for Friday to recognize that we will be voting. We will not be voting on Monday or Tuesday in observance of the Jewish holiday. But the Senate will be in session to conduct business and discussing amendments. Those amendments will be stacked for votes on Wednesday. We will notify Senators as to what time that will be. I encourage Senators to come forward and offer their amendments as early as possible so we can vote on Wednesday.

PANDEMIC PREPAREDNESS

Mr. President, on another issue, an important issue—we have so much going on in this body with the appropriations bills, and the nomination coming forward, and that is going very well in terms of the discussion on both sides of the aisle. But there are many other issues as well.

I want to focus for a few minutes on an issue I do not believe is receiving the attention it deserves given the risk that is before us.

Yesterday, I sent a letter to Health and Human Services Secretary Michael

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S10529

Leavitt regarding our Nation's pandemic preparedness. The H5-N1 avian influenza—the name of this particular strain of virus—has spread from Southeast Asia to Russia. It is spreading across the world.

If you look at a map and look at that spread, it gives you real pause—and it should. It threatens to land in Europe. Although you can't say with certainty as you look at that picture of the globe and you see that spread, it will next be in Europe and America, although we don't know what that order will be.

It has infected more people and more poultry than any previous strain. If you look at the animal population—it is called the avian or bird influenza—it has caused the death or destruction of not just a few million but 160 million birds. That includes what is called the "culling" that goes on. But 160 million birds have died as a result of this influenza.

It has jumped from animals, the birds and other animals, actually, with a genetic shift to humans. People ask, How many humans have been infected? We do not know exactly, but we have documented 115 confirmed human cases of this particular H5-N1 influenza.

How fatal is it? It is fatal. The mortality rate is very high. Fifty-nine people out of the 115 confirmed cases died from this particular virus. It has a very high mortality rate.

Just this week, Indonesian health officials reported that yet another person—a young woman age 30—has died from the virus. This follows last week's deaths of two young girls and a boy with very similar symptoms in Jakarta and Samarinda. Since last Monday, Indonesia has put itself on an "extraordinary incident" status.

Experts warn that a global cataclysmic pandemic is not a question of if but when. Like an earthquake, or like a hurricane, it can hit any time. When it does, it could take the lives of tens of millions of people.

People ask, Is that an overstatement? I don't believe it is. You only have to go back and look at the history. This August, I spent a great deal of time talking to experts around the country on the H5-N1 influenza virus. In Tennessee, over in Memphis, there is St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital. There is a group of researchers there who probably know more about this particular strain than anybody in the world, led by Dr. Robert Webster at the St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital. He is one of the leading experts of the H5-N1 strain.

He explained in very clear terms that there are 16 families of the avian influenza. Billions of mutations of the virus are occurring every day. It is constantly changing, constantly adapting. With each of these little mutations, the virus multiplies its odds of becoming transmissible from human to human. It is changing up, to be spread throughout the bird population to the human population. And with just one little, tiny change, it can be trans-

mitted person to person to person. It is a little bit like pulling the lever on a Vegas slot machine over and over again. If you pull it enough times, the reels will align and hit the jackpot. In this case the jackpot is a deadly virus to which humans have no natural immunity.

It is very important right now. Nobody listening to me has a natural immunity to this particular virus. Infected hosts are contagious before they are symptomatic. In other words, anyone walking around who is infectious can spread the disease. They may not have any symptoms. The virus would thus have ample opportunity to spread rapidly throughout the population before it could be detected or appropriately contained—but not symptomatic. You don't know whether it can be contained or know to stay away from people.

To make matters worse, we lack our best defense. People say, If it does happen, surely in America or in the world today we have a vaccine, and we have a robust antiviral stockpile. If you think you are disposed, or if you are a physician or health personnel and go into a community to treat it, do we have enough of the antiviral pill which you can take that will protect you? The answer is no.

This particular antiviral pill is Tamifly. I will mention that shortly.

We don't have enough today for first responders, or doctors and nurses who would be taking care of you. The United States of America—the richest country in the world, and the most advanced country in the world—is unprepared in terms of the number of vaccines to treat, as well as the initial antiviral pill or therapy to treat. We do not have enough doses of the antiviral Tamifly. It is a drug which is effective today in the treatment of this particular strain. We have enough to treat about 2 million people—a little over that, 2.3 million people. We have 295 million people in this country and we can treat about 2 million people—and then that is it.

There is only one company located in the United States that produces the influenza vaccine—not the Tamifly, but the vaccine itself. In contrast, Britain, France, and Canada have tens of millions of doses on order—that is the Tamifly, the antiviral agent. We have 2 million. They have tens of millions in Britain, France and Canada.

Where does the Tamifly come from? It comes from Switzerland. That is where the manufacturing facility is located.

With our weakened domestic manufacturing capacity in this country for both something like Tamifly but especially vaccines—we do not have manufacturing plants to do it—it makes us dangerously dependent on other countries and foreign sources.

If there is an outbreak in that country and the manufacturing plant is there, it is very unlikely they will send doses to the United States of America.

The vaccine testing today indicates that an H5-N1 vaccine is safe and able to generate a robust immune response in healthy adults. That is good. That shows real progress. This data is preliminary, but it represents a very positive step that progress is being made. That is an important first step, however, and this is the key: It would take 6 to 9 months to produce 180 million of what are called monovalent vaccines. If this virus did have that transmission ability, it would be traveling and ravaging our population with no vaccine available. Two doses are required. We could make 180 million. That is enough to treat 90 million people in 9 months. It would take at least a full year to produce enough vaccine for the entire country. By that time, because this virus can be transmitted or could be transmitted so easily, the risk is that tens of thousands could die.

Some ask, why do I use such high figures? We do have a historical precedent. Look back to 1917 and 1918 and the Spanish flu. That pandemic killed not just tens of thousands but 40 million people worldwide. The Spanish flu virus killed 40 million people worldwide, the majority of whom were kids, children, and young adults between the ages of 10 and 35.

Vaccines were available for the 1957 and 1968 flu pandemics, but they arrived too late and 104,000 people died in the United States alone.

Dr. Hitoshi Ashitani at the World Health Organization warns this time around the avian flu virus may be impossible to contain. The geographic spread is historically unprecedented.

So people ask: Well, why are you giving us, Senator FRIST, all this bad news? What can and should be done? In my letter sent to Secretary Leavitt—and I had the opportunity to discuss it with him a little bit last night—I did ask him to finalize the agency's Pandemic Influenza Response and Preparedness Plan. We need a coordinated, comprehensive, aggressive plan which draws on public health and homeland security, foreign policy and defense expertise.

The plan should serve a dual purpose: First, to detect, identify, contain, and respond to threats abroad; and, No. 2, to bolster domestic preparedness and response capacity. I also urged the Secretary to purchase enough additional Tamifly to treat a large portion of the U.S. population.

These are critical first steps, but we have to do a lot more. We need to develop a bold vision of how to address this in future threats—whether they are biological weapons or infectious disease, whether they are natural, whether they are accidental, or whether they are deliberate.

That is why earlier this year I called for a Manhattan Project for the 21st Century to launch an unprecedented collaboration among the Federal Government and industry and academia. We must encourage and support advanced support and development into

prevention and treatment. We must enable the detection, the identification, and containment of any emerging or newly emerging threat. And we must ensure our domestic ability to manufacture, distribute, and administer the treatments needed to protect the American people. This should be a central focus of our national attention.

As I mentioned in opening, there is a lot going on in our response to natural disaster today. But we need to keep the focus, as well, on the potential for this pandemic. Failing to do so risks the public health and our national security.

In May 2004, the Senate passed Project BioShield and shortly thereafter President Bush signed it into law. Project Bioshield builds on the Bioterrorism Preparedness Act of 2002 and strengthens our Nation's defenses against the threat of anthrax, botulism, smallpox, Ebola, or plague, as well as a radiological fallout from a potential terrorist attack.

Building on the goals of Project BioShield, the leadership has introduced the Protecting America in the War on Terror Act of 2005 earlier this year. I applaud my colleague for the steps we have taken thus far, and I applaud them for their continued leadership. But we have much more to do. More work remains to be done. We are in a race against time, and unlike the flu pandemics of the 20th century, we have been warned.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to protect the health, well-being, and security of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). The Senator from the great State of Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

COAL ENERGY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I have stated that each day we are in session I am going to try to rise in the Senate to speak about the dependent condition we find ourselves in on foreign oil. Some 58 to 60 percent of our daily consumption of oil comes from foreign shores. This is not a good position for the United States. No matter how much we sounded the alarm bells over the past several years, it is hard to shake the powers that be out of our collective lethargy, to break this stranglehold that oil has running through our economy. And it has led us to our dependence on oil for well over a majority of our daily consumption.

That is not a good position to be in for the defense of our country's interests where we have to protect the free flow of oil to all of the very oil-thirsty world. A lot of those sealanes coming out of the Persian Gulf region look to the United States for the military protection to keep those lanes open so oil can flow.

Clearly, we ought to, after the remainder of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, be on the journey quickly to weaning ourselves from the dependence on this oil. That means the collective will of this Nation to come together in a major project, like a Manhattan Project or an Apollo Project. In other words, the moonshot of this decade ought to be weaning ourselves from dependence on foreign oil, as going to the Moon as a result of the Apollo Project was to the decade of the 1960s.

Each day I am going to try to chronicle a new technology so that we can do that. Today I will talk about coal gasification, specifically coal-based integrated gasification. It is otherwise called combined cycle technology.

Our Nation has an abundance of coal. The United States has the largest proven coal reserves of any Nation in the world. At the current production levels, U.S. coal reserves should last over the next 250 years. That is the good news; the bad news is coal's high carbon content relative to other fossil fuels so that in the burning of it, it releases significant quantities of carbon.

Right now, coal combustion, the burning of coal, accounts for more than one-third of the world's carbon emissions. Those emissions in the air is what we do not want.

I will never forget being in Beijing, China, in the year 1981 in the dead of winter, January of that year. The city of Beijing was shrouded in black smog that was a result of the coal dust settling over that city because the primary source of heat was the burning of coal, with no attention to the emissions that allowed all of those particulates to go into the air. The last time I visited Beijing, about 2 years ago, after the dead of winter, I must say they have cleaned up their environment quite a bit, but they still have a ways to go.

We know the negatives with regard to burning coal. Now let's look on the positives; that is, coal gasification or coal-based integrated gasification combined cycle technology has much lower pollutant emissions, and it holds great promise. Only two such plants exist in the United States today. One of them is in my State of Florida. It is run by Tampa Electric Company. I commend TECO for being one of the leaders in this country. My State of Florida is going to have another IGCC plant—that is coal gasification—by 2011, through the Orlando commission and the Southern Company. I thank those two companies for being leaders.

This is the technology: First, the coal is gasified using a chemical process rather than just the burning of coal to generate a synthetic gas—or what we call a syngas, synthetic fuels—that is mostly composed of hydrogen and carbon monoxide. Then that synthetic gas is used to fuel a combustion engine, a turbine, and the exhaust heat is employed to produce steam for power generation and for gasification. The process has the potential to be both cleaner

and more efficient than just the burning of coal in a steam boiler which is done to make electricity, and it generates considerable waste heat in the traditional burning of coal that then leads to the release of a myriad of undesirable emissions.

In contrast, coal gasification isolates and collects nearly all of the impurities, including mercury and a large portion of the carbon, before the combustion. So those things are not going to be emitted into the atmosphere. The coal is gasified with either oxygen or air, and the resulting synthetic gas or syngas is cooled, cleaned, and fired in a gas turbine, and the hot exhaust from the gas turbine passes through a heat recovery steam generator where it produces steam that drives a steam turbine.

Theoretically, the steam gasification process can be applied to any low-quality carbonaceous feedstock. The progress in developing this technology also raises interesting possibilities with respect to the future of biomass—either alone or in combination with coal—for electricity production. This has a lot of promise.

This whole process, called IGCC, could also be utilized for something called polygeneration. That is co-producing other high-valued products in addition to electricity using gasification.

Gasification could be used to produce ultraclean synthetic fuels from coal, and biomass. Carbon dioxide capture and storage would have to be developed to address the climate change issues coal-based synthetic fuels pose.

But the long and short of it is, these synthetic fuels are inherently superior to crude-oil-driven hydrocarbon fuels. This would help us in the transition to more energy-efficient technologies, such as compression-ignition-engine hybrid electric vehicles.

We could exploit our country's huge coal reserves in an environmentally responsible way. The economic and reliability challenges certainly still exist before these kinds of plants become more readily abundant. And the CO₂ carbon capture and storage must be perfected.

Those are all challenges we must meet. But it is a promising technology that would provide the United States with an alternative to electricity produced from natural gas and a way to set us on a course to wean ourselves from dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. President, I will continue to speak out on all of the alternatives in which we can try to sever our dependence on foreign oil.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the nomination of John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States. I speak about this at an exciting time for this country. This will be the 17th person to occupy this position. It is a rarity for this position to become available. I love this Nation.

I love the institutions of this Nation. More, I love the people of this Nation.

I know, as well, that John Roberts does too. I know from the time I have spent talking with him and hearing his comments, that he too loves this Nation. He loves the people of this Nation and he looks forward to its greater greatness into the future. I am looking forward to his service.

When the Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, whom many of us quote often, visited the United States in the 1830s, he wondered how Americans could maintain a genuine representative government when the liberty they enjoyed would suggest that the average citizen would be a purely self-interested individual. If we were to give them pure liberty, they would, he believed, just pursue self-interests. So how could you have a government that would govern when everybody is focused on their self-interest?

He was amazed to find what kept Americans joined together and with their government was what he called "habits of the heart." By this, he meant that citizens often were concerned about the greater public good, along with their own narrow self-interests. So, while they had their own self-interests, their hearts pulled them to a greater public good and these "habits of the heart." That led to their participation in political discourse, to be involved in their communities, and take care of their fellow citizens.

Throughout our history, our "habits of the heart" have informed and driven America's conscience. The people knew the colonial system stifled freedom, so they rejected the British monarchy and ultimately ratified the U.S. Constitution. The people knew in their hearts that slavery was wrong, and that terrible institution was rightly brought to an end. It was difficult, and it was at a terrible cost. And the people knew that the legal promise of equal protection was empty without racial justice.

Throughout the consideration of Judge Roberts' nomination, many of my colleagues have spoken about a particular issue that I want to discuss, and its impact and relationship to that habit of the heart. This particular issue, which is at the center of the debate for Judge Roberts, is the right to privacy. They also have demanded that Judge Roberts adhere in a few cherished cases to stare decisis, that is, the practice of letting a precedent stand for the sake of stability in the law, regardless of whether the precedent reflects the correct interpretation of the law.

What is striking about this discussion is that it has not been illuminated by what Tocqueville saw in us long ago—those "habits of the heart" that make Americans aware of the greater good and of the justice due their fellow citizens.

To explain what I mean, consider Judge Roberts' confirmation hearing. During the hearing, Judiciary Committee members spent a lot of time dis-

cussing section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. It was often mentioned that it was critical for Congress to enact a so-called effects test in order to eradicate discrimination in voting practices. Under this test, a neutrally worded law was to be struck down if it diluted the political preferences of minority voters, even if that effect was intentional. If there was an effect where it had a negative impact on voting for minority groups, it was to be thrown out, it was to be declared unconstitutional, it was a bad effect.

It seems to me there is a broader lesson to be learned by discussion of an effects test. And I agree with that effects test in the Voting Rights Act; it is absolutely right. It seems to me there is a broader lesson to be learned about the effects test.

During the debate on Judge Roberts, some have argued about whether he will vote to affirm or reject abstract legal principles, without really considering what the real effects of these principles have been. And when it comes to the right to privacy and stare decisis, the discussion of effects has been obscured, if not ignored altogether.

The standard argument we have heard is that cases such as *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* have established the right to privacy, and that such cases should be maintained for the sake of "stability" and "settled expectations." Yet both our heads and our hearts tell us that these decisions deserve much more searching scrutiny. This is in part because we rightly resist insulated courts short-circuiting political debates. But it is also because we rightly believe that these decisions and doctrines have all-too-real effects.

And so it is with the right to privacy. Some of my colleagues have argued that this right, which has been interpreted to guarantee a right to abortion, has been beneficial to women. They argue the right to abortion has "freed" them to pursue such goals as full participation in the workforce. But there are certain other effects of this right which should be identified, if we are to have an honest appraisal of what this right has accomplished, and what it has wrought.

I have pointed out repeatedly that in the wake of *Roe*, 40 million children have been aborted in America—40 million souls who could have brightened our existence and made their contribution to the habits of the American heart. But even this general result of abortion's cold reality masks the specific costs of the Supreme Court's constitutional misadventure in *Roe*. For it has become clear in recent years that it is the so-called least among us, the disabled, who have paid a disproportionate price as a result of the right established in *Roe* and other cases.

Let me give you some examples. According to recent numbers released in November of 2004 by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, over 80 percent of preg-

nancies involving a child with Down Syndrome were terminated "by choice" in the 1980s and 1990s—80 percent. Again, that is "by choice." According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, out of over 55,000 pregnant women screened, 83 percent of unborn children are terminated after testing positive for cystic fibrosis. Finally, the CDC noted that for spina bifida and similar neural tube defects, at least 80 percent of pregnancies "were electively terminated."

These particular numbers are astonishing, and not just because they represent the wholesale destruction of generations of unborn disabled children. What makes them painfully ironic is that this trend persists even in a society that has extended significant protections to the disabled once they are born.

A prime example, of course, is the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which was an historic achievement. I applaud my colleagues, Senators KENNEDY and HARKIN, and my predecessor, Senator Bob Dole, for their important role in passing this milestone legislation.

Deeming the protection of the disabled a "human rights issue," the first President Bush called the ADA "the world's first comprehensive declaration of equality for people with disabilities." His successor, President Clinton, stated on the ninth anniversary of the passage of the ADA that "For too long, we have encumbered disabled Americans with paternalistic policies that prevent them from reaching their potential. But now, we endeavor to empower individuals with the tools they need to achieve their dreams." I would note that to dream, they have to be alive.

In enacting the ADA, the Congress explicitly made the following finding, upon which one of the protections of the ADA was based:

People with disabilities, as a group, occupy an inferior status in our society, and are severely disadvantaged socially, vocationally, economically, and educationally.

In worthy fulfillment of the promise of the Declaration of Independence that "all Men are created equal," the Congress issued in the ADA a "clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities." There were not qualifiers for it. They did not say at certain places or points of time in life. They said this is a "clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities," period.

To enforce this mandate, Congress explicitly "invoke[d] the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities."

The ADA establishes extensive protections for persons with disabilities. It

protects them when they seek employment; it protects them when they attempt to use government services; it protects them when they wish to use public transportation; it protects them even when they want to book a hotel room or seek access to a restaurant; it even protects the hearing-impaired and speech-impaired who want to share in the benefits of the revolution in telecommunications.

Similarly, 30 years ago, Congress passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. In the act, Congress found, among other things, that “[d]isability is a natural part of the human experience and in no way diminishes the right of individuals to participate in or contribute to society.”

These are worthy and grand statements of inclusion and support to people with disabilities.

The ADA and the IDEA demonstrate that the disabled need and deserve the protection of the law in order to fulfill their potential.

Yet ironically, it is when the disabled are most vulnerable—indeed, completely voiceless—that our society leaves them completely unprotected. The laws offer no shelter to them before they are born. In this dangerous legal vacuum has stepped the Supreme Court. In 1973, just 2 years before enactment of the IDEA, the Court invented a right to abortion—a right which has proven lethal to legions of disabled Americans. And in a cruel jurisprudential twist, it was none other than the 14th Amendment, which Congress invoked in enacting the ADA, upon which the Supreme Court based the right to abortion.

What does it say about our society that we refuse to acknowledge the damaging effects of Roe on the disabled? Where does the path lead when we ignore the habits of our hearts, which demand that we extend our compassion to these Americans? What have we become when we have jettisoned the unalienable right to life Thomas Jefferson found self-evident in favor of the moral and legal quicksand of Roe?

The sad experiences of other countries suggest a few unsettling answers to these questions. For example, China recently criminalized abortion for the purpose of sex selection. The reason for this is revealed by figures—an effects test, if you will—showing that 119 boys are born in China for every 100 girls—119 boys for every 100 girls. This gender gap can be attributed to the combination of the Communist government’s one-child policy with a culture that often values sons more than daughters. So millions of parents have aborted baby girls hoping to have a boy next time. If current trends continue, some experts say that China could have as many as 40 million men who can’t find spouses by the year 2020.

India faces a similar problem. Sex determination has been a serious problem there since the 1970s, when amniocentesis began to be widely used

to determine the sex of the unborn child. A 1985 survey revealed that 90 percent of amniocentesis centers were involved in sex determination, with nearly 96 percent of female fetuses aborted. In response, India outlawed fetal sex determination for sex selection 8 years ago, but prenatal sex determination through ultrasonography continues.

Indeed, the situation has become so dire that the Indian Medical Association has appealed to the conscience of that country—the habit of the heart of that nation—and the world to save baby girls from abortion. The association says that up to 2 million baby girls still are killed by abortion every year. A former President of the Indian Medical Association told the BBC that the situation has led to a demographic imbalance of up to 50 million fewer women in the country than would be expected.

This selective destruction of the unborn in other countries has a grim predecessor in American history: the eugenics movement. As Edwin Black has noted in a book called “War on the Weak”:

[T]he eugenics movement slowly constructed a national bureaucratic and juridical infrastructure to cleanse America of its “unfit.” Specious intelligence tests, colloquially known as IQ tests, were invented to justify incarceration of a group labeled “feeble-minded.” Often the so-called feeble-minded were just shy, too good-natured to be taken seriously, or simply spoke the wrong language or were the wrong color. Mandatory sterilization laws were enacted in some twenty-seven states to prevent targeted individuals from reproducing more of their kind. Marriage prohibition laws proliferated throughout the country to stop race mixing. Collusive litigation was taken to the U.S. Supreme Court, which sanctified eugenics and its tactics. The goal was to immediately sterilize fourteen million people in the United States and millions more worldwide—the “lower tenth”—and then continuously eradicate the remaining lowest tenth until only a pure Nordic super race remained. Ultimately, some 60,000 Americans were coercively sterilized and the total is probably much higher.

The source of the word “eugenics” is very interesting. The very word was coined by Francis Galton, the nephew of Charles Darwin. Galton believed that “what nature does blindly, slowly, and ruthlessly, man may do providently, quickly, and kindly.” In 1883, Galton created a new term for this manmade ordering of life. As Black describes it, Galton “scrawled Greek letters on a hand-sized scrap of paper, and next to them put two English fragments he would join into one. The Greek word for ‘well’ was abutted to the Greek word for ‘born’ . . . and the word he wrote on that small piece of paper was ‘eugenics.’” Well born.

Among the strongest proponents of eugenics was Margaret Sanger. Sanger advocated for the mass sterilization of so-called “defectives” and the wholesale incarceration of the so-called “unfit.” She particularly supported the sterilization plan of those people she

deemed unfit; she believed this plan would lead to the “salvation of American civilization.” She also argued for sterilization of those who were “irresponsible and reckless,” including those “whose religious scruples prevent their exercising control over their numbers.” For these people, she contended that “there is no doubt in the minds of all thinking people that the procreation of this group should be stopped.” She repeatedly referred to the lower classes as human waste not worthy of assistance, proudly promoting the views that these “weeds” should be “exterminated.”

Sanger went on to found a group that came to be known as Planned Parenthood, the very same organization which successfully prevailed upon the Supreme Court to reaffirm Roe v. Wade in the 1992 case of Planned Parenthood v. Casey. Sanger’s legacy still resonates today.

Dr. John Harris of Manchester University in England has offered a slightly milder formulation than that of Sanger. He has stated that:

Eugenics is the attempt to create fine healthy children, and that’s everyone’s ambition. . . . We’re not trying to do this through killing people or eliminating individuals, we’re trying to do this by making choices about which people will exist in the future.

Given the experience of other countries with abortion; given our own experience with abortion of the disabled; and given the natural repugnance most people have with the eugenics movement, I would suggest to my colleagues that Roe and other related cases simply flunk the “effects test” we have long applied in the context of voting and other rights. These cases have carved millions of voices out of our civic core and cannot withstand moral scrutiny, much less an honest legal examination.

The right to privacy as it has been extended has not only weakened our legal culture; it has made us poorer as a people. It is impossible not to recognize the significant contributions made by those with disabilities who do survive; they help to bring out the humanity in each of us, and we are better for it. Every time I see one of these beautiful children, I am reminded of what joy they bring, and what joy their counterparts might have brought.

How can we, as a nation, stand for the principle of equality, that we are all blessed to be alive, that we are all capable of great success regardless of disability, and that we are a compassionate society, when our laws blithely allow the elective termination of more than 80 percent of a vulnerable population. It is incomprehensible.

Numerous men, women, and children with disabilities have overcome adversity and achieved great successes in their lives. I would like to take a few minutes to share a few of their stories.

Here is a picture of Abby Loy. I met her last week when she visited my office. She is a beautiful young girl and

she has Down Syndrome. She does modeling and was recently featured in a book called "Common Threads," which illustrates the numerous accomplishments achieved by people with Down Syndrome. Abby and her mother came to Capitol Hill from Michigan last week to promote awareness of disability issues and to illustrate Abby's wonderful life journey.

Look at this beautiful child. This note is from her parents:

When Abby was born, physicians and social workers informed our family of all of her potential limitations, developmentally and physically. When we asked what Abby's education path might look like, we were told that she would attend special classrooms. Abby has been successfully educated with support in all regular education classes and continues to grow. We felt Abby would prove herself to be much more capable than others believed . . . It continues today.

Again, that note is from her parents.

It is a tough choice when a mother or a spouse gets a diagnosis in utero that a child has Down Syndrome; it is agonizing. I know from my own thoughts when we were having our children. Yet I ask people to look at the beauty of the child and embrace her. If they can't, there are other groups and individuals that will. It is a tough choice, but it is a child, a beautiful child, a child that can accomplish much.

I want to show another example. This one is Samuel. I have had Samuel in to testify before a subcommittee I chaired last year. I am rather partial to the name Samuel myself. In this picture he is catching fish. It doesn't look like a very big fish and the fish doesn't look too happy, but Samuel is sure happy. He has spina bifida, which most medical professionals call a devastating birth defect. These are his parents' words:

Though we were devastated by learning that our unborn son had spina bifida, we wanted to do all we could to improve the quality of his life. Ending it was never an option. Let's see what we can do to improve it. At 21 weeks gestation, Samuel had fetal repair of his spina bifida lesion. Today he is a 5-year old kindergartner. He is imaginative, funny, and compassionate. He can read, swim, and catch even the fastest lizard. He has touched many lives. We are so thankful for him and are eager to see what great things he will accomplish.

Normally, about 80 percent of children diagnosed with spina bifida are terminated and killed in utero.

I have a final example. This is a lady who looks at her Down Syndrome as an "up syndrome" and has started "Up with Down Syndrome". She has served on President Clinton's Committee on Mental Retardation. She served three terms from 1994 to 2000, one of the first two members with a disability to be appointed to this committee. Her name is Ann M. Forts. She goes around the country and talks with individuals about what she can do. The second paragraph of a letter she sent to me is particularly striking:

As I think about my active and happy life on the upside of my Down Syndrome disability, I find it extremely frightening

to think of how vastly different my life would have been if my parents had taken that ill-conceived professional advice when I was born.

In other words, to put her in some form of an institution rather than bringing her home.

These are inspirations to all of us. And if you need further inspiration, just go talk to Jimmy, the elevator operator right outside the door of the Senate Chamber, who brightens all of our lives.

They will not be defeated by their disabilities, and we celebrate them for that. But think about the many more like them, think about the more than 80 percent of the beautiful capable children, similar to Abby, Ann, Jimmy, and Samuel, who are never given a chance because their lives are terminated before they are born.

We should not use bland phrases such as "right to privacy" or "stare decisis" to disguise the issue at stake with Judge Roberts' nomination to be Chief Justice of the United States. We must be truthful with the American people, as well as ourselves, and admit that this confirmation is, at its root, about the most fundamental and basic right of all: the right to life.

As Americans, it is our duty to protect and defend the weakest among us. The duty is not only mandated by our laws but nurtured by our conscience and our habits of the heart.

With the recent enactment of the bipartisan partial-birth abortion ban and bills like the Pre-Natally Diagnosed Awareness Act, which I sponsored with Senator KENNEDY, we have begun heading in the right direction. However there is still significant work to be done.

There is still a glaring inconsistency between the life that we deem to be worthy of protection under the Constitution, and the life which we do not. The value placed on certain persons and stages of life seems to be arbitrarily assigned. The Constitution clearly states in the 5th and 14th Amendments that "no person" shall be deprived of "life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

"No person." What does that mean? Does it extend to an unborn child? Is an unborn child a person or merely a piece of property? A person is entitled to inalienable rights established under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Property can be done with as its master chooses. I posed this question to Judge Roberts during his confirmation hearing. Because this issue may come before the Court at some point in the near future, he declined to answer directly. But the persistence of this issue simply underlines the importance of each Supreme Court vacancy.

I will support the nomination of John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States. I will do so based in part on his stellar credentials for the position, but also on my hope and my prayer that he understands what is at stake

when the Supreme Court interprets the people's Constitution—not a sterile debate over arcane legal principles and Latin doctrines but the very habits of our hearts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I pay tribute to my colleague and friend, Senator BROWNBACK, for his eloquent speech on behalf of those who are disadvantaged and deserve protection from the law. He made an outstanding speech.

I rise to express my support of Judge John Roberts in regard to his nomination as Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. I know what the committee has done, and I know what the majority of Senators will likely do, and that is to vote in favor of Judge Roberts. But I also believe that an open-minded individual, applying Kansas common sense, would reach the same conclusion that I have come to hold.

It is no small event for a Senator to have the opportunity to participate in the confirmation of a candidate for the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Over the course of our Nation's history, the Senate has come together 155 times to vote on a Supreme Court Justice. This occasion marks the 17th time to confirm a Chief Justice. So I am humbled and honored to be part of this moment of history.

The consultation efforts on behalf of the administration with my fellow Senate colleagues in regard to this nomination have been extensive. That is probably an understatement. The President has made great efforts to open dialog and to invite input and to reach out to Members of the Senate. His nomination of Judge John Roberts is a solid choice and not one made in isolation.

Kansans understand that the words inscribed on our Founding Fathers' documents are not as delicate and fragile as the paper on which they are written. They know that the power behind these ideas is what serves as the foundation of our Nation's democratic government.

My sense from Judge Roberts is that he, too, rigorously believes in the power of the ideals set forth in the Constitution. As illustrated by his record as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, he adheres to the guidelines outlined in the Constitution. Simply put, he walks the talk.

After watching Judge Roberts endure—I guess that is the best word for it—over 20 hours of questioning during the nomination hearings, I find myself not only more familiar with his many qualifications, his impressive experiences, but deeply impressed with his character. Judge Roberts' respectful demeanor and his personal humility in the face of periodic abrasive questioning from some are exactly the type of qualities that a Chief Justice should

possess. During the question-and-answer portion of the nomination hearing, testimonies of his colleagues, former clients, and others who attested to his character, Judge Roberts has shown to be a man of high integrity, wisdom, and fairness. This assessment was echoed from those representing a broad range of ideologies.

Judge Roberts does possess a brilliant legal mind and a thorough understanding of the law. He performs his duties with a vigor and a meticulous attention to detail that has been noted by all who have spoken about him. As a judge, he approaches a case to understand the legal facts involved and the laws that are affected, while avoiding the temptation to fulfill a specific judicial philosophy. His decisions are based on the merits of the law. His record has earned him the highest rating from the American Bar Association, the ABA. It is worth mentioning that the ABA has often been referred to by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and those on this side as well as the "gold standard" for evaluating judges.

Most notably, in his opening statement before the Senate committee, Judge Roberts stated:

Judges and Justices are servants of the law, not the other way around.

And concerning the rule of law, he went on to say:

It is what we mean when we say that we are a government of laws and not of men. It is that rule of law that protects the rights and the liberties of all Americans. It is the envy of the world. Because without the rule of law, any rights are really meaningless.

Clearly, Judge Roberts understands that the role of a judge is not to rule based on his personal judgments but to adhere to the laws as they are written.

The role of the third branch under our Constitution is paramount, as the Supreme Court is often referred to as the "gatekeeper of democracy." The duty to ensure that legislation passed and executed is in line with the Constitution is an important check within our Government. The lifetime appointment provided for in the Constitution is an important protection for our Justices to guard against any pressure in regard to politics. The forward thinking by the authors of our Constitution actually provided for the preservation of our democracy by including these checks and balances between these three branches.

Some have expressed concern about Judge Roberts' relatively young age to be nominated to such a powerful position. On the contrary, I believe that age will allow for a term of growth and stability for the Court. In my view, his age is of less importance when compared to his style of judging. In his response to my colleague, Senator HATCH, he explains that his style is that of a modest judge. He went on to explain that:

It means an appreciation that the role of the judge is limited, that a judge is to decide the cases before them, they're not to legislate, they're not to execute the laws.

However, at the same time, we have witnessed judges acting beyond the scope of their duties in making decisions that in a representative democracy are legislative in their jurisdiction. We have seen that all across the country. This what I consider to be abuse of power is a source of tremendous contention, not only with folks from the great State of Kansas but with Americans nationwide on too many issues. In too many cases, we have seen decisions that are contrary to the will of the people. Americans have questioned the rulings on cases ranging from the Boy Scouts of America to the most publicized recent attack on private property rights. In Kansas, land is gold. And if land is gold, farmland is platinum. We have a healthy respect for property rights in middle America. Based on his comments, I believe Judge Roberts holds a similar opinion.

Finally, let us not forget that Judge Roberts is currently a judge. He has already experienced the confirmation process for his judgeship on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. Let us also remember that the same accolades that led to Senate approval of his nomination by unanimous consent—no disagreement, every Senator—are certainly applicable as of today.

I am hopeful that through the course of debate on this nomination and the next Supreme Court nomination—the next Supreme Court nomination—we can avoid the destructive partisanship that approached the brink of absolutism and ideology, a different criteria in regard to how we select judges. We have a duty to respectfully reflect the great traditions of this Chamber and rise above partisan bickering. We must raise the level of civility in our political discourse more so than ever in regard to considering the nomination of judges.

Our democracy is only as strong as our governmental institutions. Judge Roberts will provide a strong pillar of support in the third branch of our Government. That, and for the reasons I have just enumerated, is why I will vote in favor of Judge Roberts' nomination to be the 17th Chief Justice of the United States.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I thank the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ISAKSON). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Judge John Roberts for Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Just 1 year ago, I was in the middle of a heated Senate campaign, and one of the most important issues to the voters of South Carolina, an issue that came up again and again, was the topic of judges. At that time, I promised the people of South Carolina that I would fight for fair judges who would judge based on the facts and the law, not on their personal political opinions.

Americans simply cannot understand how certain judges arrive at decisions such as banning the Pledge of Allegiance or allowing local governments to take a person's home and give it to a business simply to generate more taxes.

Judge Roberts clearly understands and demonstrated in his hearings that he is the kind of Justice America needs. He is brilliant, fair, and independent. He has proven himself to be a person of integrity who is committed to equal justice for all Americans.

Judge Roberts is eminently qualified. He has earned the American Bar Association's highest rating of "well qualified." Before being unanimously confirmed by the Senate in 2003 to the DC Court of Appeals, Judge Roberts had already established an unmatched resume in the legal world. After graduating in the top of his class from Harvard Law School, he went on to clerk for Justice William Rehnquist and then worked as a top aide in President Reagan's Justice Department. In private and public practice, he argued an amazing 39 cases before the Supreme Court, establishing his reputation as one of the Nation's top litigators.

During his hearing, Judge Roberts displayed his humble expertise, and I believe Americans warmly welcome his approach to the law. Despite what some Democrats are saying, Judge Roberts was very forthcoming at his hearing in discussing his judicial philosophy, his legal thinking, and his views on a judge's proper role within our constitutional framework.

The Senate was also allowed to review an unprecedented number of documents from Judge Roberts' service in the Federal Government illustrating his judicial philosophy and legal ability. In question after question, Judge Roberts showed an extraordinary knowledge of the law and its history. Without the use of notes or staff, Judge Roberts easily recalled facts from hundreds of years of case law.

I was pleased to see during the hearings that Judge Roberts stuck strictly to the Ginsburg rule, choosing not to comment on cases or issues that are likely to appear before the Court. In her hearings, Justice Ginsburg emphatically declared that she could give "no hints, no forecasts, no previews" as to how she would decide on future cases. She was right to do so. Judges are expected to be impartial and fair, looking at each case without prejudice. Senators who expected Judge Roberts to answer questions that required him to prejudge cases were ignoring the Code of Judicial Ethics and, I suspect, playing politics with the confirmation process for partisan reasons.

Nominees should never compromise their judicial independence and ability to rule fairly by advocating positions on issues that could come before them. Judges are not politicians. In fact, Judge Roberts himself put it best during the hearings when he said:

Judges wear black robes because it doesn't matter who they are as individuals. That's

not going to shape their decision. It's their understanding of the law that will shape their decision.

Judge Roberts has earned praise for his conduct during the confirmation hearings, and he has solidified broad, bipartisan support.

I believe Judge Roberts deserves a fair up-or-down vote before the Supreme Court starts its next session in October. It is important to have a Chief Justice on the bench for the start of the session and to have the Court at full strength.

Based on my July meeting with Judge Roberts, based on his qualifications and his exemplary performance before the Judiciary Committee, I am confident he will strictly interpret the law and not legislate from the bench.

Judge Roberts has all the qualities Americans want in their Chief Justice. It is critical that the Chief Justice have the ability to listen to all sides of a debate and work well with each Associate Justice. Judge Roberts has clearly displayed his patience, fairness, and respect.

The votes tomorrow for Judge Roberts will show that an overwhelming majority of Senators agree. The votes tomorrow against Judge Roberts will reveal the Senators who would not support any of President Bush's nominees, no matter how qualified they are.

I fully support the nomination of Judge Roberts. I will cast my vote in his favor for confirmation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support Judge Roberts as the next Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today, like my colleague who spoke just before me, to support the nomination of John Roberts to be the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. To those who know me, to those who have heard me talk on this subject, this is no great surprise. But voting on a Supreme Court nomination is a very rare task. It is more historic now, as the Senate will consider a nominee for the top job of the Court.

The question I ask today is, Why should America care about this debate? This debate is more significant than a lifetime appointment of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

This debate is more significant than the influence that one single individual brings who is chosen. This debate is about future decisions that will affect the lives of every American, that will affect our children and our children's children. From our civil liberties, to property rights, to questions of life and death, to safety in communities, to the very basic freedoms, there is no area in our daily lives that is not somehow affected by the judicial decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. The decisions made by the Court today will have a lasting effect long after we have gone from this institution. It is essential, absolutely essential, that we confirm

not only competent, impartial judges, but those who are the very brightest and those who are good citizens and understand the task for which they have been nominated and confirmed.

Over the course of the last several weeks we have all had the opportunity to hear from legal experts, from political analysts, about Judge Roberts and the chances of the success of his nomination and his confirmation. We have had a process of very detailed hearings where our colleagues, many of whom are lawyers, have asked the most appropriate questions, with a lot of thought, a lot of time to deliver the questions, and we have seen the response of a brilliant lawyer, with no notes, quote case law from years past that appropriately answered the questions that did not affect future cases the Court might hear.

Now, I am not a lawyer and perhaps I do not judge Judge Roberts' legal background the same way lawyers might judge it, but I do understand people. I understand when I meet somebody who is a good person. I have met Judge Roberts. This is a good person. This is an individual in whom America can be proud when they refer to him as Chief Justice.

A couple weeks ago I had the opportunity to have Judge Roberts in my office. We talked about his background, his life experiences, we talked about our families. I did not quiz him about legal precedent or court rulings. I did not present him with hypothetical cases or his position on hot topics of the day. That, quite frankly, was not the ground I was focused to go on. Personally, as a husband and a father, I wanted to know where Judge Roberts truly stood and if he understood the job he has been asked to do. I wanted to know if he understood the responsibilities not just as a lawyer, not just as a Justice, but as a husband and as a father, and the implications of the decisions he would rule on and how they would affect not just his family but in a real way the people of North Carolina.

As Senators, we are all responsible for constituencies. I am responsible for more than 8½ million individuals in North Carolina, and I wanted to know, quite frankly, if Judge Roberts intends to preserve our Nation's constitutional principles by interpreting law, not by making law. I am proud today to tell you, based upon the answers he gave to me in his testimony in front of the Judiciary Committee, I am confident he will do just that—interpret the law, not write the law. Judge Roberts, as every person has heard, has the academic and the professional credentials to serve not only as a Supreme Court Justice but as Chief Justice.

There is something that concerns me today. It concerns me, and it should concern the American people: This vote will not be unanimous. This vote will be far from unanimous based upon the reports from Senators. Why? Politics. I am not sure it has ever permeated the

process to the degree it has in this. As we stand here today, with one of the brightest nominees, ready to confirm, some in this institution are already suggesting the next nominee has no chance. There is not a person who has been nominated. There is a group of names that has been talked about. I might remind Senators that Judge Roberts was never talked about in the group that was purported to come up in the President's first nomination. Yet some suggest we are going to move the bar even farther for the next nominee who comes through.

The divisiveness has to stop in this institution. We choose the best and the brightest to serve this country. If we consistently move that bar, if we consistently dig to find things that no other Congress has looked for, if we are not careful, no one will want that job. If we are not careful, the best and the brightest legal minds in this country who would serve on the bench and serve with distinction, regardless of the party they are from, when they get that call, will say, Mr. President, I want to pass. I can't put my family through it. I can't put myself through it. The risk of doing it is too great to everything around me, to make a commitment to serve my country.

I ask all of us, what message are we sending to our children when the best and the brightest pass, when they elect not to go through the process we in this body have control of?

This is a defining time for the Senate. This will determine who is willing in the future to actually serve their country and to serve in one of the single most important areas, the U.S. Supreme Court.

I am confident Judge Roberts holds the academic credentials, he holds the professional credentials but, more importantly, I am confident today that Judge Roberts is a good man. He deserves the support of every Member of the Senate to become the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina yields. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank you for the time. It is for me a privilege to speak on behalf of Judge Roberts, but especially because while I have voted on hundreds of nominations for President Clinton and now at the present time President Bush, this is the first time I will cast a vote, an affirmative vote, for a member of the U.S. Supreme Court, and, perhaps, if Judge Roberts lives long enough, the only time I will cast one on behalf of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is for that reason that I asked Judge Roberts to come see me. I enjoyed a delightful visit with him prior to announcing my affirmative decision to vote for him without qualification, without reservation, or any reluctance. He is, in short, a brilliant nominee and I believe he will be a brilliant judge

who will make us proud for years and years to come.

When I ran for the Senate, I ran as someone with a hat in the political arena. It is an experience where you state your position, you ask for votes. That is a fundamentally different exercise than being a judge. A judge is not someone who comes as a candidate asking for a vote, posturing in any fashion, and playing politics. The nature of the judicial branch, even the executive branch, is fundamentally different from the judicial branch. Ours is to make law. The president is to execute the law. The judge is to interpret that law.

When I was running for an election certificate, I was asked repeatedly about how I would judge nominees to the Court. The underlying question was always, what is your litmus test? Do you have a single issue litmus test? I promised Oregonians that I would have no litmus test and would vote for qualified Democrats and Republicans from the administration that put them forward because I truly believe we have to remember the characteristic distinctions between the roles of these different branches of Government. What I did tell them is that I would judge them by their intelligence, their integrity, and their temperament. By that standard, I am not sure we will ever have the privilege of voting for a nominee who is more intelligent than Judge John Roberts. His academic credentials are without equal. He is clearly qualified by his schooling and by his service in the legal community. His integrity is beyond reproach as well. He has conducted himself honorably. There has been no hint of any kind of scandal that would disqualify him from holding high public office. I like especially the fact that he and his wife late in life decided to adopt two beautiful children. Every parent in America, I think, squirmed when they watched the concerns the Robertses had when President Bush announced his nomination—the little boy Jack was fidgeting on a public occasion, and all chuckled and recognized the humanity of Judge and Mrs. Roberts, and also related to that experience.

When it comes to temperament, I think there are many qualifications Judge Roberts has that are evident in his entire life. He is overwhelmingly qualified. He has promised fidelity to the law. He has said:

My obligation is to the Constitution, that's the oath.

The quality in his temperament, I think, that was particularly meaningful was the humility he demonstrated in the give and take with our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee is composed of many very bright men and women, and the back and forth was thrilling to watch for someone who loves constitutional law. He went into a heavyweight ring and he came out the champ. I was impressed and expressed that to him.

The quality of humility is one that I think bears mentioning. Judge Roberts said, in fact, to that committee:

A certain humility should characterize the judicial role. Judges and justices are servants of the law, not the other way around.

What he is saying is that judges and justices are bound by the law, as we are as individual citizens, and as Members of the Senate we are bound by the law, and so are judges. That humility is important in the life of a judge.

I remember a great public servant once said:

Pride is concerned with who is right, humility is concerned with what is right.

I believe Judge Roberts will be focused on what is right, not who is right. The greatest threat Judge Roberts identified to the law is that of a judicial branch beginning to act more like a political branch.

That is something many of my colleagues have spoken to. It is something I learned about in law school in a constitutional law class. It is called the political question doctrine. What that doctrine refers to is the wisdom that judges need to have, the humility they have to not intersect questions that are in the political arena, part of the discussion, the debate between we the people about where we want to go. So, instead of reaching over the people and deciding it when the issue is ripe for settlement at the ballot box, judges should be restrained in overreaching and doing things from on high that, frankly, disturb the body politic here in our country. I believe Judge Roberts will have that kind of restraint, that kind of humility.

Judge Roberts made a quote in his opening statement, again without notes; something he feels obviously in his bones and knows in his heart and mind. He said:

The one threat to the rule of law is the tendency on behalf of some judges to take that legitimacy—the legitimacy of the law, and that authority—the authority of the law, and to extend it into areas where they are going beyond the interpretation of the Constitution into where they are making the law. Judges have to recognize that their role is a limited one.

An aside, Mr. President, I like his metaphor to an umpire.

Judges have to recognize that their role is a limited one. That is the basis of their legitimacy. Judges have to have the courage to make the unpopular decisions when they have to. That sometimes involves striking down acts of Congress. That sometimes involves ruling that acts of the executive are unconstitutional. That is a requirement of the judicial oath. You have to have that courage.

What I find in that statement is an understanding of the political question doctrine. He is saying we have to be humble in most all instances; to respect the rights of the people. But he is also saying you have to have courage to interpret the Constitution in a way that is faithful to it.

As Cicero once said:

We are in bondage to the law so that we might be free.

I know my time is up, so I yield the floor and urge my colleagues to vote in support of Judge Roberts. If you can't vote for him, it is hard to know for whom one could vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Under the previous order, the time from 11 a.m. to 12 p.m. shall be under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will vote on the nomination of John Roberts to be the 17th individual to serve as Chief Justice of the United States. I have put an enormous amount of contemplation and consideration into my vote on this nomination. Some may wonder why this has been such a difficult decision for me. Clearly Judge Roberts is an individual of great accomplishment. He has an outstanding educational background and keen legal skills. He is a thoughtful, decent, modest person, impressively knowledgeable about constitutional law and the Court.

I watched much of the judiciary hearings. I have reviewed briefs and court decisions written by Judge Roberts. And, thanks to his generosity, I met with Judge Roberts for more than an hour in my office last week, talking one on one.

What I did not find in the hearings or in Judge Roberts' writings or in our meeting was a clear indication that Judge Roberts understands the critical role the courts play in protecting the civil rights of Americans and in allowing those who have suffered discrimination to be able to seek recourse and affirm their rights in Federal court. I was seeking some indication that Judge Roberts understands that the issues that come before the high Court cannot always be viewed with a cool, legal dispassion and detachment, but that the Court and its members play a critical role in protecting the powerless in our country.

This is of grave concern to me because the individual who fills this Supreme Court vacancy will have the ability to enhance and strengthen or undermine and weaken the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Judge Roberts' nomination comes at a time when there is a very significant clash occurring between the Supreme Court and Congress over whether Congress has the authority to require the States to comply with antidiscrimination laws. Unfortunately, the law caught at the center of this clash is the Americans With Disabilities Act.

As I have deliberated on this nomination, the first and foremost question in my mind has been this: What kind of Court would the Roberts Court be? Would it be a Court that serves as a refuge of last resort for the powerless in our society? Or, would it be a Court that will continue down a disturbing path seen in the later years of the Rehnquist Court, a path that limits the

ability of Congress to pass legislation that provides meaningful protections to individuals, including the 54 million Americans with disabilities?

Unfortunately, after carefully reviewing the record and talking with Judge Roberts, I am unable to conclude that a Roberts Court would guarantee the rights of the powerless and those with disabilities.

Earlier this year we celebrated the 15th anniversary of passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act. The ADA, as it is known, prohibits discrimination in employment against people with disabilities. It requires that the services and programs of local and State governments be accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities. Since its enactment, the ADA has provided opportunity and access for 54 million Americans with disabilities who, prior to the law's enactment, routinely faced prejudice, discrimination, and exclusion in their everyday lives.

As Members of this body know very well, I was the lead sponsor of the ADA. I championed it because I had seen discrimination against the disabled firsthand, growing up with my brother Frank, who was deaf. During his childhood, my brother was sent halfway across the State to a school for the "deaf and dumb." He was told his career path would be limited because surely someone who is deaf cannot contribute to society. Throughout his life, Frank experienced active discrimination at the hands of both private individuals and government, and this served to limit the choices before him. Frank's experience was by no means unusual, as Congress documented extensively prior to enactment of the ADA. As part of the writing of that bill, we gathered a massive record of blatant discrimination against those with disabilities. We had 25 years of testimony and reports on disability discrimination, 14 congressional hearings, and 63 field hearings by a special congressional task force that were held in the 3 years prior to the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act. We received boxes loaded with thousands of letters and pieces of testimony gathered in hearings and townhall meetings across the country from people whose lives had been damaged or destroyed by discrimination. We had markups in 5 different committees, had over 300 examples of discrimination by States. I know; I was there. I was the chairman of the Disability Policy Subcommittee.

Yet since enactment of the ADA the Court has repeatedly questioned whether Congress had the constitutional authority to require States to comply with the ADA. Amazingly, it questioned whether Congress adequately documented discrimination. In 2000, the Supreme Court held in a 5-to-4 decision that an experienced nurse at a university hospital—who was demoted after being diagnosed with breast cancer because her supervisor did not like being around sick people—

was not covered by the ADA. Why? Because she had the misfortune to work for a State hospital.

In contrast, last year, by a 5-to-4 decision, the Court held that Congress did have the authority to require States to make courthouses accessible.

This year, the Court will look at whether a State is required to make a prison accessible. There is no guarantee that the Court will come to the same result. Instead, we could end up with a crazy patchwork where courthouses are accessible, but maybe libraries are not, perhaps prisons are accessible, but employment offices are not.

When we passed the ADA, we in Congress did not forbid employment discrimination against the disabled unless they worked for the State. We didn't say some services must be accessible. But that is what the Court has been saying. Talk about judicial activism.

I would point out here, in those years when we were developing the Americans With Disabilities Act, my friend Senator HATCH was ranking member on the Judiciary Committee. They had their staffs look to make sure we passed the constitutional tests. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh, a great supporter of the Americans With Disabilities Act, had the Department of Justice look and make sure we were passing constitutional muster. Boyden Gray, in the White House Counsel's Office, looked at it to make sure we passed constitutional muster. Fifteen Ronald Reagan appointees to the National Council on Disability, working with constitutional law experts, looked at the bill to make sure it passed constitutional muster. Yet the Court, by 5-to-4 decisions, is undermining all we did.

As a result, 15 years after passage of the ADA, the rights of those with disabilities still hang in the balance. Those rights will be determined in a very significant way by a potential Roberts Court. As Chief Justice, Mr. Roberts personally will have a major role in determining whether the balance swings for or against people with disabilities. If Judge Roberts lends his voice to those on the Court who believe in the rights of States over the rights of people, individuals with disabilities in this country will face enormous setbacks.

Judge Roberts was asked many questions at his hearing about congressional power, the ADA, and the rights of the disabled. I posed similar questions in our meeting. Judge Roberts chose not to answer those questions in any significant or revealing detail. Without some greater assurance that he would give deference to the policies passed by Congress, without solid assurance that he would be a defender of the ability of the less powerful to go to court and have their rights vindicated, without those assurances, I am left guessing and speculating, and that is not good enough.

Without clear assurances from him personally, I am left only with Judge

Roberts' paper record and, quite frankly, it is a record that does not bode well for people seeking to vindicate their rights. In the interests of brevity, let me cite one example from Judge Roberts' tenure with the Department of Justice, the 1982 case of Board of Education v. Rowley. In the Rowley case, a trial court ruled that Federal law required the State to provide a sign language interpreter for an 8-year-old student who was deaf. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed that decision. The case then went to the Supreme Court and the Department of Justice had to decide whether to support the student and argue in favor of an interpreter, or support the local school board and the State and argue against an interpreter.

In a memo to the Attorney General, Judge Roberts said the lower court decisions amounted to an exercise of judicial activism and the lower courts had inappropriately "substituted their own judgment of appropriate educational policy."

This was not the language of a lawyer merely representing the views of a client. This was the language of an attorney in a policymaking position at the Department of Justice, suggesting that the Government should have weighed in against the right of a deaf student to have access to an interpreter under the Education of the Handicapped Act, a predecessor of today's Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. In other words, Judge Roberts thought that this law, the primary Federal law to ensure that students with disabilities have access to the same educational opportunities as all other students, should be interpreted narrowly rather than broadly.

That is not the quality I am looking for in a Chief Justice. I want a Chief Justice who brings a passion for justice to the law; who does not lose sight of the real people whose lives and livelihoods are at stake in the Court's decisions. Some supporters of Judge Roberts have argued that the Rowley case was more than two decades ago and Judge Roberts' views on statutory interpretation and on the ability of individuals to protect their rights through the courts may have evolved since then. But how are we in this body to know that, particularly when the White House has failed to provide us with all requested and directly relevant documents?

Of greatest interest to me are the decisionmaking memoranda written by Judge Roberts during his tenure as Principal Deputy Solicitor General. Again, in his role as Principal Deputy Solicitor General—a position sometimes referred to as a "political deputy" because it is a political appointment—Judge Roberts was not merely representing a client but was involved in crafting the Department's legal positions in some of the most important cases in recent years.

During his tenure as Principal Deputy, Judge Roberts argued before the

court that individuals shouldn't be allowed to go to court to enforce their rights under the Medicaid statute, that children shouldn't have access to courts to enforce their rights under the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act, and that courts should take a restrictive view of remedies available under title IX and other civil rights laws.

Given the decision of the White House to withhold these documents from the Senate, I am forced to draw my conclusions on what I do know.

Before I conclude my remarks, I would like to describe an example of one of the "real people" I referred to earlier, a woman by the name of Beverly Jones. Ms. Jones, who testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Judge Roberts' nomination, has been using a wheelchair since a 1984 traffic accident in 1990, the year we passed ADA. She completed court reporting school and set out to work as a courtroom stenographer in order to support her family. But what she found as she traveled throughout the State of Tennessee was she couldn't get the jobs in a great majority of Tennessee's courthouses. She was forced to choose between asking complete strangers to carry her into the courthouse or into inaccessible rest rooms or simply turn down employment opportunities. That is an unacceptable choice for a single mother supporting two kids.

Ms. Jones testified to the committee that she spoke to Federal, State, and local officials about the problem of inaccessible courtrooms, but her entreaties were met with indifference, until she filed suit. I would like to quote from Ms. Jones' testimony about her experience because I think it vividly illustrates what is at stake.

She said:

The door that I thought had been opened [with passage of the ADA] was still closed and my freedom to live my dream was still a dream, and turning into a nightmare. Nobody took either me or the law seriously until I and others brought a lawsuit.

That is what is at stake today—the right of 64 million Americans with disabilities to live their dreams, the right of the powerless in our society, the disenfranchised, to turn to the courts to take them seriously.

Unfortunately, I am not yet persuaded that a Roberts Court would protect these rights.

For this reason, I will be voting no on this nomination.

Certainly, I bear no personal animosity whatsoever toward Judge Roberts. Within this body, there are many people on the other side of the aisle whom I respect, admire, and value as friends. But I don't often vote with them because I have a different viewpoint on many issues. As I said, in our personal meeting, I found Judge Roberts to be a very decent, modest individual.

I hope the future will prove me wrong about Judge Roberts. I hope he proves to be a Justice who recognizes that discrimination in this country occurs in

many areas and that Congress has both the authority and the duty to remedy it.

Judge Roberts will have an immediate opportunity to do just that. In this upcoming term, the Supreme Court will hear arguments in a case that will once again examine the question of whether Congress had the authority to order States to make public facilities accessible to people with disabilities. Knowing this, during our meeting I tried to convey to Judge Roberts how discrimination against people with disabilities was deeply ingrained across the decades and across the centuries prior to passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act. I talked with him in detail about how prior to passage of ADA people were institutionalized, segregated, taken from their families, taken from their communities, excluded from schools, excluded from educational opportunities, excluded from employment opportunities, excluded from all aspects of daily life, shopping, going to the movies, playing golf, on and on, simply because of a disability. I explained how people with disabilities were excluded in the same way African Americans were excluded prior to the passage of the Civil Rights Act.

In closing, let me quote from Thurgood Marshall in the *Cleburne* case, *City of Cleburne v. Texas*. Here is what Justice Thurgood Marshall had to say. Here is a sense of real injustice and that something needs to be done about it. This is what Justice Marshall said:

The mentally retarded have been subject to a "lengthy and tragic history," of segregation and discrimination that can only be called grotesque. . . . A regime of state-mandated segregation and degradation soon emerged that in its virulence and bigotry rivaled, and indeed paralleled, the worse excesses of Jim Crow. Massive custodial institutions were built to warehouse the retarded for life; the aim was to halt reproduction of the retarded and "nearly extinguish their race." Retarded children were categorically excluded from public schools, based on the false stereotype that all were ineducable and on the purposed need to protect non-retarded children from them. State laws deemed the retarded "unfit for citizenship."

That has been the experience for the last 200 years or more in this country. We stepped in to remedy that with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

I hope Judge Roberts keeps these things uppermost in his mind and in his heart. Only time will tell.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the nomination of Judge John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States.

I thank my colleague from Iowa for his heartfelt and outstanding words.

Votes like this come about so rarely that many Senators have spent their entire careers in this body without ever having had the opportunity to vote on a Chief Justice.

And most of us in the Senate today will likely never again vote on a nominee to that incalculably important position.

That is why I have been troubled about how some have characterized the votes of conscientious Senators in this case—Senators from my party who have struggled with, and deliberated over, Judge Roberts's record in arriving at their decisions.

As will be borne out tomorrow, Democratic Senators have given this vote the profound and serious consideration that it deserves.

We are not voting monolithically, but rather each according to his or her own conscience.

And that is what this vote is.

It is a question of principle—not of politics, partisanship, or positioning, as some have cynically suggested.

Democrats have truly struggled with this vote. I know I have. Like some others, I did not make up my mind until late on the night before the committee vote.

We are not marching in lockstep, with nary a dissent like my colleagues across the aisle.

But while this vote was a close call for many, (Like myself) the next one may not be.

While this nomination did not warrant an attempt to block the nominee on the floor of the Senate, the next one might.

If the President sends us a nominee who, like Janice Rogers Brown, believes that the New Deal was the triumph of a "socialist revolution," there will be a fight.

If the President sends us a nominee who, like Priscilla Owen, was criticized by her conservative colleague—Alberto Gonzalez—for an "unconscionable act of judicial activism," there will be a fight.

If the President sends us a nominee who, like Miguel Estrada, refuses to answer any real questions and whose record is not made fully available, there will be a fight.

If the President sends us a nominee who is committed to an agenda of turning the clock back on civil rights, workers' rights, individual autonomy, or other vital Constitutional protections, there will likely be a fight.

And it will be a fight without any winners.

So, Mr. President, on the eve not only of the confirmation vote on John Roberts, but also the President's nomination of a replacement for the seat of Justice O'Connor—for more than two decades a pivotal swing vote on the High Court—I hope and pray that the President chooses to unite rather than divide; that he chooses consensus over confrontation.

Now let me return to the vote at hand.

This vote should be viewed against a unique—and troubling—historical backdrop.

Many are saying the Senate should not bring "politics" into this. Their

quarrel should be with the President of the United States if they feel that “politics” means figuring out a judge’s ideological, judicial philosophy. Politics, if you define it as that, was introduced by a President who vowed that, if given the opportunity, he would name to the Supreme Court Justices in the “mold” of Clarence Thomas and Anthony Scalia.

Given the President’s campaign promise and repeated declarations, there is a presumption that any nominee the President sends to the Senate is in that “mold.”

The presumption is especially strong—and is particularly hard to overcome—with a nominee who was carefully vetted, researched, and interviewed at sufficient length by a President who professed a desire to nominate people in the mold of Thomas and Scalia; and, with a nominee who is eagerly embraced by those groups who support the views of Thomas and Scalia and who want to change America through the Courts;

The presumption can be rebutted, of course. And the way it can be rebutted is through the answering of questions and through the production of relevant documents. And here, regrettably, there was much lacking.

To be fair, Judge Roberts did partially rebut the presumption. He made some inroads.

Judge Roberts has a keen and impressive intellect. We all know that. His encyclopedic knowledge of the law and eloquent presentation certainly confirmed what his colleagues have said about him—that he is one of the best advocates, if not the best advocate in the Nation.

But being brilliant and accomplished is not the number one criterion for elevation to the Supreme Court—there are many who would use their considerable talents and legal acumen to set America back. So, while legal brilliance is to be considered, it is never dispositive.

In addition, very good lawyers know how to avoid tough questions. People have said that one of the reasons the nominee was so effective arguing in the Supreme Court is that he mastered the trick of making the point he wanted to make, rather than answer the question asked.

When I reviewed the transcript in the week after the hearings concluded but before we were called on to vote, there was often less than met the ear.

There is an obligation of nominees to answer questions fully and forthrightly, because they are essential to figuring out a nominee’s judicial philosophy and ideology—to me, the most important criteria in choosing a Justice.

Many of us were disappointed in his failure to answer so many questions and is one of the contributing factors to the no votes that will be cast against Judge Roberts.

Add to that the refusal of the administration to allow the Senate to exam-

ine important and relevant documents, and we are voting on a hunch. Senators voting on the position of Chief Justice should not be relegated to voting on a “hunch.”

We should not be left to guesswork, impressions, and hunches.

There was a bit of a game of hide and seek going on—as much as Senators tried to seek out his views, many remained hidden away.

That is why that I so badly hope that the next nominee will be more forthcoming and will answer more questions about his or her legal views, and that all relevant documents will be provided.

But, the answering of questions is only a means to an end—it is a means of finding out what kind of judge, or Justice, a nominee will make.

In this case, because there were not enough questions answered or documents provided, we are still unsure of the answer to the central question: Who is Judge Roberts?

Particularly troubling to me are the eerie parallels between Judge Roberts’s testimony and then-Judge Thomas’s, especially given President Bush’s declaration that he would nominate Justices in the mold of Justice Thomas.

The echoes of then-Judge Thomas’s empty reassurances that he was a mainstream jurist are ringing in the ears of every Senator who listened to many nearly identical statements from Judge Roberts last week.

I was particularly troubled by his answers in two areas—the constitutional right to privacy and the Congress Commerce Clause power to protect the rights and improve the lives of the American people.

At his hearing, for example, Judge Roberts said that he believes “there is a right to privacy protected as part of the liberty guarantee in the due process clause.” At his hearing, then-Judge Thomas made almost the identical statement. As a Supreme Court Justice, however, Justice Thomas has repeatedly urged the most narrow interpretation of a privacy interest possible, in *Casey*, in *Lawrence*, and at every other opportunity.

At his hearing, Judge Roberts repeatedly assured the Committee that he had “no quarrel” with various Supreme Court decisions on issues of privacy, women’s rights, civil rights, education, and other important issues. The same assurance in nearly identical words were made by Justice Thomas at his hearings, but when given the opportunity to consider those cases with which he had “no quarrel” from the bench, Justice Thomas voted to overrule.

At his hearing, Judge Roberts repeatedly assured the Committee that he had “no agenda.” The same assurance was made by Justices Thomas and Scalia at their hearings.

Besides these concerns about Judge Roberts’s views on the right to privacy and on the Establishment Clause, I also was troubled by his answers on the

Commerce Clause. I asked him if he would disagree with Justice Thomas’s extremely narrow, 19th-century, and widely-discredited view that Congress may not regulate activities occurring within a State even if they have substantial effects on interstate commerce. He refused.

There is therefore too serious a chance that Judge Roberts believes that Congress is without power to protect workers’ rights, women’s rights, and the environment on this widely-accepted constitutional basis.

We simply did not get definitive answers to these questions at the hearings.

At the hearings, I gave Judge Roberts every opportunity to distance himself from Justice Thomas’s most extreme views. He refused.

Now, Senator CORNYN, my good friend from Texas, and others from across the aisle have said that if we can’t vote for this nominee who could we vote for? Here is your answer: someone who answers questions fully and who makes his or her record fully available; someone who gives us a significant level of assurance with some answers and a record that he or she is not an ideologue;

Judge Roberts is clearly brilliant and his demeanor suggests he well might not be an ideologue.

But he simply did not make the case strongly enough to bet the farm.

There is a good chance—perhaps even a majority chance—that Judge Roberts will be like Justice Rehnquist on the bench. We know he will be brilliant, and he could well be—while very conservative—not an ideologue. That is why I struggled with this decision so long and so hard.

If he is a Rehnquist, that would not be cause for exultation; nor would it be cause for alarm. The Court’s balance will not be altered.

But there is a reasonable danger that he will be like Justice Thomas, the most radical Justice on the Supreme Court.

It is not that I am certain that he will be a Thomas. It’s not even that the chance that he will a Thomas is greater than fifty percent. But the risk that he might be a Thomas and the lack of reassurance that he won’t—particularly in light of this President’s professed desire to nominate people in that mold—is just not good enough.

Because if he is a Justice Thomas, he could turn back the clock decades for all Americans. The Court’s balance may be tipped radically in one direction and stay that way for too long.

I hope he is not a Thomas. But the risk is too great to bear, and it exceeds the upside benefit.

Because of that risk and its enormous consequences for generations of Americans, I cannot vote yes. I must reluctantly cast my vote against confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, 5 years have passed since the Presidential election of 2000, and legitimate questions

about the outcome of that campaign have left too much of America too divided. Legitimate questions about the outcome of that election have given rise to an ever-growing polarization between so-called red and blue States, between liberals and conservatives, and between Republicans and Democrats in the Congress.

Despite a somewhat more convincing outcome in the 2004 Presidential election, the divisions caused by the events of 2000 show little sign of abating. Having closely observed this widening divide, I now wonder whether Judge Roberts' confirmation will add to the bitterness and distrust of the Federal Government or whether it may serve to remind the people and the lawmakers they elect that we cannot move forward as a nation if we remain dedicated to tearing each other down.

This is my first vote on a nominee to the Supreme Court of the United States, and my obligation as articulated in the Constitution is to either consent or not consent to a choice specifically entrusted to the elected President of the United States. Some of the policy watchdogs that I respect the most and agree with on so many issues have asked whether I oppose Judge Roberts because he is not one of us, because he is too conservative, because he is too young, because he may prove effective. He is not whom we would choose, they say. And on that point, I am in full agreement.

Should the test to confirm a Chief Justice be, he is not one we would choose? I ask my friends to imagine the mess we will have left for our country if the Senate uses this test and votes solely on the basis of a nominee's political beliefs. Friends who a year ago said, We don't want ideologues appointed to the Supreme Court, now want John Roberts and the next nominee to show up at the witness table to submit to an ideological litmus test.

Here is my message to those friends: A sword forged in ideology in 2005 can be used against a progressive nominee in 2009 with an equal disregard for the Constitution and the individual.

In 2008, I fully intend to work harder than ever before to elect a President who rejects the dangerous priorities that have led us to war in Iraq and an energy policy that is folly, that assures our continued dependence on foreign oil. Should this new Democratic President have to contend with a Republican Senate majority, he or she better hope that the judicial nominations in 2005 did not become purely ideology-driven contests. If these debates are purely partisan, our future will include constitutional bedlam whenever a Supreme Court opening occurs while the Senate is controlled by the opposition party.

I reject the suggestion that a Republican nominee is, per se, objectionable. A number of certainly moderate justices nominated by Republican Presidents certainly belie this claim. The decision each Senator must make

should be based on the judicial nominee that is before the Senate, not the one that we wish was before the Senate.

To put this into historical perspective under the advice and consent responsibility assigned to the President, the President's judicial nominees to the Court have traditionally been given a large degree of deference. For example, in spite of the divisive national debate surrounding gays in the military, universal health care, Travelgate, Filegate, and the Whitewater investigation, this deference translated into 96 votes for Justice Ginsburg and 87 votes for Justice Breyer when their nominations came to a vote before the Senate. Yet these are two of the most progressive voices in the over 200-year history of the Court.

When I had the opportunity to meet with John Roberts in my office this past August, I pressed him to tell me how he viewed some of the issues that have most divided our country. The answers Judge Roberts gave me during the hour we spent together left me with the impression that he will be his own man on the Court.

Here are my judgments about the individual before the Senate now: One, on the basis of his public testimony, it is hard to see Judge Roberts as a man who will walk into the white pillard building across the street and set about tearing apart the fabric of our society; two, on the basis of his public testimony, it is hard to see Judge Roberts as a judicial activist who would place ideological purity or a particular agenda above or ahead of the need for thoughtful reason; three, on the basis of his public testimony, it is hard to see Judge Roberts as a divisive, confrontational extremist who would try to further exploit the divisions in our country.

What I saw in his public testimony and in our private meeting is an intelligent, thoughtful man, certainly a deeply conservative man with a tempered view of the role of Government.

At his Judiciary Committee hearings, nothing he said in public conflicted with what he had told me in private.

In addition to meeting with him, I have scrutinized Judge Roberts and his record closely, considering his Reagan-era documents, reading the news analysis printed in papers across our country and listened to the hearings and reviewed the transcripts of them as well. No one disputes that Judge Roberts has a brilliant legal mind. My analysis of his record leads me to conclude that he is not cut from the same originalist cloth as Justice Thomas and Justice Scalia. He does not seem to believe that the words of the Constitution are fossilized, leaving only a one-size-fits-all, 18th century remedy for every problem that our society confronts. It is hard not to get the sense that he believes in limited government.

Back in March, I led the effort in the Senate to block attempts to dictate a

specific medical treatment in Terri Schiavo's tragic case because I believed the Constitution affords families the right to decide these matters privately. This is an area, in my view, in which the Federal Government has no business intruding. Involving itself in the Schiavo case, Congress was inappropriately meddling and blatantly ignoring the limits of its constitutional authority.

I believe that the Terri Schiavo case is the first of many such end-of-life cases that will arrive at the Supreme Court's doorstep. In my view, most of these cases will involve one individual and passionately held views. Demographic trends and improvements in medical technology assure that there will be many of these cases.

Given what is ahead, I felt I had an obligation to examine how Judge Roberts saw end-of-life issues in the context of the Constitution and whether he would be willing to manipulate its meaning to authorize Government intrusion in private family matters. When I met with Judge Roberts in August, we discussed end-of-life issues at length, not because this was a litmus test for me, and I certainly don't believe in litmus tests, but because I thought it was important to carefully consider Judge Roberts' judicial temperament on this critical issue.

Judge Roberts did not say how he would have handled the Schiavo case or any case before the Court. However, Judge Roberts did say quite a bit that made a lot of sense to me and I think would make sense to the vast majority of Americans. Judge Roberts agreed that there is a constitutionally based privacy right and that while the scope of the privacy right is still being defined in the context of end-of-life care, he said that when he approached the issue, he starts with the proposition that each person has the right to be left alone and that their liberty interests should be factored in as well.

At his hearing, Judge Roberts reiterated his position, stating that a right to privacy exists in the Constitution. He stated that privacy is a component of the liberty protected by the due process clauses of the 5th and 14th amendments, and he stated this liberty interest is protected substantively as well as procedurally.

While discussing the Schiavo tragedy during our August meeting, I also asked him about Congress's authority to legislate a particular remedy in a particular case, and Judge Roberts expressed his concern about judicial independence. It was apparent to me Judge Roberts understands there are constitutional limits to the recent enthusiasm of Congress to prescribe particular remedies in a particular end-of-life case.

Concerning States rights to regulate medical practice and the scope of the 10th amendment, Judge Roberts stated he believed the Framers expected States to do most of the regulating and that they expected most regulation to

be State-based. In his view, the basic genius of the Federal system is that it affords different States the ability to approach problems in a way that is best suited to meet their different needs, and that imposing uniformity across the country would stifle the genius of our Founding Fathers.

Judge Roberts also told me he attaches great importance to legislative history in interpreting law. He repeated this point several times during his public hearings. Those who have closely studied former Attorney General Ashcroft's challenge to the Oregon physician-assisted suicide law know there is not one word in the Controlled Substances Act, the law used to launch the case, indicating the Controlled Substances Act is aimed at or should be used to overturn or undermine the right of States to regulate medical practices within their borders.

On the extremely important matter of a woman's right to choose, I asked Judge Roberts about Roe. He did not offer specific comments, but his response indicated he would not enter the Court with an "agenda" and he would respect the Court's precedents. In the public hearings, he also said he personally agreed with the conclusion of the Griswold and Eisenstat decisions, which held that the privacy right protects the right of individuals to use birth control.

His opinions on the issues that matter indicate he is intelligent, thoughtful, and that he has a tempered view of the role of the Federal Government.

Judge Roberts' combination of temperament and intelligence give him the potential to be a conciliatory voice at a divisive time in American history. He has the skills to reach across the divisions in America to show that justice can be a healing force for the wounds that cut our society so deeply. He can help to unify the country by building a record of well-reasoned opinions grounded in the rule of law, not ideology.

He will receive my vote tomorrow to be the next Chief Justice of the United States.

I want to make one final point, Mr. President, a point that is important to me. There is another vacancy on the Court, and the President is expected to send forth his nominee soon. My intention to vote for Judge Roberts tomorrow should in no way be construed as a "weathervane" for how I might vote on the next nominee. In the past, I have not hesitated to vote against several of the President's nominees to the courts of appeals when they carried the ideological and activist baggage I believed would be disruptive to our society. If the President puts forward a nominee to replace Justice O'Connor who is unlikely to ably and respectfully fill her shoes, I will vigorously oppose that nomination.

I began by voicing my question about the impact of this nomination on the body politic of our country. Among the many awesome duties of the Chief Jus-

tice, no duty is of greater importance than the duty to unify our Nation when Americans find themselves in disagreement. Different Chief Justices have shouldered this burden with varying degrees of success. This ability to unify is what is most sorely needed at this moment in our Nation's history, and I am of the opinion that Judge Roberts possesses the nature and the desire to unify the Court and, with it, our Nation. I wish him wisdom, diplomacy, and moderation as he prepares to assume this critical role.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time from 12 p.m. to 1 p.m. will be under the control of the majority.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I would like to comment a bit on the nomination of Judge Roberts. I wish to make a political observation. This is certainly a political body, and the nomination process has politics to it. That is not a bad thing. That is to be expected.

From a Republican point of view, this is an easy vote. We are inclined to support a President when he is in power making a nomination. But that is not always the case, that every Republican votes for every nominee. I expect that will be the case here. Most of us on our side of the aisle are pleased with the nominee, someone of extraordinary intelligence and legal abilities and seems to be an all around good guy who has served his country well in every capacity that he has been called upon to serve. We will all vote en masse. It is an easy vote for us.

To our Democratic colleagues, it is not so easy. Any time you are in the minority, and the Court being an important part of American life and politics, there is a lot of pressure on my Democratic colleagues to say no for different reasons by special interest groups on the left. We certainly have them on the right. Our day will come. If there is ever a Democratic nominee, we will face the same pressure.

I would like to compliment my Democratic colleagues. Every one has taken the process seriously. There will be a healthy number of Democratic votes for Judge Roberts. To those who have decided to vote for him, history will judge you well. You have based your votes on the qualifications test. You have seen in Judge Roberts someone who loves the law more than politics. Over time, history will judge you well. One of the highlights of the Bush

administration will be the selection of Judge Roberts to be the Chief Justice of the United States.

For those who vote no, to a person everyone has struggled with it, thought about it, cast your vote. Generally speaking, the debate in committee and in the Chamber has lived up to the best traditions of the Senate. A few months ago, we were at each other's throats, about to blow up the place. There is plenty of blame to go around, but we have sort of broken that cycle. We have had a confirmation process that is in the best tradition of the Senate. We will go forward, and I hope he gets a healthy number of votes. It looks as if he will.

One thing I wanted to take some time to discuss is some of the reasoning given to vote no and make a cautionary tale about some of the suggestions why a "no" vote would be appropriate. There seems to be some suggestion that if he does not have an allegiance to a particular line of cases, particularly the right of privacy cases centering around Roe v. Wade, that you can't vote for him. That one case or that line of legal reasoning is so important that without some commitment on his part to uphold Roe v. Wade or the concept of Roe v. Wade, a "no" vote would be in order. I would argue that could be applied on our side. Most of us are pro-life. I would say 90 percent of the Republican caucus is pro-life. Probably 90 percent of the Democratic caucus is pro-choice. The country is pretty evenly divided. If we have a litmus test about Roe v. Wade or any other case, that is not doing the judiciary a good service because you are putting a judge in a bad spot.

Senator HARKIN mentioned the Americans with Disabilities Act, something he should be very proud of. He fought hard to make it part of law, and we are a better Nation for it. There are some cases involving the Americans with Disabilities Act that will come before the Court. Senator HARKIN did not think that he could vote yes because he wasn't assured that Judge Roberts would uphold the Americans with Disabilities Act in a way that he felt comfortable with in that States have been exempted from the act. We are all dealing with that issue.

The only thing I can say about a guarantee with Judge Roberts, if you are a conservative and would like to see certain Court decisions reversed, if you are a liberal and would like to see certain decisions sustained, the one thing I can promise you about Judge Roberts is he is going to make his decision based on the facts, the briefs, the record in the particular case, and the arguments made by litigants. If he overturns a precedent of the Court, he will apply the four-part test that has been the historical analysis of how to overturn a standing precedent. He is going to do it in a businesslike fashion. He is going to apply the rule of law. If you are looking for an outcome-determinative judge, someone who is going

to see things your way before they get your vote, you are going to be disappointed. To be honest, the law is better off for those answers. He is not the only one to refuse to bargain his way on the Court.

Justice Marshall was asked by Senator McClellan: Do you subscribe to the philosophy expressed by a majority of the Court in *Miranda*?

That is a major league constitutional case in our Nation's history where police officers have to inform a criminal defendant of certain rights they possess under the Constitution. That was a big deal. When Justice Marshall was coming along, that case had not been long decided. He said: I cannot answer your question because there are many cases pending that are variations on *Miranda* that I will have to pass on if I were confirmed.

Senator McClellan: Do you disagree with the *Miranda* philosophy?

Justice Marshall: I am not saying whether I disagree or not, because I am going to be called to pass on it.

Senator McClellan: You cannot make any comment on any decision that has been made in the past?

Justice Marshall answered: I would say that on decisions that are certain to be reexamined in the Court, it would be improper for me to comment on them in advance.

I couldn't say it better. This idea that Judge Roberts has been evasive, that he will not give you a detailed answer of how he will decide the concept of the right of privacy or how he might rule on interstate commerce clause cases that will certainly come before the Court, he is doing exactly what Justice Marshall did when he was in the confirmation process. He was not going to bargain his way on the Court.

Justice Ginsburg gave a very famous quote: I am not going to give you hints, any previews, no advisory opinions about matters that I believe will be coming before the Court.

If that is your test, that you have to have a guarantee in your mind that a certain line of cases or a legal concept will be upheld or stricken down, Judge Roberts is never going to satisfy you. It is good for the country that he not try to do that, just as Justice Marshall avoided that dilemma.

This is a question by Senator KOHL to Justice Souter: What was your opinion in 1973 on *Roe v. Wade*?

Justice Souter: Well, with respect, Senator, I am going to ask you to let me draw the line there, because I do not think I could get into opinions of 1973.

Senator LEAHY: You do not have the same sense, to whatever degree you consider privacy in *Griswold* settled—which is the ability to engage in birth control practices—to whatever extent that is, you do not have in your own mind the same sense of settlement on *Roe v. Wade*; is that correct?

Justice Souter: Well, with respect, sir, I think that is a question that I should not answer. Because I think to

get into that kind of comparison is to start down the road on an analysis of one of the strands of thought upon which the *Roe v. Wade* decision either would or would not stand. So with respect, I will ask not to be asked to answer that question.

He said it better than I read it. Bottom line is, he is telling Senator LEAHY and Senator KOHL that if you start asking me to compare one case with another that has viable legal concepts, that could be a foreshadowing of how I might rule on matters before the Court, and you are putting me in a bad spot and I like not to do that. I can talk about *Griswold*, but if you ask me to say am I settled about *Roe v. Wade* as I am *Griswold*, then you are basically getting a preview how I might rule on a *Roe v. Wade*-type scenario.

So the idea that Judge Roberts did not want to make such comparisons with the interstate commerce clause is not unknown to the confirmation process. Justice Souter did not want to go down that road with the right of privacy.

Judge Roberts was asked probing, hard, clever questions to try to get him to tip his hand. I think what he said was the right answer: I will follow the rule of law. There is a process of how to overturn a case. There is a process of how to decide a case. That process is, you look at the facts, you look at the record, you listen to the arguments of the litigants, and you don't prejudge. I think that will serve the country well.

The other concept that is coming into play is what burden does the nominee have, what deference should the Senate give to the President, what is the standard for confirmation. I have always believed that the idea that the President's nominee should be given deference by the Senate is a long-standing concept in our country. I am not the only one who believes that.

There is a lot of information out there from our Democratic friends who have gone down that same road and have come to the same conclusion. There are prominent law professors out there who have suggested that there is a presumption of a nomination by the President that the Senate should give great deference to the Presidential nominee and that our advise-and-consent role does not replace the judgment of the President but simply to see if the person is qualified, has the character and integrity and will wear the robe in the way that is consistent with being a judge and not turn it into power grab.

Professor Michael Gerhardt, who has advised our Democratic friends about the confirmation process established now and in the past, says:

The Constitution establishes a presumption of confirmation that works to the advantage of the President and his nominee.

He also said:

The presumption of confirmation embodied in the Constitution generally puts the onus on those interested in impeding a nomination to mobilize opposition to it.

So the general idea that the President should be given deference, in Professor Gerhardt's opinion, is accepted in terms of the practice of the Senate.

Senator BIDEN, on past nominations, has said: First, as a Member of the Senate, I am not choosing a nominee for the Court. That is the prerogative of the President of the United States and we, Members of the Senate, are simply reviewing the decision he has made. Second: Our review, I believe, must operate within certain limits. We are attempting to answer some of the following questions: First, does the nominee have the intellectual capacity, confidence, and temperament to be a Supreme Court Justice? Second, is the nominee of good moral character and free of conflict of interest that would compromise her ability—in this case it was Justice Ginsburg—to faithfully and objectively perform her role as a member of the Supreme Court? Third, will the nominee faithfully uphold the laws and Constitution of the United States of America? We are not attempting to determine whether the nominee will address with all of us—being the Senate—every pressing social or legal issue of the day. Indeed, if that were the test, no one would pass this committee, much less the full Senate.

I could not agree with Senator BIDEN more. If that is the test, we are OK. If it becomes some subjective test where you have to adopt our view of a particular line of legal reasoning, then I think you have undermined the role of the President, I think you put the Judiciary at a great disadvantage, and I think you will be starting down a road that will not pay great dividends for the Senate.

I argue that whatever votes you cast, let's not create standards that will come back to haunt the judiciary. Let's not put people in a bind, in trying to get on the Court, by making decisions or answering questions that will compromise their integrity and violate their judicial ethics to get votes.

I do not think anybody is intentionally trying to do that, but there are some disturbing comments about what the standard should be. There have been a couple of occasions on the Judiciary Committee where people have looked at Judge Roberts and said: Convince me, the burden is on you to convince me you will not do the following or you will do the following. I don't think that is helpful.

There have been some occasions in the committee where people have acknowledged the great intellect of Judge Roberts. His preparation for the job is not in question. I said in committee: If you question his intellect, people are going to question yours. He is a genius. There is no way of getting around that. He is one of the greatest legal minds in the history of the country, and I think he will be a historic choice by the President.

People have suggested: I don't know if he has the real-world experience; I know about your brain, but I don't

know about your heart. I suggest it is dangerous for us in the Senate to begin judging other people's hearts. That gets to be a slippery slope.

Senator WYDEN's statement, I thought, was dead on point. He understands the deference the body gives to the President. He pointed out, in fact, that Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer, two Clinton nominees, received 87 votes and 96 votes, respectively. If you start applying heart tests, I can tell you that gets to be so subjective and so political, and I think it is dangerous for the judiciary and not healthy for the Senate.

One of the issues Justice Ginsburg wrote about was the idea that prostitution should be a legal activity because to restrict women from engaging in prostitution is basically restricting a woman's right to engage in commerce.

You can agree or disagree, but from my point of view, looking at the world as I know it to be as a former prosecutor and former defense attorney who has had some experience in criminal law, if I am using the heart test or the real-world experience test, I would argue that from the experiences I have seen as a criminal defense lawyer and as a criminal prosecutor, that prostitution is hell for women; that if you really understood the life of a prostitute, it would not be a good business endeavor to uphold. It would be something we would want to deter.

That is my view based on life as I know it, having been involved in the criminal law business for 20-something years.

She said she supported the idea of Federal funding for abortion. If you wanted to try to question someone's heart from a pro-life perspective, I think it would be pretty tough to take taxpayers' dollars and use them for a procedure that millions of Americans find morally wrong.

So if we start going down the road of whether we believe a person before us has the right heart or the right real-world experiences, then you are taking the objective qualification, intellect, and character test, not an ideology—which I think is an appropriate thing—and you are beginning to put subjective elements in it that will not be good for the judiciary and will not be good for the Senate. I can assure you, if we started looking at those type of tests for Justice Ginsburg or Justice Breyer, who was a Democratic staffer, if we started looking at their philosophy or trying to judge their heart or having their value system equate with ours to the point we feel comfortable, then they would not have gotten nearly the votes they did because it is clear to me that not too long ago Republicans, during the Clinton administration, overlooked all the differences they had with Ginsburg and voted for her 96 to 3 and overlooked all the differences they had with Justice Breyer and gave him 87 votes. It is clear to me that Democrats and President Bush 1's administration overlooked all the differences

they had with Justice Scalia, and he got 98 votes.

It has been mentioned that the President has politicized this process, and there have been all kinds of veiled and direct threats about the next nominee: If you pick so and so, you are going to get a fight. If you pick Priscilla Owen, if you pick Janice Rogers Brown, you are going to get a fight, bringing back the specter of the filibuster.

What did the President do when he ran in his campaign? He talked about the Supreme Court and how important it was to him. He said, basically: If I am the President of the United States, on my watch, I am going to nominate well-qualified, strict constructionists to the Court with no litmus test, who will interpret the law and not become legislators themselves. He showed praise and admiration for Scalia and Thomas.

I would argue that something is wrong with the Senate if they can vote for someone 98 to 0 and say, If you pick someone like him, they are out of the mainstream and desiring a filibuster. How can you go from 98 to 0, someone similar to the person a decade later, and you filibuster? I would argue that if you do that, it is more about politics than it is about qualifications.

I hope we don't do that because the one thing I can assure you, knowing the President reasonably well, is that he is going to fulfill his campaign promise. He is going to send over to this body a well-qualified, strict constructionist, and to expect anything else, you ignored the last two elections. We are not going to sit on the sidelines and watch the election be overturned because of political pressure from the left. That is not going to happen.

I do expect the President to listen, as he did before he nominated Judge Roberts. I expect him to consult, as he did before he nominated Judge Roberts. I was very pleased and proud of his pick. I am encouraging the President to listen to our Democratic colleagues, listen to us all. But the most encouragement I could give the President is: Fulfill your campaign promise. Do what you said you would do when you ran for President. Send us over a well-qualified, strict constructionist conservative with no litmus test attached. If you do that, then you will have done a good service for the American people because you got elected twice telling them what you are going to do.

I have about 5 minutes, and I will let my other colleagues speak.

There were a couple of other comments about concerns with this nominee. It goes back to the memos. This nominee worked for the Reagan administration. He was in his midtwenties, and that has gotten to be a bad thing. Working for Ronald Reagan, I think, is a good thing. Justice Breyer was a Democratic staffer. No one held that against him. He worked for the Democratic side of the aisle in the Senate, and I don't remember anyone suggesting that was a bad thing.

Presidents pick people they know and with whom they are comfortable. Clinton was comfortable with Ginsburg, the executive general counsel for the ACLU, someone we would not have picked. He was comfortable with Justice Breyer, a former Democratic staffer, someone this President would not pick. This President picked someone who worked for his dad, President Bush 1, and Ronald Reagan.

There is an argument out there that adopting the Reagan position on extending the Civil Rights Act in toto, without a change, that would lead to a reverse discrimination test called "proportionality" and is out of the mainstream. Ronald Reagan won 49 States. If you can win 49 States and be out of the mainstream, I would argue the person saying you are out of the mainstream is out of the mainstream. If you picked someone similar to Scalia and that would justify a filibuster and the guy got 98 votes, there is a disconnect going on here.

One of the memos that is in question is a memo that Judge Roberts wrote about the Reagan administration's decision to grant amnesty, for lack of a better word, to illegal aliens in this country. He was writing a memo to suggest how the President should respond to an inquiry by Spanish Today, a Latino, Hispanic newspaper. He talked about the idea that it would be well received in the Hispanic community to grant amnesty. And he said to the effect that Spanish Today would be pleased that we are trying to grant legal status to their illegal amigos.

Somehow that one phrase has been suggested that this young man, working for the Reagan administration, committed some kind of a wrong that would deny him the ability to be fairly considered for the Supreme Court 20-something years later. I argue, No. 1, that if you read his writings in terms of what he was talking about, it was not meant to be slanderous, it was not meant to be a derogatory remark—he answered the question fully—that it was not meant to be that way at all. That was a commonly used term in the White House, the term "amigos," and he made a correct observation: that certain Hispanic groups did welcome President Reagan's decision.

Bottom line is, if we are going to take a phrase that a person wrote when they were 26, and that is going to be a reason to vote no, woe be to anybody else coming before this committee. I would not want that to be the standard for me.

He never apologized because he did not think he had anything to apologize about. So this is much ado, in my opinion, about nothing. You have read his writings. He used Latin, French, and Spanish terms all over the place. He is kind of a witty guy. You may not like his sense of humor, but I think it is given sometimes in that vein. The idea about, you know, more homemakers becoming lawyers, who said we need more homemakers than lawyers—and I

think a lot of people agree with that, and his wife happens to be an attorney, by the way—taking these phrases out of context and not looking at life in total is not fair. Not one person came before this body or the committee to say Judge Roberts has lived his life in any way, shape, or form to demean any group in America or individual. It is quite the opposite. He has received praise from everybody he has worked with on both sides of the aisle because he is basically a very good man. So I hope we will not make that the standard in the future.

Final thoughts. The vote is not in question in terms of confirmation. The process is in question. And that to me is as important as the vote total. The President is going to get another pick. That is the way it has happened. He has had a lot of things happen on his watch historic in nature. Whatever you think about President Bush, whether you like him or not, he has had to deal with some major league events. Let me tell you, some will go down good and not so good in history. That is the life of a President. But one thing I can say for certain is that his decision to make John Roberts Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court will go down well in history. It will be one of the greatest things he has done as President of the United States because he has picked one of the most uniquely qualified men in American history to serve on a Court that needs all the unity it can find, and this guy will be a consensus builder. The next one is coming and it is coming soon. There is all kind of jockeying already about what the President should do and what he should not do. I hope and pray we will remember the best traditions of the Senate, that we will listen to the Joe Bidens of the past, when he informed us that our role is to give deference to the Presidential nominee, look at their character, intelligence, and qualifications; that we will remember what Senator KENNEDY said about Justice Marshall: it is not your job, we shouldn't hold someone's political philosophy against them. We should look at who they are and what kind of judge they would be, would they be fair.

So as the next pick is about to be made, the Senate can fight if we want to or we can recognize that elections matter, we can judge the nominees based on their qualifications, integrity, and character, whether they are going to wear the robe in some improper fashion, or we can start putting political tests on the Presidency that will come back to haunt everybody and every party. If you want someone such as O'Connor—President Clinton did not think 1 minute about replacing Justice White with Justice Ginsburg. No one asked him to think about that. This idea that you have to have an ideological match is something new. What is old and stood the test of time is that Presidents get to pick once they win, and our job is to make sure they pick wisely in terms of character, integrity,

and qualification. And if we will stick to that test and not substitute our political philosophy for that of the President and not require a political allegiance of the nominee to our way of thinking about a particular line of cases or a particular concept in law, but judge the entire person, we will have served the country well. If we get into the mud and start fighting each other over the second pick, because some people don't like how the election turned out, then we will set a trend that will come back to haunt this body, haunt all future Presidents, and we will be worse off as a nation.

With that, I am going to end with the idea I am optimistic that we will not go down that road, we will give the next nominee the respect and deference this nominee has, and we will vote our conscience, and the vote will come and the vote will go. And the worst thing we could do is politicize the judiciary any more than it has been politicized. If you are selected to be on the Supreme Court, there will be millions of dollars to run you down and destroy your life, and that is going to happen on both sides of the aisle if we do not watch it. The best thing the Senate can do is use this opportunity to stand up to those people who want to run down somebody and ruin their life unfairly, because our day will come as Republicans. If we can unite around the idea we are not going to let special interest groups take over the Senate, the country will be stronger.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. I congratulate my colleague and good friend from South Carolina for a fine statement.

I also rise today in support of President Bush's nomination of Judge John Roberts to serve as Chief Justice of the United States.

President Bush could not have nominated an individual more qualified to be confirmed as the next Chief Justice of the United States. If one were to prescribe the ideal training regimen for a future Chief Justice, Judge Roberts' career may well serve as the model.

Judge Roberts has interacted with the Supreme Court in nearly every conceivable capacity. After law school, he held a prestigious position at the Supreme Court as a clerk to Justice William Rehnquist. He then went on to argue 39 cases before the Supreme Court, representing both public and private litigants. He currently serves as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit often referred to as the second highest court in the land.

In short, he has worked at the Supreme Court, represented dozens of clients before the Supreme Court, and served as a judge on the court that many consider a stepping-stone to the Supreme Court. I cannot imagine someone more qualified to now serve as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

After spending considerable time with Judge Roberts the nominee, I

came to be equally impressed with John Roberts the man. He is humble, unassuming, polite, and respectful. In that respect, he shares the values of many of my fellow Coloradans.

The humility he exudes is reflected in his view on the role of judges and the courts. Judge Roberts says:

[A] certain humility should characterize the judicial role. Judges and Justices are servants of the law, not the other way around.

He describes himself as a "modest judge," which is evidenced in his "appreciation that the role of the judge is limited, that judges are to decide the cases before them, they're not to legislate, they're not to execute the laws."

This judicial philosophy is imperative to preserving the sanctity of the Constitution that is under attack by a handful of activist judges activist judges who proclaim the Pledge of Allegiance unconstitutional and attempt to redefine the institution of marriage. Unlike these activist judges, Judge Roberts will be on the side of Constitution.

As a Senator representing Colorado, I also appreciate the uniqueness of the issues important to Colorado and the West. The departure of Justice O'Connor, and now Chief Justice Rehnquist, marks the loss of a Western presence on the Supreme Court.

Earlier this year, I asked President Bush to nominate a judge with an understanding of issues important to Colorado and the West, such as water and resource law.

I asked Judge Roberts about his understanding of Western resource and water law. Judge Roberts acknowledged the loss of the Western presence on the Court and assured me that he understands the uniqueness to the West of such issues as water, the environment, and public lands.

He shared his experience working on several cases in the State of Alaska, encompassing issues on rivers, Indian law, and natural resources. He also described his practice of traveling to the site of cases when he believes it is beneficial to his understanding of the facts. This practice is demonstrative of his commitment to fully understanding cases from the perspective of both sides.

I was pleasantly surprised to learn that he currently has a law clerk from New Mexico. Law clerks sit at a judge's right hand and are integral in the judge's decisionmaking process. I am hopeful that Judge Roberts will continue to surround himself with individuals who have a Western perspective.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has reviewed Judge Roberts' record more extensively than any previous Supreme Court nominee. The Administration produced more than 76,000 pages of documents related to Judge Roberts' distinguished career in public service. Judge Roberts testified for more than 20 hours before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

During the extensive review process, the country learned a great deal about

Judge Roberts' fitness to serve on the Supreme Court.

We learned about his judicial philosophy, one which is firmly rooted in the rule of law and unwavering in its reverence for the Constitution. I believe his most telling statement was this:

I come before the Committee with no agenda. I have no platform. Judges are not politicians who can promise to do certain things in exchange for votes. I have no agenda, but I do have a commitment. If I am confirmed, I will confront every case with an open mind. I will fully and fairly analyze the legal arguments that are presented. I will be open to the considered views of my colleagues on the bench, and I will decide every case based on the record, according to the rule of law, without fear or favor, to the best of my ability, and I will remember that it's my job to call balls and strikes, and not to pitch or bat.

We learned that Judge Roberts subscribes to "the bedrock principle of treating people on the basis of merit without regard to race or sex." His belief in these principles is echoed in praise from several women's and minority groups.

The Minority Business Round Table says "his appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court would certainly uphold our core American values of freedom, equality and fairness."

The Independent Women's Forum applauds Judge Roberts as a "very well qualified candidate with a reputation of being a strict interpreter of the law rather than someone who legislates from the bench."

We learned that Judge Roberts recognizes the limitations on the government's taking of private property and the role of the legislature in drawing lines that the Court should not. The Court in *Kelo* permitted the transfer of property from one private party to another private party to satisfy the Constitution's "public use" requirement, essentially erasing this fundamental protection from its text. Judge Roberts says the *Kelo* decision "leaves the ball in the court of the legislature. . . . [Congress] and legislative bodies in the States are protectors of the people's rights as well. . . . [Y]ou can protect them in situations where the Court has determined, as it did 5-4 in *Kelo*, that they are not going to draw that line."

We learned that Judge Roberts will rely on domestic precedent to interpret the U.S. Constitution, not foreign law. Judge Roberts said, "as a general matter . . . a couple of things . . . cause concern on my part about the use of foreign law as precedent The first has to do with democratic theory. . . . If we're relying on a decision from a German judge about what our Constitution means, no President accountable to the people appointed that judge, and no Senate accountable to the people confirmed that judge, and yet he's playing a role in shaping a law that binds the people in this country."

Given his keen intellect, impartiality, temperament, sound legal judgment, and integrity, it is not surprising that Judge Roberts enjoyed bi-

partisan support by the Senate Judiciary Committee. I expect that he will enjoy similar bipartisan support in his confirmation vote tomorrow morning.

I want to commend President Bush on the unprecedented level of bipartisan consultation he engaged in with the Senate prior to this nomination. The Constitution grants the power to the President to nominate and the Senate to provide advice and consent. Although Senators can provide input, the Senate does not co-nominate. When the President sends forth highly qualified candidates, this body has an obligation to the American people to provide a timely up-or-down vote.

I commend my colleagues on the respectful hearings and expeditious process. The Ginsburg Standard was applied to Judge Roberts fair, respectful hearings; no prejudging of cases likely to come before the court; and a timely, up-or-down vote.

With consultations on the next nominee already well under way, and an announcement imminent, I am hopeful that my colleagues will apply the same standards.

Judges are not politicians. The Senate debate should reflect that the job of a judge is to review cases impartially, not to advocate issues. Judges should be evaluated on their qualifications, judicial philosophy, and respect for the rule of law.

I am confident that President Bush will send forth a highly qualified nominee to replace Justice O'Connor, and I am hopeful that my colleagues will continue to build on the spirit of bipartisanship witnessed during this confirmation process.

In conclusion, I cannot imagine a better qualified candidate than Judge Roberts to lead this nation's highest Court into the 21st century. I believe his rhetoric matches his actions.

On behalf of the citizens of Colorado, I thank Judge Roberts for his willingness to serve our country. I am hopeful that the fair and respectful hearings accorded to him by this body will serve to inspire the best and the brightest of future generations to make similar sacrifices in the name of public service.

I strongly urge my colleagues to cast a vote in favor of Judge John G. Roberts' confirmation as the 17th Chief Justice of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, after listening to my friend from Colorado and my good friend from South Carolina, and then to look at the statement that I have, it appears we are all saying about the same thing, but we just all haven't had the opportunity to say it yet. I will try to put a little different slant on it.

We know the qualifications of this man, Judge Roberts. He has consistently shown me excellence in all aspects of his previous academic and his professional career. He is widely thought of as one of the best legal minds in the country, is highly re-

spected by his colleagues as a fair-minded, brilliant, and temperate jurist. He graduated from Harvard College *summa cum laude*. He did it in only 3 years. He then graduated from Harvard Law School at the top of his class.

Less than 3 years ago, Judge Roberts was confirmed by a unanimous vote to the DC Court of Appeals, which is often referred to, as my friend from Colorado says, as the second highest court in the land. He was also a partner in the prestigious law firm of Hogan & Hartson. He specialized in U.S. Supreme Court litigation, arguing numerous cases before the very Court to which we seek to confirm him today. Further, he had an active practice in appellate law.

I guess what we look for in the men and women we like to see on the country's highest Court is pretty much found in all the qualifications of Judge Roberts. He had worked in the private sector. He also worked in the White House under President Ronald Reagan as Associate Counsel. In addition, he earned a highly prestigious clerkship on the Supreme Court for Chief Justice William Rehnquist—that in 1980 and 1981. Then he was nominated by this President and went before the Judiciary Committee.

We watched those hearings with a great deal of interest. I speak not as a member of that committee or even as an attorney, but what we heard more than anything else—and this is important to my State of Montana—is that we will have a qualified, fair, and competent Supreme Court Justice. That is important. When questioned on all of those qualifications, fairness, and competence, no one challenged any part of those elements. In this respect, Judge Roberts earned the "well qualified" rating from the American Bar Association, which is the highest rating that association offers. There was no challenge there.

He continually impressed my colleagues in the Senate by showing his immense knowledge of the law while reflecting his vast understanding of the rule of law and the importance of precedent. There was no challenge there.

What becomes important is that we know that our Supreme Court Justices understand their duty is to interpret the law as it is reflected in the cases that come before them and refrain from personal biases and from legislating or putting their biases into those cases.

He impressed me when he said that he wanted to be the umpire. He didn't want to be the pitcher or the batter; he just wants to call the balls and the strikes. I appreciate that. I spent a lot of years on a football field, and I was one of those who wore the striped shirt. When I look back on that game, maybe our judiciary should be a little bit like this great American sports feature of football. When you think about it, 4 old referees—some of them overweight

whom I could talk about—go out on a field of 22 young men who are hostile, mobile, and bent on hurting each other, and we have very few problems because those striped shirts are the arresting officers, the judges, and the penal officers. They do it in 30 seconds, and they do it without very many complaints. Thus the discipline of the game: 22 young men in armor and dead set on winning the contest.

Throughout his hearings before the Judiciary Committee, Judge Roberts proved over and over that he understands the role of the judiciary as an interpreter and not a legislator and why it is important to our governmental system that our judges across America refrain from overstepping their duties. The law is the law. Yes, it can be a subject of interpretation, but look how simple our Constitution is. It doesn't use very many big words. They are very simple. There is a lot of difference between the word "may" and the word "shall," and you can interpret them.

He explained his judicial style during his hearings by saying:

I prefer to be known as a modest judge . . . It means an appreciation that the role of the judge is limited, that a judge is to decide the cases before them. . . .

They are not to change it or use their biases to execute a judgment. That is pretty important.

When you look at his private life, the values of how he has progressed in his professional life, how he has carried himself and what is personally important to him—family, being a good husband, a provider—we see all of those values that we Americans hold in very high esteem.

Then we move it over into now what kind of a judge will he be. He was questioned on a lot of social issues that the courts have no business even considering. That falls on us, the elected representatives of America, and our constituency. What their values are should be reflected here. Yet what I heard was questions on human rights.

It is a wonderful thing, this Constitution we have. The Constitution was not written for groups, it was written for you as the individual. It is your personal Bill of Rights and how we structure our Government and the role of each one of those equal entities and how they relate and interact with each other—the executive, the judicial, and the legislative.

It is important to me and the people I represent that we have judges on the bench who will not prejudge cases. He may have a bias one way or the other, but what does the law say as it pertains to me as an individual citizen? This judge made his own commitment to listening, to hearing both sides of the case, and is committed to a fair and reasonable outcome, whether the judge personally likes or dislikes the eventual results. His approach to the law, simply put, is one of restraint. He is shown not to be an ideologue with an intent of imposing his views or his biases on the law.

Will he always rule in a way that would be consistent with my philosophy? I would say no. I have a feeling, though, however he rules will be fair, and he will not compromise any of the principles of the law as written. He explained:

As a judge I have no agenda, I have a guide in the Constitution and the laws that are precedents to the court, and those are what I apply with an open mind after fully and fairly considering the arguments and assessing the considered views of my colleagues on the bench.

I am not sure if it is the job to really draw a consensus when you have nine men and women who have strong views of the law and the Constitution and maybe would interpret them in many different ways, but what this man has shown us is strong character, integrity, and his immense knowledge of the law.

Uphold the Constitution, which protects us all—and we have heard a lot about that lately. People who are maybe short of patience would come up to us and ask, What is taking Iraq so long to get a constitution? I said, You know, it took almost 3 years to put ours together.

I still question: If we had had television and news channels, spin meisters, commentators, and reporters who seemed to inject their bias every now and again into the news, I am not real sure we would have a Constitution yet.

This man has shown us he has all the qualifications to be a judge, especially a judge on the highest Court in the Nation.

On behalf of my constituents in Montana, and from all that I can read and all the information I can gather, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting aye on Judge Roberts as Chief Justice of the United States.

When the premise was wrong, he wasn't afraid to challenge the premise. That is unique when coming before any kind of a committee in a legislative body. That is what impressed me. The premise is assumed instead of factual. That is the importance to all of us when making judgments that affect so many of us in our daily lives.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it is, indeed, a privilege for me to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator abstain for a moment.

Under the previous order, the time from 1 to 2 p.m. is under the control of the Democratic side.

Mr. WARNER. That is correct. I see one of my distinguished colleagues rising to be the floor manager of this period of time, but he very courteously

said I could open up, if that is approved by the Chair.

Mr. President, as I said, it is a great honor for me to first and foremost stand on this floor at this great moment in contemporary history. Tomorrow, this Chamber will, I anticipate, with a strong bipartisan vote, exercise its constitutional right of giving consent to the nomination of John Roberts to serve as the next Chief Justice of the United States.

I am privileged to know the nominee by virtue of the fact that we both, at different times in our careers, served in a very prestigious and revered law firm in our Nation's Capital, the law firm of Hogan & Hartson. When I joined the firm approximately forty-five years ago, Nelson T. Hartson was very active in Hogan & Hartson. I had the good fortune of being one of his aides-de-camp. Mr. Hartson's philosophy and his standard of ethics permeated that law firm then, as they still do today.

As a consequence of our mutual affiliation with Hogan & Hartson, I was privileged to be asked by Judge Roberts to introduce him when he was nominated by the President to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. In the 2 years he served on that court, he established an extraordinarily fine record.

I was privileged to once again introduce Judge Roberts to the Judiciary Committee some two weeks ago at the start of his confirmation hearing to serve in this highest of positions in our land.

I would simply say this: As I have come to know this magnificent individual, he is, in my judgment, an unpretentious legal intellectual. I say that because he is a man of simplicity in habits. He has a lovely family. He has a marvelous reputation among colleagues in the legal profession who are both Democrats and Republicans and conservatives and liberals. He is admired by all. In that capacity, as an unpretentious legal intellectual, he is, in my judgment, a rare if not an endangered species here in America for his personal habits and extraordinary intellect and for the manner he conducts himself every day of his life.

In fact, in the 27 years I have been privileged to serve in the Senate, slightly more than 2,000 judicial nominations have been submitted by a series of Presidents to the Senate for "advice and consent." John Roberts stands at the top, among the finest.

I commend our President on making such an outstanding nomination—a nomination which will receive strong bipartisan support in the Senate.

Just 4 months ago, with the judicial confirmation process stalled in the Senate, and with the Senate on the brink of considering the so-called nuclear or constitutional option, there was an aura of doubt, at the time, that any Supreme Court nominee would receive a vote reflecting bipartisan support.

But on May 23, 2005, 14 U.S. Senators, of which I was one, committed themselves, in writing, to support our Senate leadership in facilitating the Senate's constitutional responsibility of providing "advice and consent" in accordance with article II, section 2.

In crafting our Memorandum of Understanding, the Gang of 14 started and ended every discussion with the Constitution. We discussed how, without question, our Framers put the word "advice" in our Constitution for a reason: to ensure consultation between a President and the Senate prior to the forwarding of a nominee to the Senate for consideration.

Accordingly, in the Gang of 14's Memorandum of Understanding, Senator BYRD and I incorporated language that spoke directly to the Founding Fathers' explicit use of the word "advice." That bipartisan accord reads as follows:

We believe that, under Article II, Section 2, of the United States Constitution, the word "Advice" speaks to consultation between the Senate and the President with regard to the use of the President's power to make nominations. We encourage the Executive branch of government to consult with members of the Senate, both Democratic and Republican, prior to submitting a judicial nomination to the Senate for consideration.

Such a return to the early practices of our government may well serve to reduce the rancor that unfortunately accompanies the advice and consent process in the Senate.

With respect to the nomination before us today, I believe that the President has met his constitutional obligations in an exemplary way.

In my view, that consultation between the President and individual Senators laid a foundation for the confirmation of John Roberts with bipartisan support.

The Gang of 14's Memorandum of Understanding provided a framework that has helped the Senate's judicial confirmation process. It has enabled the Senate to have six up-or-down votes on judicial nominations and now the Senate is about to confirm Judge John Roberts.

While I thoroughly understand that President Bush didn't choose a nominee that some in the Senate might have chosen if they were President, that is not what the Constitution requires. Indeed, in Federalist Paper No. 66, Alexander Hamilton makes it clear that it is not the Senate's job to select a nominee. It is the Senate's responsibility to provide advice to a President on who to nominate and then to grant or withhold consent on that nomination. On the other hand, it is the President's responsibility, and solely the President's responsibility, to nominate individuals to serve on our courts. As Hamilton so clearly wrote:

It will be the office of the President to nominate, and, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint. There will, of course, be no exertion of choice on the part of the Senate. They may defeat one choice of the Executive, and oblige him to make another; but they cannot themselves choose—they can only ratify or reject the choice of the President.

In my view, the Senate was given a meaningful opportunity to provide its advice to the President, and the President respected the Senate's views when he nominated John Roberts. Soon, the Senate will provide its consent to that nomination.

John Roberts' credentials are well-known and of the highest quality.

He earned a B.A., *summa cum laude*, from Harvard College and his law degree, *magna cum laude*, from Harvard Law School. At Harvard Law School, he served as managing editor of the Harvard Law Review. Subsequent to graduation, Mr. Roberts worked as a Federal law clerk for Judge Friendly on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the second Circuit, and later as a law clerk for Justice William Rehnquist on the Supreme Court. He has worked in the Department of Justice, the Reagan administration, the George H.W. Bush administration, and he practiced law for many years in private practice.

But while John Roberts' legal credentials are unquestionably impressive, equally important is the type of person that he is. Throughout his legal career, both in public service, private practice, and through his pro bono work, John Roberts has worked with and against hundreds of attorneys. Those attorneys who know him well typically speak with one voice when they tell you that dignity, humility, and a sense of fairness are hallmarks of John Roberts.

In my view, all of these traits came across to those of us who watched the hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee. John Roberts unquestionably demonstrated a mastery of the law and a commitment to decide cases based upon the Constitution and the law of the land, with appropriate respect and deference to prior Supreme Court precedents. He views his role as one of impartial umpire, rather than as one of ideologue with an agenda. He testified to all of this under oath.

To me, all of these qualities—John Roberts' legal credentials and his temperament—represent the embodiment of a Federal judge, particularly a Chief Justice of the United States. And I am confident that the vast majority of the millions and millions of Americans who watched his confirmation hearings agree.

Indeed, the American Bar Association has given John Roberts its highest rating, unanimously finding him "well qualified" for this position. And just slightly more than 2 years ago, the Senate unanimously confirmed him for a Federal appeals court judgeship by voice vote.

Before I conclude my statement in support of this outstanding nominee, I would like to highlight a few key facts of Senate history and tradition with respect to Supreme Court nominees. I find these facts particularly illustrative.

Over the last 50 years, America has seen a total of 27 Supreme Court nominees. Six of those nominees received the unanimous consent of the Senate

by voice vote. Another 15 of those nominees, including seven current members of the U.S. Supreme Court, received the consent of the Senate by more than 60 votes. In fact, only three nominees to the Supreme Court over the course of the last 50 years have failed to receive the consent of the Senate.

Chief Justice Rehnquist was confirmed to the Court as an Associate Justice in 1971 with 68 votes in support, and later confirmed as Chief Justice with 65 votes. John Paul Stevens received the consent of the Senate 98 to 0. Justice O'Connor, Justice Scalia, and Justice Kennedy were all confirmed by the Senate unanimously. Justice Souter was confirmed via a vote of 90 to 9. Justice Ginsburg was confirmed by a vote of 96 to 3. And Justice Breyer received the Senate's consent by a vote of 87 to 9.

Like all of these highly qualified Americans who came before him seeking Senate confirmation to the Supreme Court, John Roberts has earned, over a lifetime, the strong vote of bipartisan support he is about to receive.

Mr. President, I will yield the floor to my distinguished colleague at this time who will be the manager of this period. I say to my colleague, thank you for participating in the Gang of 14, as we have become known. Perhaps in the course of our remarks today we can talk about the mission, the challenge of that group, and how, in my humble judgment, we did succeed in enabling our leadership to once again put in motion the Senate's role in the confirmation of those nominated by our President for the Federal judiciary.

I think back when there was a great uncertainty about that process, and even some thought of invoking certain rules of the Senate by way of change, and how my distinguished colleague from Nebraska and I stood, with others in that group, and were able to lay a foundation which, I say with a deep sense of humility, may well have contributed to our being here today and casting that historic vote tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I first thank you for the opportunity to speak today. And I say to my distinguished colleague from Virginia, it was a pleasure to get to know you better through the Gang of 14 in our efforts to bring about advice and consent with the White House in the nomination process for the Supreme Court.

It is always difficult to take either less or more credit than you deserve, but I think in this situation, by working together, we were able to bring the Senate into fulfilling its obligation to deal with the confirmation of judicial nominees. It made it possible for us to be able to have a nomination and a process that works so well that it will now result in an up-or-down vote on Judge Roberts.

The Senator from Virginia is right. There were suggestions that we needed

to change the rules because of certain practices on the part of certain Members of the Senate that raised doubts about the process, whether we could get up-or-down votes on judicial nominees, particularly appellate court nominations and perhaps Supreme Court nominees. But by working together, we found a solution that I believe in very many ways held on to the traditions of the Senate that are good but also invoked a process that has resulted now in what we are going to be able to accomplish tomorrow. We were able to refuse to engage in extreme partisanship but worked together in partnership to develop a compromise. We paved the way. We preserved the traditions. And I believe in some respects we have also assisted in leading to the historic outreach by the White House to an overwhelming number of our colleagues for their input under the advice and consent portion of our agreement that we shared with the White House.

I personally thank the White House for reaching out. The administration has reached out to many of our Members on several occasions. Most recently, I had the pleasure and the privilege of being contacted for my thoughts about the next nominee and the process that would be used there.

I think we have also learned not to believe everything we hear about the Senate not being able to accomplish much, the criticism that Senators are lost in partisanship and deadlock through the unwillingness of people to compromise or be able to work together. I believe we disproved that theory with this Gang of 14.

We have gone through divisive elections. We know America needs to be brought together. We do not seek to further divide ourselves. We need to work together. It gave us an opportunity to, in many ways, reduce the partisan tension that was ripping this body to the extent that it was difficult to get anything done, particularly as it might have been difficult to get through the nomination process for the Supreme Court.

So it is a pleasure for me to be here on the floor and a real privilege to be associated with my colleague from Virginia. We have been joined by other members of the Gang of 14 who I know have some similar thoughts they would like to express.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I might say, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska was a leader among the Gang of 14. I say to the Senator, I guess you might say you were one of the "Founding Fathers" of that group, and modesty prevents you from acknowledging that leadership. We are joined on the floor by two of our colleagues. I purposely scheduled my appearance to coincide with members of the Gang of 14 whom I am privileged to be with today.

But I think, as the Senator pointed out about the advice and consent clause, we, the Gang of 14, want to acknowledge the important contribution of Senator BYRD of West Virginia. He and I sort of partnered together to draw up that short paragraph which recognizes and points out the Founding Fathers put the word "advice" in the Constitution for a specific purpose. As the distinguished Senator from Nebraska said, indeed, our President fulfilled that. But I wanted to acknowledge Senator BYRD's very major participation in our group.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise today to comment with respect to the Gang of 14. I join my good friend from Nebraska and my good friend from Virginia and my good friend from Arkansas here today in again reminding ourselves as a Chamber that the 14 Members of the U.S. Senate who came together came here to do good. What they decided to do and we decided to do in the formation of that agreement was to transcend partisan politics to try to find a common purpose for the benefit of this great institution, the U.S. Senate, and for the benefit of our Nation.

I commend the leadership, particularly of our senior members of that group of 14 Senators, including the great Senator from West Virginia, ROBERT BYRD, who worked closely with the Senator from Virginia, especially on the advice and consent portions.

All of the members of the group were very instrumental in putting the compromise together.

I would offer two observations with respect to that process and that agreement. The first is, it is my hope, as the newest Member of the U.S. Senate, the Senator who still ranks No. 100, that this is a kind of template that can be used as our Nation faces difficult issues in the future. We were able to put aside partisan politics to get beyond the gridlock that had existed in this body for some period of time.

We must be able, as a Chamber to do the same thing with respect to other very difficult issues, such as the Federal deficit or how we engage in the recovery of the gulf coast or how we deal with the issues of health care, because my involvement in this group was based on the fact that I believe it is our responsibility as leaders in our country to get about doing the people's business. What was happening was we had gotten too involved in this impasse that had been going on for a very long time.

The second point I wish to make is to underscore the importance of the advice and consent provision of our Constitution. It was Senator BYRD and Senator WARNER who believed it was important to include that provision as part of the agreement. It was in recognition there is a joint responsibility between the President of the United States and the Senate in the appointment and confirmation of persons to

the bench that that advice and consent provision really needed to be part of that agreement.

From my point of view, it is very important that advice and consent provision of the Constitution be honored because of the fact that, as we make our decisions, it is very important that these decisions, which will have a long-lasting impact on the history of America, be based on the most informed consent possible. The way you get the most informed consent possible is that there be a communication and a free flow of information between the President and the White House and the members of the Judiciary Committee and this body.

So I again commend the Senators from Virginia and West Virginia for having worked so hard on that long weekend to craft language that became a keystone of this document.

Finally, I would say that through this process I also became comfortable with Judge Roberts, recognizing that he is in the mainstream of political and, more importantly, legal thought of America. I think the Members who were part of this group, led by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from West Virginia, are also part of that mainstream of America.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from Virginia and Arkansas and Nebraska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, one of the things that was surprising to my constituents in Arkansas is that I would actually come to Washington, DC, and join a gang. They sometimes wonder what we do up here and why we do it. I am very proud to be part of this gang, with my 13 colleagues who stood tall and exercised some of the best traditions and best judgment that Senators can. One of the lessons we learned through the Gang of 14 process and trying to take the nuclear option off the table—and also trying to get some up-or-down votes on some more nominees—is that good things happen when Senators talk to each other.

I have learned since I have been in Washington that we spend a lot of time talking about each other and not enough time talking to each other. I hope this serves as an object lesson. It shows we can work together in this political environment. The truth is, we talk about how bad things are, and sometimes they do get bad. But basically, we are all sent here by our States. Each State gets two Senators. Even the two Senators from the same State don't always agree. We don't have to agree. But certainly all 100 of us should, as the Book of Isaiah says, reason together. We should come together and put the country first and put others' interests ahead of our own. We should try to continue to work together and build on not just a bipartisan approach but in many ways a nonpartisan approach where we look at

the challenges facing our country and try to approach those as best we possibly can.

I know a lot of people around the country and in this Chamber and this city are focused on the next nomination. We haven't even had a vote on John Roberts. Nonetheless, a lot of people are concerned about the next nomination. I understand that. In some ways, and rightfully so, we should be focused on that. My colleagues have touched on it already. But part of the language Senator WARNER and Senator BYRD crafted during this agreement—we all helped in different ways on this language and had our thoughts incorporated in the language, but Senator BYRD and Senator WARNER took the lead on the language—is the advice and consent portion of the agreement. Basically all we do is encourage the President to take the Constitution literally. When the Constitution says that it shall be with the advice and consent of the Senate, we take that literally. We hope the President will seek our advice.

Supposedly either the President or the White House reached out to about 70 of us when we received the John Roberts nomination. That works, and that is very positive. I hope we see that again.

Some of my constituents in Arkansas have asked me: Don't you have some anxiety about John Roberts? Gosh, he used to work for the Reagan administration. There are things in his background that various people don't agree with.

My response is: Certainly, I have anxiety about John Roberts. I have anxiety about any nominee that any President will nominate to the Supreme Court. It is a lifetime appointment. There is no question about the influence and the impact that one Supreme Court Justice can have on the American system of justice and on American society. I have anxiety about anybody. I certainly have some about John Roberts. But nonetheless, he has the right stuff to be on the Court.

I am proud of the courage my colleagues showed in the time when it mattered and we came together and worked it out, the Gang of 14.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I am announcing my support for Judge John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States.

From the beginning, I told the White House I would like to see a nominee that the vast majority of the American people would say, yes, that is the quality of person who ought to be on the Supreme Court. When the nomination of Judge Roberts was first announced, my initial impression was that he met that test. I had a chance to visit with him personally at some length in my office, and I concluded from that visit that Judge Roberts is exceptional. Not only is he of high intelligence and

strong character, he also is someone of midwestern values of honesty and decency.

I have looked at his record. I find that he is in the judicial mainstream. Yes, he is a conservative, but my own belief is that the Court is strengthened by a range of views. I don't think we should have all progressives or all conservatives. We need to have people of differing views and differing backgrounds to make the Supreme Court function appropriately.

When Judge Roberts came to my office, I asked him about his association with Judge Friendly. He clerked for Judge Friendly. He is reported to be very impressed by Judge Friendly's service. I asked him what impressed him about Judge Friendly. He told me one of the things that most impressed him is that Judge Friendly did much of his own work. He didn't just rely on clerks to do the work. I also asked him what else impressed him about Judge Friendly.

He said: You know, you could not tell whether he was a liberal or a conservative, a Democrat or Republican. All you could tell from his rulings was that he had profound respect for the law.

I thought that was a pretty good answer. I went on to ask him: Judge, at the end of your service, how would you want to be remembered?

He said: I would want to be remembered as a good judge, not as a powerful judge but as a good judge.

I said to him: What does that mean to you, being a good judge?

He said to me: Listening to both sides, putting aside one's personal prejudices to rule based on the law. He said: I have a profound respect for the law.

In the confirmation hearings, we saw Judge Roberts perform brilliantly. His mastery of the law, his judgment, his demeanor confirmed for me that he is someone who deserves my support.

Beyond that, I had a chance to talk to Judge Roberts again on the phone last week. I said: Judge, I saw in your confirmation hearings that you said you are not an ideologue.

He said: Senator, I can tell you, I do not bring an ideological agenda to the court. What I bring is a profound respect for the law.

I told him I believed him. I think he is absolutely conservative. That is not disqualifying. I also think he is somebody of extraordinary talent and somebody who will listen to both sides and rule based on the law. He has a healthy conservatism, believing that the job of a Justice is not to make the law but to interpret the law. That is the appropriate role for a judge in our system. He has it right with respect to that issue.

I believe Judge Roberts has the potential for greatness on the Court. Rarely have I interviewed anyone in my 19 years who so impressed me with the way their mind works and their basic demeanor. I have interviewed

others who struck me as arrogant and pompous and filled with themselves, somebody I would never want to have in a position of power over the people I represent. I do not feel that way in the least bit about Judge Roberts. He is someone who is steady and even. He is somebody who is thoughtful and quite exceptional.

I know there are groups who feel very strongly on one side or another. There are colleagues who have made different judgments. I respect that. But I believe Judge Roberts is the kind of nominee who deserves our support, and he will have mine.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished colleague from North Dakota. That was truly a beautiful set of remarks. It is not just that you indicated that you will cast your vote in support; it was a very thoughtful reflection on a very important responsibility we as Senators have.

I thank again the Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Colorado. We have been a team together for some time. I am delighted to have had the privilege to be here on the floor with each of them.

In conclusion, I reflect back on, once again, the Federalist Paper No. 66 in which Alexander Hamilton said: It will be the office of the President to nominate and, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint. There will, of course, be no exertion of choice on the part of the Senate. They may defeat one choice of the executive and oblige him to make another, but they cannot themselves choose. They can only ratify or reject the choice of the President.

We are on the eve of accepting that choice, giving our consent. Again, in my 27 years in this institution, I cannot recall a more humble and yet enjoyable group I have worked with than these 14 Senators. It had been my hope that our distinguished colleague from West Virginia could join us today. I asked him and he said he would if he possibly could. But were he here, we would all stand again and thank him for his guidance as we worked through this situation.

I thank my colleague from Nebraska and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Virginia for his wise counsel through the process of bringing together 13 other colleagues to bring about a confirmation process and nomination process that has worked. Now we are on the eve of this confirmation vote on the 17th Chief Justice of the United States. The question is, what is next? We also have another Supreme Court vacancy to fill. I hope the President and the White House will continue to reach out and seek the advice of our colleagues so we

can face that nomination with the same kind of input we did in the case of Judge Roberts.

Let me say that the late Senator from Nebraska Ed Zorinsky said on so many occasions that in Washington there are too many Republican Senators and too many Democratic Senators and not enough United States Senators. I can say as the gang of 14 got together, there were less Republicans and less Democrats than there were United States Senators, anxious to work and bring about a resolution to the judicial impasse, but also to pave the way for where we are today and where we are going to be tomorrow and where we are going to be in the next confirmation process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time from 2 to 3 p.m. will be under the control of the majority.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next hour under majority control be allocated as follows: 15 minutes for Senator TALENT, 10 minutes for Senator VITTER, 15 minutes for Senator THUNE, and 20 minutes for Senator BUNNING.

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

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, it is really a privilege for me to spend a few minutes visiting with the Senate about Judge Roberts. He is probably the most analyzed and evaluated Supreme Court nominee ever. Based on my study of his record and my discussions with him—which have certainly not been extensive but have been enough to help me get a feel for the man—I believe that he will turn out to be one of the best Chief Justices ever.

We have learned a great deal about who he is. We know about his extraordinary professional accomplishments. We have seen the overwhelming bipartisan support that he has earned from his colleagues in the legal profession. We heard from John Roberts himself on the rule of law, on the judicial role, and the kind of service he intends to provide to the Nation as Chief Justice should the Senate confirm him.

I said before he is one of the most analyzed and evaluated Supreme Court nominees. He spent almost 20 hours before the Judiciary Committee while Senators asked him 673 questions. Senators then asked him 243 more questions in writing. And I am sure he thought the bar exam was a struggle. Judge Roberts provided nearly 3,000 pages to the Judiciary Committee, in-

cluding his published articles, congressional testimony, transcripts from interviews, speeches, and panel discussions, and material related to the dozens of cases he argued before the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Judiciary Committee obtained more than 14,000 pages of material in the public domain. And as if all of that were not enough, the committee obtained a staggering 82,943 pages of additional material from the National Archives and both the Reagan and Bush Libraries regarding Judge Roberts' service in those administrations.

If you total that up, there was more than 100,000 pages of material on a 50-year-old nominee, which amounts to 2,000 pages for every year of his life.

What did all that material reveal? Simply put, that Judge Roberts is one of the finest nominees ever to come before the Senate. His professional record speaks for itself, but I am going to speak about it for a minute.

He was an excellent student. He graduated from Harvard—I can forgive him that—in only 3 years as an undergrad. I am a University of Chicago lawyer myself. He became the top graduate in law school and became editor in chief of the Harvard Law Review. He served as clerk for Judge Friendly, who was, by consensus, one of the greatest circuit court judges ever. He served as clerk for Chief Justice Rehnquist. He went on to become Deputy Solicitor General of the United States. He became one of the top partners in one of the top law firms in the country and argued 39 cases before the Supreme Court. In 2003, he was confirmed unanimously by this Senate to be a judge on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

We learned a lot about him as a person as well. He embodies the idea of being fair, being thoughtful, and being capable. He is certainly hard working. He is certainly brilliant. He managed his testimony before the Judiciary Committee without a note. He is a man of integrity, he is honest, and he is devoted to his family.

Those are the qualities we want in the men and women who serve our Nation on the High Court. They are the kind of qualities that will move America forward and move the judicial branch forward, and more on that in a minute or two.

He has proven beyond any doubt that he has the qualifications, the temperament, the knowledge, and the understanding to serve as America's next Chief Justice. I was particularly impressed by the humility he showed through the process. I think it is very important that judges have a judicial temperament and, for me, that begins with the idea of service.

When you are a judge, the people who come before you have to treat you with respect because of your position. You should conduct yourself in that position so they want to treat you with respect, they feel that is owing to you, not just because of your office but be-

cause of how you conduct yourself in office.

I would hazard to say even those who will oppose his nomination for other reasons would agree that he has that kind of a temperament. He wants to be on the Court because he loves the law, and he wants to be a judge because he wants to serve the United States of America. Those are the right reasons to want to be on the Supreme Court of the United States.

We have had this opinion ratified by the individuals who know him the best—by his colleagues on the bar, Democrats and Republicans alike, who have overwhelmingly supported his elevation to the Supreme Court. I think it is very important when you look at judicial nominees to make certain they have support from people from all parts of the political spectrum and all parts of the jurisprudential spectrum.

A point I made on other occasions on this floor about judicial nominations is that it is misleading in a way to talk about a judicial nominee being in or out of the mainstream of American jurisprudence because the truth is, there is more than one mainstream. Lawyers are divided over which jurisprudential theory ought to guide judges in interpreting statutes and interpreting the Constitution. They may differ as to theories or constructs, if you will, as they approach different parts of the Constitution.

There is not one mainstream, and often there is not any one completely correct answer when you are interpreting a vague provision of the Constitution. But that does not mean there are no incorrect answers. Just because reasonable people looking at the history and the text of the document might disagree as to what is exactly the right answer does not mean there are no wrong answers.

The wrong answer, as Judge Roberts said so eloquently and so often in his testimony, is one that does not respect the rule of law. A wrong answer is one that is based on an idea of the judicial role that allows the judge to do whatever he or she thinks they would want to do if they were in control of the policy in issue. Whatever their theory of interpreting the Constitution is, they should be consistent in applying it. They should be circumscribed by their own jurisprudence. They should have a standard against which they measure their decisions, and that standard has to be other than their own predilections on the underlying issue.

It is one thing to be ruled, to some extent, by judges. We are talking about officers of the Government. So the decisions have the power of law, and we have always, to some extent and in appropriate ways, been ruled by judges. It is another point to be ruled by judicial whim. This is the distinction Judge Roberts made over and over again, for which I think we should all be grateful.

Because of his attitude in that respect, more than 150 Democratic and Republican members of the DC Bar, including well-known Democrats such as

Lloyd Cutler and Seth Waxman, wrote to the Senate calling Judge Roberts one of the very best and most highly respected appellate lawyers in the Nation.

The American Bar Association has given Judge Roberts a rating of "unanimously well-qualified," its highest possible rating. As Steve Tober, the chairman of the ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, explained: Judge Roberts has the admiration and respect of his colleagues on and off the bench, and he is, as we have found, the very definition of collegial. This is another quality that I hope and believe Judge Roberts will bring to the role of Chief Justice. I think he can operate in that Court in a way that pulls the Justices together where their convictions honestly allow them to be pulled together. It is one thing to disagree when you have strongly different opinions on the jurisprudential matters before the Court; it is another to disagree because over time you have become part of one faction or you have become alienated or estranged on some other grounds from some of the other Justices.

That is not good, and I believe, just my gut opinion after talking with him and watching him is that this is a person who can lower the temperature on the Court, who can shed light rather than just heat on many of the issues that are before the Court.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining of the 15 minutes allocated.

Mr. TALENT. I did not want my eloquence to outstrip the time I had available, Mr. President, so thank you for that.

We have heard a lot from Judge Roberts himself, and maybe it is good for me to close by quoting some of what he has said about the judicial function. I thought he did an excellent job of explaining to people what the judicial role is. Of course, to explain something clearly you have to, to some extent, oversimplify it, and he admitted the times he was doing that.

He talked about the judge being the umpire, and somebody else basically writes the rules. The judge is the umpire. Believe me, that gives plenty of discretion and authority to the judge to develop the law in one direction or another but to develop it within the constraints of an objective rule of law.

Judge Roberts said about this:

If the people who framed our Constitution were jealous of their freedom and liberty, they would not have sat around and said, "Let's take all the hard issues and give them over to the judges." That would have been the farthest thing from their mind. Now judges have to decide hard questions when they come up in the context of a particular case. That is their obligation. But they have to decide those questions according to the rule of law, not their own social preferences, not their policy views, not their personal preferences, but according to the rule of law.

That leaves room for Supreme Court Justices, for the rule of law, to include

their views developed over time carefully with respect to colleagues and arguments from litigants about how particular provisions of the Constitution ought best to be interpreted in a range of cases so as to reflect the purposes of the document and the impulses of the Framers.

There is room there for that, but always according to the rule of law, not according to a desire to make the case or make the result be a particular thing, or to make Americans live the way the judge wants them to live, rather than the way they have chosen to live in the decisions they make about their own lives or the decisions they make through their representatives. I think Judge Roberts understands that. He understands that is a judicial role with which we can all live.

He clerked for Judge Henry Friendly. Another great court of appeals judge—he had an interesting name—was Learned Hand. If I had met his parents, I would have asked them why they called him Learned Hand, but they did. Judge Hand said one time, and he was referring to the same thing Judge Roberts was referring to about the rule of law: I would not choose to be governed by a bevy of platonic guardians even if I knew how to choose them, which I most assuredly do not.

The first right, the first birthright of every American, is to participate through the representative process in their own governance. The first and most basic right is the right to govern yourself through the processes set up in our Constitution. And it is not out of a desire to avoid difficult decisions but out of a respect for that right that Judge Roberts talked about the rule of law. He manifested in those hearings a confidence that I think we should all reflect on in the judgment and the decency of the American people. It is OK, whether your views about social policy are on the rightwing or whether they are on the leftwing, whether they are someplace in the middle, it is OK basically to leave the development of our culture and our society to the wisdom and the decency of the American people. The center will hold. The people will move us in an orderly and decent direction as they have for 200 years. We don't need to be ruled by platonic guardians or dictators, whether they are in the form of judges or anybody else. There is plenty of scope, in the Senate, on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and in the Supreme Court building as well, for the exercise of individual leadership and appropriate discretion to try to move the people in a direction that we think is appropriate, with their consent. But there is no reason to feel out of some fit of desperation or panic that courts or anybody else have to make the American people do something they have not chosen the orderly processes to do. That is what Judge Roberts meant when he was talking about the rule of law.

That is why I believe, because of that and also his professional qualifications,

he is going to do an outstanding job as Chief Justice of the United States, and that is why I think he will be confirmed by an overwhelming majority of this body.

I thank the Chair, and I yield back whatever remains of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong support for the nomination of Judge John G. Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States. This is a historic moment, Mr. President, as many of my colleagues have already noted. This moment marks only the 17th time in the history of our Republic that the U.S. Senate has considered a nominee to be Chief Justice.

As one of the Senate's newest Members, it is a great privilege for me to participate in this process. To have had only 16 individuals lead the judicial branch of government in our history illustrates the most important characteristic of the judicial branch, and that characteristic is lifetime tenure.

I believe the guiding question for each of us in determining a nominee's fitness for this post should be whether the person is dedicated to applying the Constitution to every case considered by the Court, and not adding to or changing the Constitution's text to suit his or her own personal policy preferences.

I was pleased to have met privately with Judge Roberts just yesterday. I came away from that meeting even more convinced that this man has the ability and temperament necessary to lead the Supreme Court. I believe Judge Roberts is dedicated to the rule of law and the principle of judicial restraint, and most importantly, will not substitute his own policy preferences for those of the elected representatives in the executive and legislative branches of our government.

The Supreme Court gets the last word on some of the most challenging and divisive issues of our day. Because Federal judges and justices have lifetime tenure, we must ensure that those who populate Federal bench are people of strong character and high intellect, with a passionate commitment to applying the law as it is written, rather than legislating from the bench.

Judges and justices must say what the law is, not what they believe it should be. That is the job of the Congress. That is what the authors of the Constitution intended.

I believe Judge Roberts' career embodies these principles. As Judge Roberts stated during his hearing, judges are like umpires, and umpires don't make the rules, they apply them. I do not believe Judge Roberts will engage in the judicial activism that we have witnessed on the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts in the past few decades.

Even in the recent past, we have witnessed several instances of judicial activism. Judicial activism manifests itself when justices detect “penumbras, formed by emanations” in the Constitution, as Justice Douglas did in the case of *Griswold v. Connecticut*—in other words, judges who rely on their personal views rather than the Constitution when deciding matters of great importance.

We have seen what damage the Supreme Court is able to do when it is composed of individuals who are not committed to judicial restraint. Instead of acting as umpires and applying the law, some on the Supreme Court and the Federal bench are pitching and batting.

The most recent example came in the case of *Kelo v. City of New London*, decided just this past June. As you know, Mr. President, the Constitution says the government cannot take private property for public use without just compensation. However, in the *Kelo* case, the Supreme Court emptied any meaning from the phrase “for public use” in the fifth amendment.

In *Kelo*, the Supreme Court held that a city government’s decision to take private homes for the purpose of economic development satisfies the “public use” requirement of the fifth amendment. This case makes private property vulnerable to being taken and transferred to another private owner, so long as the government’s purpose for the taking is deemed “economic development.”

While I understand that many of the principles reflected in the Constitution are written broadly, and sometimes can be subjected to conflicting interpretations, I think we can all agree that the Supreme Court cannot be adding or deleting text from the Constitution. Yet that is what happened in the *Kelo* case. The majority effectively deleted an inconvenient clause in the fifth amendment.

The Supreme Court is also engaging in a troubling pattern of relying upon international authorities to support its interpretations of the laws of the United States. In *Atkins v. Virginia*, the Court cited the disapproval of the “world community” as authority for its decision. In *Lawrence v. Texas*, the Court cited a decision by the European Court of Human Rights as authority for that decision. Most recently, in *Roper v. Simmons*, the Court cited the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child—a treaty never ratified by the United States—as authority for that decision.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution requires two-thirds of the Senate to ratify a treaty. Democratically elected Members of the Senate, accountable to the people, have refused to ratify the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Unfortunately the Supreme Court chose to ignore this fact and based their judgment in part on a treaty never ratified by the United States.

Clearly, some on the Supreme Court are substituting the policy preferences of democratically elected representatives with their own. This is judicial activism at its worst.

As we near the completion and expected confirmation of Judge Roberts, I want to take a moment and look ahead as the President will soon make another nomination to the Supreme Court. It is important that the nominee to replace Justice O’Connor share Judge Roberts’ commitment to judicial restraint and dedication to the rule of law. It is important because the Supreme Court will be considering several cases in the near future that may have far-reaching consequences.

The Supreme Court will probably consider the Pledge of Allegiance case that was recently decided in the Ninth Circuit at the district court level. In that case, the district court held that the words “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance violate the establishment clause of the first amendment. However, in the Fourth Circuit, the appellate court came to the opposite holding—that the Pledge of Allegiance did not violate the establishment clause. Where there are conflicting holdings in the lower courts, the Supreme Court must become the final authority on the matter, and it is important that Judge Roberts and individuals who share his approach are on the court to confront this issue.

During the next term, the Supreme Court will also consider a case about a State’s parental notification law and possibly a case about partial-birth abortion. Again, these are instances where the Supreme Court will have the last word on one of the most divisive moral issues of our time. It is critical that those who confront these cases are deferential to the elected branches of our government, exercise restraint, and follow the law.

After our confirmation vote tomorrow on Judge Roberts, the President will forward his nominee to fill the seat vacated by Justice O’Connor. It will then become our duty in the Senate to provide our advice and consent on that nomination. It is a responsibility that we should all take very seriously. The manner in which we handle that nomination will say a lot about the Senate as an institution.

I read in today’s edition of the *Washington Post* that several of our Democratic colleagues, as well as the Democratic National Committee chairman, are already threatening to filibuster the next nominee to the Supreme Court. It is shocking to me that they are threatening a filibuster of the next nominee before they even know who the nominee is going to be. They are even threatening to filibuster possible nominees who were just confirmed to the appellate courts and explicitly included in the Memorandum of Understanding that seven Democrats and seven Republicans signed onto last May.

That is wrong and the American people will see it for the blind partisanship

that it is. I would remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that they have sworn to uphold the Constitution through their representation in this body, not to thwart its intent or reshape its application to suit the nattering liberal elite and their special interest groups. I implore my Democratic colleagues not to blindly abuse the filibuster. These threats are symptomatic of the breakdown of the nomination process, and they must stop.

The process by which justices and judges are nominated and confined has degenerated to a point where ideological litmus tests are too often applied and nominees are torn apart by personal attacks.

The nomination process should not be brought down to the level of personal attacks on the nominee or fishing expeditions into the nominee’s political allegiances. I believe there is a lot of room for improvement in the process, and I hope to see such improvement as we consider the next nominee.

One ideological litmus test I am hearing about a lot these days is that the Supreme Court must somehow maintain its “balance.” Where in the Constitution does it say that a certain balance must be maintained on the Supreme Court? According to the Constitution, the President is entitled to nominate the individuals he desires to have on the courts, and we in the Senate must determine whether the nominee is fit and qualified. There should be no ideological litmus test for nominees. If a nominee is fit and qualified, he or she should be confirmed.

I believe Judge Roberts is eminently fit and qualified to serve as the next Chief Justice. I will proudly cast my vote for him, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Chair.

I, too, rise in strong support of the nomination of John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. I do that for two reasons, two equally important reasons. One is the strong qualification and background of Judge Roberts. But the second and perhaps just as important or even more important is the fact that this nomination and this confirmation process I believe has gotten us back as a Senate, as a country to the process that the Founders intended and the sort of values and the sort of qualifications, the sort of judgment by the Senate that the Founders intended.

We are finally remembering that it is the President’s prerogative to nominate qualified persons to fill judicial vacancies, and in the past the Senate

has accorded great deference to the President's selection. Justice Ginsburg was overwhelmingly confirmed 42 days after her nomination. Justice O'Connor was overwhelmingly confirmed 33 days after her nomination. So we are returning to that determination of the President's prerogative.

The White House is to be commended for engaging in unprecedented consultation with respect to this nominee. So we are also returning to a very robust and full and healthy consultation process. I understand that the Bush administration consulted with more than 70 Senators on the Roberts nomination, countless conversations and phone calls and meetings and now is a strong part of our tradition which we are certainly returning to.

Moreover, few would disagree that President Bush could not have nominated a more qualified person for this position. John Roberts has an impressive academic background, a distinguished career in Government service, private practice, and as a Federal judge.

So we are also returning to that fine tradition that actual qualifications matter. It is not all about ideology and political positions but qualifications, judicial temperament, those sorts of important considerations matter, first and foremost.

Certainly, Judge Roberts has those. He graduated *summa cum laude* from Harvard college, my alma mater. He also graduated from Harvard Law school, *magna cum laude*. I guess he couldn't get into Tulane Law School, as I did, but I congratulate him on his accomplishments at Harvard. After graduation, he law clerked for Judge Henry Friendly on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and then for William Rehnquist on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Roberts enjoyed a distinguished career as a public servant in many different positions during the Reagan administration and became a partner at a major and highly respected law firm in Washington, DC, where he acquired the reputation as one of the finest Supreme Court advocates in the country. In fact, he argued an impressive 39 cases before the Supreme Court. Of course, as we all know, Judge Roberts was appointed in 2002 by President Bush for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit—those sort of mainstream qualifications.

Academic, practice, smarts, judicial temperament—all are certainly very important. But I think the single most important factor which qualifies Judge Roberts for this esteemed position is his appropriate view of what it means to be a judge, his appropriate view of the limited role of the judiciary and what that means in our system of government.

He has said, frankly and refreshingly, in a straightforward way, that judges should not place ideology above thoughtful legal reasoning. He is not

the sort who will legislate from the bench. His judicial philosophy is based on the rule of law and on respect for the Constitution.

Let's think about what he said in his own words. This is what he said on September 12 at his confirmation hearing:

[A] certain humility should characterize the judicial role. Judges and justices are servants of the law, not the other way around. Judges are like umpires. Umpires don't make the rules, they apply them. The role of an umpire and a judge is critical. They make sure everybody plays by the rules but it is a limited role. Nobody ever went to the ball game to see the umpire."

He also said on the same occasion:

... I come before the committee with no agenda, I have no platform. Judges are not politicians who can promise to do certain things in exchange for votes. I have no agenda. But I do have a commitment. If I am confirmed, I will confront every case with an open mind. I will fully and fairly analyze the legal arguments that are presented. I will be open to the considered views of my colleagues on the bench, and I will decide every case based on the record, according to the rule of law, without fear or favor, to the best of my ability, and I will remember it is my job to call balls and strikes, and not to pitch or bat.

That, first and foremost, is the tradition we are getting back to with this confirmation. I sincerely hope that it is a tradition in which we remain grounded. Let's remember again the lessons of this nomination and this confirmation. Let's remember that it is the President's prerogative to nominate qualified persons to the bench. Let's remember that the Senate does have an important consultative role and let's all encourage the President to perform that consultation in a full and robust fashion, as he did with Judge Roberts. Let's remember that qualifications—smarts, academic credentials, practice history—are very important when you are talking about a judicial nominee. And let's all remember, first and foremost, that judges are umpires, they are not the players in the baseball game. That is the crucial distinction that I think we have lost over the past several decades and that we are finally trying to pull back to.

It is very important for us as a body to remember that lesson of this nomination of this confirmation as we move on. As we move on, I do think that is the most important open question. As the previous speaker mentioned, already certain Democrats in this body are threatening a filibuster without having the foggiest notion who the next nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court may be. Already they are threatening a filibuster of circuit court nominees who have basically been agreed to in terms of no filibuster in the Senate.

That would move us dramatically in the opposite direction from the one I have spoken about. That would turn the clock back. That would move us 180 degrees and point us again in that wrong direction.

I will be proud to join with other Members of this body tomorrow for this historic confirmation vote. I will

be proud to vote yes for Judge John Roberts to be the next Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Just as proudly, just as fervently, I will argue and fight to make sure that where we are today is where we remain in terms of future nominations and future confirmations; that we all remember that we are talking about an umpire to enforce the rules of the game, not a player—not a batter we like or a fielder we prefer but the umpire to enforce the rules as written.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of John Roberts to be the next Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Confirmation of a Supreme Court Justice, particularly the Chief Justice, is one of the most important duties we have in the Senate. I hope we can put politics and partisanship aside and swiftly confirm him.

Earlier this year, we found ourselves in an unprecedented position. The Democratic minority decided to use Senate rules to block judicial nominees. The minority tried to take away the power of nomination that the Constitution gives the President. But President Bush was solidly reelected last fall, and during the campaign he stressed the type of judges he would nominate—those who respect the law and the Constitution and who will not legislate from the bench.

The American people knew what they were getting when they reelected President Bush. President Bush kept his word. His judicial nominees have been highly qualified and worthy of confirmation. The minority's obstructionism ended earlier this year, or at least for now. Many on the left want to see a filibuster against John Roberts, but I have no doubt that John Roberts will be confirmed soon. Our job is to determine the qualifications of the nominees. Then we should vote to approve or oppose them. Anything else is to disregard the oath we took when we joined the Senate.

Our job is not to oppose nominees because we think their views are different from ours. We should not oppose nominees to keep our political base happy. Regardless of all the excuses, nominees deserve a vote. That is it.

John Roberts is extremely qualified to serve on the Supreme Court, and he is as qualified to be Chief Justice. He is, no doubt, one of the most qualified nominees to come before the Senate since I have been here. He is a brilliant legal scholar, an accomplished attorney, and a fine judge. I will strongly support him.

I do not need to spend too much time restating John Roberts' qualifications. They have been stated. He graduated with honors from Harvard college and its law school. He clerked in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals and for Chief Justice Rehnquist when he was an Associate Supreme Court Justice.

John Roberts also worked for the Attorney General, the White House counsel and Solicitor General in previous administrations.

In private practice, he was one of the best appellate and Supreme Court litigator's in the Nation. He argued an unprecedented 39 cases before the Supreme Court. Now he is a judge on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, where he has been since we confirmed him unanimously in 2003.

His resume is not what convinces me that he will be a fine Chief Justice. What is clear is that John Roberts respects the law and Constitution and will be faithful to the proper role of a judge. In his confirmation hearings, Judge Roberts used an example to explain the proper role of a judge. It has been stated before. He said a judge is like an umpire, not a player or a coach. And similar to an umpire, a judge applies the rules to the situation at hand. An umpire doesn't rewrite the rules or enforce what he thinks the rules ought to be.

I know a little bit about umpires. I have dealt with them, and all types of them, for years. Some are liberal and some conservative with the strike zone. Some were unpredictable and made the strike zone up as the game went along. The worst umpires decided the outcome of the game by playing favorites or enforcing their own version of the rules. The best umpires applied the rules as written in the rule book and let the rules and the players dictate the outcome of the game.

As Judge Roberts said, that is how judges should act. The law, and not judges, should decide the outcome of the cases. The rules of the game, the writing of the laws is done by Congress. The President implements and enforces the laws, the judiciary settles disputes by applying laws and the Constitution. Judges are not lawmakers as umpires are not players. If umpires want to be players, that umpire should quit and join a team. If a judge wants to write laws, he should run for Congress.

We have seen courts try to replace Congress and legislatures. Social issues have been taken out of the political process and decided by unelected judges. The voice of the people has too often been ignored. Activism of a few judges threatens our judicial system.

If judges keep exercising powers not granted to them, the public and its servants may tune out the courts and ignore them altogether. That would be bad and we would all suffer. I think Judge Roberts sees that danger. As Chief Justice, he will protect the Constitution and reputation of the courts.

At his confirmation hearing, Judge Roberts recognized the damage of an activist judiciary. Their activism undermines the authority and respect needed to overturn truly unconstitutional actions. Courts must not be activists and settle public policy disputes. Judge Roberts also sees that danger, and I trust he will work hard to keep the Court within its boundaries

and implore judges to exercise restraint in decisionmaking. A key part of that restraint is to not wade into public policy disputes. I imagine it is tempting for judges to impose their personal views when making decisions.

But I believe Judge Roberts will exercise restraint and encourage the Federal court system to do the same.

Many of my colleagues are frustrated over Judge Roberts not revealing his views on public policy.

As Chief Justice, Judge Roberts is not going to act like a Senator. He will not let his personal views influence his decision and rulings.

The complaints of some of my colleagues led me to believe that they did not understand the role our Founding Fathers intended for the courts. Congress is the policymaking branch of government. The President and the administration enforce the laws. And the courts act as neutral decisionmakers when disputes arise.

But my colleagues know this.

And so I fear they see the courts as a political arm to implement their liberal policy agenda.

To them—the Supreme Court is a super legislature. But that is not what our Framers envisioned. And that is not how Judge Roberts will use his position as Chief Justice.

The left turns to the courts to impose their agenda because they cannot advance it through elections. They cannot pass their laws through Congress or legislatures. They cannot even get elected by running on their liberal policies. So they must use the courts to impose their agenda.

What is that agenda?

Unlimited abortion on-demand; banning schoolchildren from saying the Pledge of Allegiance; banishing the Ten Commandments from public places; rewriting the definition of marriage; and banning arms for self-defense.

That agenda does not sell with America or in Congress.

So the last great hope for liberals is the judicial bench. And that is why they oppose nominees who do not agree to their liberal activist agenda.

The only thing stopping the rewriting of our Constitution are judges that will support the rule of law.

John Roberts is one such judge. He will not write new laws from the bench.

As Chief Justice, he will set an example for the court system to follow the same principles.

Many Senators have expressed frustration at not knowing Judge Roberts' political views. I do not know his views either.

I have not asked him. And I will not ask him.

They do not matter. I trust him not to let his political beliefs influence his decisions.

During his hearing, Judge Roberts rightly declined to answer how he would rule in specific cases.

The current Supreme Court Justices also declined to answer similar questions.

Answering those kind of questions would corrupt and politicize the process.

Judicial nominees would turn into politicians campaigning for office to get confirmed—pledging to vote a certain way in order to gain votes.

They would also have to make promises to the President in order to get nominated.

Judges must be selected based on their qualifications.

I have not asked Judge Roberts about his personal political views. I have not asked him about his legal views. I do not need to know how he will rule in a certain particular case—because I know his approach to the law—and that is all I need to know.

John Roberts will lead by example and earn the respect of the other Justices and the American public. He will also be joined on the Court by another new Justice.

I trust President Bush will choose another highly qualified nominee to replace retiring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

If the new nominee is in a similar mold and has the same respect for the rule of law, then I will be glad to support the next nominee.

I have seen comments from some of my Democrat colleagues that they will filibuster certain nominees. That is most unfortunate. And it could bring us back to the point where we were earlier this year.

I hope and pray the minority does not do this.

But make no mistake about it. We will ensure that the next nominee receives fair treatment in the Senate and gets a vote.

I thank President Bush for keeping his promise to nominate outstanding individuals to our courts.

I thank Chairman SPECTER for ushering this nomination swiftly through his Judiciary Committee.

And I thank John Roberts for his service to our country.

I vow very strongly to vote for him when his vote comes up tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to express my agreement with the Senator from Kentucky. He stated the case very clearly for the proper role for a judge. I know he faced many an umpire in his Hall of Fame baseball career. But he knows when they make the call, they are stuck with it, and he has every right to expect that that umpire is going to make the call not based on whether they favor one team or another or one side or another but what the rules of the game are.

I think that metaphor Judge Roberts utilized as he talked about the role of a judge is an apt one.

I saw Senator BURNS here. He used to be a football referee. I wanted to ask him: Senator BURNS, if you thought that the holding call was a little bit inadvertent and it wasn't too a bad a holding call but the penalty called for

15 yards, should the referee be free to impose 10 yards because they think that might be more fair? No. Of course, not. Those are the basic principles of rules.

I am pleased that we have a nominee who I think understands it.

Activism is a concern of the American people. It is something that should concern all of us because it represents a movement by unelected, lifetime-appointed judges to impose policy decisions and values on the American people. If it is required by the Constitution, that is their job. If it is not required and not a part of the Constitution, they should not be engaged in those kinds of issues.

The high point I think of activism was when two Supreme Court Justices in every death penalty case declared that they dissented and they would oppose all death penalty cases in the United States because they believed the Constitutional prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment prohibited the death penalty. That might sound plausible. But the Constitution itself has half a dozen references to capital crimes. That means crimes for which you may take somebody's life. It has references to not being able to take life without due process of law. Obviously, you could take life with due process of law. And when the Constitution was written, every single State, every single Colony, members of the Confederacy, had the death penalty, and they did when the Constitution was written.

So it is obviously the judges' decision that they didn't like the death penalty. They declared it was unenlightened public policy involving a standard of decency and all of that, and that justified their opinion. But that wasn't so, was it? Because State after State has maintained the death penalty. Many have enacted death penalties after they eliminated the death penalty.

It is not what the American people rejected, in fact, and would never have been rejected by the members of the legislatures of all the States.

They tried to say the Constitution prohibited any State from having a death penalty.

That is an extreme abrogation of power, and it is something we should be concerned about.

What did Judge Roberts say?

I see my chairman, Senator SPECTER, who has done such a great job in moving this nomination forward. I want to speak long and will yield the floor to him. I had my opportunity to make a few remarks earlier.

But I think it is important for us to listen to the eloquent, beautifully repeated—I am going to touch on a few of his statements—but the repeated statements of Judge Roberts in different ways that affirm so clearly that he knows what the role of the judge is in the American legal system. I picked out a few.

It is that rule of law that protects the rights and liberties of all Americans. It is the envy of the world, because without the rule of law any rights are meaningless.

Mr. Chairman, I come before this committee with no agenda. I have no platform.

Neither the President nor Members of our side of the aisle are asking any nominee to impose our political agenda on this country. I would never do that. That is not the role of a judge. But neither do I think the judge ought to be opposing any agenda. And I certainly am offended when they oppose the agenda which I don't agree with, which I think is the province of the legislative branches. Judge Roberts understands that.

Then he goes on:

That's a paraphrase, but the phrase, calmly poise the scales of Justice if, if anything, the motto of the court on which I now sit. That would be the guiding principle for me whether I am back on that court or a different one, because some factors may be different, the issues may be different, the demands may be different, but the Bill of Rights remains the same. And the obligation of a court to protect those basis liberties in times of peace and in times of war, in times of stress and in times of calm, that doesn't change.

What a beautiful statement.

Another:

Like most people, I resist the labels. I have told people when pressed that I prefer to be known as a modest judge, and to me that means some of the things that you talked about in those other labels. It means an appreciation that the role of the judge is limited, that a judge is to decide the cases before them, they're not to legislate, they're not to execute the laws.

Another:

I don't think the courts should have a dominant role in society and stressing society's problems. It is their job to say what the law is.

Isn't that correct?

But the Court has to appreciate that the reason they have that authority is because they're interpreting the law, they're not making policy, and to the extent they go beyond their confined limits and make policy or execute the law, they lose their legitimacy, and I think that calls into question the authority they will need when it's necessary to act in the face of unconstitutional action.

That is a brilliant statement.

If a court consistently abuses its power, does not remain faithful to the Constitution, at some point it may have to take a very unpopular stand to truly and rightfully defend the Constitution against congressional Presidential overreaching.

Will they have the credibility to do so? Not so, perhaps, if they have squandered it by improper legislation for many years that has undermined public confidence in the Court.

That is exactly what he is saying—a beautiful statement.

If you believe in our Constitution, if you believe in the laws to protect our liberties and that laid the foundations for our prosperity, one must believe that we have to enforce the Constitution, even if you might not agree with some part of it.

He was asked, "Are you an originalist? Are you a strict constructionist? What label do you put on yourself, Judge?"

He said this:

I do not have an overarching judicial philosophy that I bring to every case, and I think that's true. I tend to look at the cases from the bottom up rather than the top down. And like I think all good judges focus a lot on the FACTS. We talk about the law, and that's a great interest for all of us, but I think most cases turn on the facts, so you do have to know those, you have to know the record.

In other words, we were asking him to blithely make his views known on how he would rule on this case or that case. By the time it gets to the Supreme Court of the United States there has been a full trial and maybe hundreds, maybe thousands of pages of transcript and records. There are facts that underlie the dispute, and it is only after the facts are asserted that a judge needs to be making a decision about the outcome of a case.

Judges apply the facts to the legal requirements of the situation, and only then make a decision. He refused to make opinions on cases that may come before him. Of course, he should not make opinions on that. He has not studied the record, the transcript, talked with the other judges, read the briefs, or heard the oral arguments of counsel. He should not be up there making opinions on the cases. That is so obvious. He was pushed, pushed, and pushed to do that and criticized for not doing so. That is the rule of the law: Do not make a decision until you know the facts and the law.

I will say this: We have had a tutorial on the rule of law under the American system. We have had a classroom exercise beyond anything any Member could ask for on the role of a judge in the American system. It was a beautiful thing. I am pleased to see many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have seen fit now to announce they intend to support Judge Roberts. That is the right thing. I am confident, also, the President will submit another nominee, just like he promised, who will be consistent with the same philosophy of Judge Roberts—one who does not seek to impose any political agenda, liberal or conservative, on the American people, but will simply consider the facts, consider the arguments of counsel, and decide the case before them.

That is what we have a right to ask and to insist on to preserve the rule of law in this country, which, more than any other country in the world, reveres and respects and venerates law and order.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator from Alabama yields the floor, I thank and compliment him for his comments and for his work on the Judiciary Committee. He has been steadfast in his participation in all matters but especially with the nomination proceedings as to Judge Roberts. It ought to be noted for the record.

Mr. President, Senator DOMENICI was here seeking an opportunity to speak. I ask unanimous consent he be sequenced following my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to comment on a story which is in the Washington Post today captioned "Filibuster Showdown Looms in the Senate: Democrats Prepare For Next Court Pick."

I suggest it is in the national interest that there be a lowering of the decibel level of the partisan rhetoric. There is no doubt that the process for the nomination, hearings, and confirmation of a Supreme Court nominee is part of the political process. I further suggest partisanship has its limits.

The partisanship which is demonstrated in this report by the Washington Post today seems to me to be flagrant, extreme partisanship, flagrantly excessive partisanship, really out of bounds and out of the mainstream.

The core objection raised by certain Democratic political activists as outlined in the Washington Post story is frustration among party activists who think their elected leaders did not put up a serious fight against Judge Roberts.

I was present as chairman of the committee during the entire proceeding. I can state it was a very vigorous fight. It is not necessary to have ARLEN SPECTER's characterization of it. The record speaks for itself. We had experienced Senators on the Democrat side of the aisle who questioned Judge Roberts very closely and who came to the conclusion they would vote no, which they did in the committee proceedings. Senator KENNEDY, who can doubt his tenacity? Senator BIDEN, who can doubt his sincerity? And Senator FEINSTEIN questioned eloquently in many directions. Senator SCHUMER was on top of all of the issues not only in three rounds of questioning which we had, 30 minutes and then 20 minutes and then 30 more minutes, but in the submission of written questions. And Senator DURBIN, the assistant minority leader, spoke and all voted against Judge Roberts because that was their conclusion.

But who can say they didn't put up a strong and tough fight? That is an insult to those dedicated Senators tending to their business to say they did not put up a professional fight.

There are at this moment some 18 announced or reported Senators on the Democrat side who are going to vote in favor of the Roberts nomination: Senator BAUCUS, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator BYRD, Senator CONRAD, Senator DODD, Senator DORGAN, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator JOHNSON, Senator KOHL, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator LEAHY, Senator LEVIN, Senator LIBBERMAN, Senator NELSON of Nebraska, Senator NELSON of Florida, Senator PRYOR, Senator SALAZAR, and Senator WYDEN.

Among those 18 Senators are some veterans of the Senate whose credentials cannot be challenged as progressive, as liberal, as forward-thinking Senators.

I will quote from just a few of the comments which they have made. Senator LEAHY was the first among the Democrats to speak out in favor of the nomination of Judge Roberts to be Chief Justice. As the ranking member, I sat next to him during the entire proceeding. I can attest firsthand the conscientious way Senator LEAHY approached this nomination. It was not a matter of our discussing the merits. It was not a matter of my trying to persuade him.

I have served with Senator LEAHY for 25 years, and many years before that, back in 1969 when I was the host at the National District Attorney's Association Convention in Philadelphia, I was Philadelphia's D.A., and Pat Leahy, a young prosecutor from Burlington, VT, was the prosecuting attorney in his jurisdiction. I could see him struggle with the nomination as a matter of conscience. He came to the conclusion that was where his conscience led.

I identified with his courageous move in the committee. It is not easy to go against the party line, and Senator LEAHY was prepared to do that.

His statement was a very thoughtful statement, as Senator LEAHY is accustomed to be: He commented extensively on Judge Roberts' reliance on the Raich decision, moving away from Lopez and Morris on the commerce clause. He comments extensively on the precedence of Roe and Planned Parenthood v. Casey and forcefully on a number of occasions regarding the recognition to the right to privacy embodied in Griswold v. Connecticut.

Senator LEAHY commented about the assurances which he accepted from Judge Roberts about taking the mold of Justice Jackson, moving away from being a partisan in the administration as Attorney General to being an impartial judge.

There is much more, but the record of what Senator LEAHY has said speaks for itself.

In addition to Senator LEAHY, there are other very well established Senators on the other side of the aisle, impeccable standing in the liberal community. Senator LEVIN spoke in favor of Judge Roberts; Senator DODD spoke in favor of Judge Roberts for Chief Justice; Senator FEINGOLD in the committee; Senator LIBBERMAN. I have already enumerated the Senators.

So when there are some so-called Democrat political activists who speak up and are critical, as they were of Senator LEAHY after he made the opening declaration, first of the Democrats to speak—we are all subject to comment and we are all subject to criticism, but I was taken a little aback by the criticism which came to Senator LEAHY after he made his declaration. I have been the object of such substantial criticism myself, so I know what it

was like. But I think it goes a little too far when the so-called political activists are raising these objections out of purely partisan motivations. One activist was quoted in this story as saying that Democrats must vote against Judge Roberts, otherwise "we will not win an election."

The political process, I submit, goes only so far. And as foreign policy debate stops at the water's edge, at least it used to traditionally, I think that extreme partisanship stops at the consideration of a nominee for the Supreme Court of the United States. That is a line at which party loyalties ought to end and there ought to be independence. That is the confluence of the three branches of Government where, as we all know under our Constitution, the President nominates, where the Senate conducts proceedings and confirms or rejects, and where the nominee, if confirmed, if approved, then takes a seat on the Supreme Court. That is a line in the administration of justice in the United States where partisanship, rank, extreme partisanship ought to end.

The so-called political activists are blunt in what they had to say. Their concern is "restoring enthusiasm among the rank and file on the left."

I suggest there is a higher calling on selecting a nominee for the Supreme Court, and especially for a Chief Justice, which transcends appeal to extremes at one end of the political spectrum or the other.

This kind of comment, I believe, is only going to inspire corollary comment from the other end of the political spectrum. We simply do not need it. I sensed, and have commented publicly on, a lot of frustration bubbling just below the surface in the Roberts nomination hearings. I am concerned about the next nomination. We are looking at a replacement for Justice O'Connor, who was a swing vote. I have stated both publicly and privately my hope we will find someone in the mold of Judge Roberts.

The statements which were made by Senator LEAHY, by Senator LEVIN, by Senator DODD, by Senator FEINGOLD, and others all focused on the approach of Judge Roberts to modesty and stability. And it was more than the words he uttered, it was the way he conducted himself. It was the way he spoke about the cases when he answered the questions and when he did not answer questions. I spoke at length earlier, on Monday, about questions which I thought he should have answered but he did not answer. But that is the nominee's prerogative. And then the Senator's prerogative is to make a decision on how the Senator is going to vote. But when you talk about a filibuster, this body was at the risk of a virtual civil war, with the Democrats filibustering and with Republicans threatening to exercise the constitutional or nuclear option. I took the floor earlier this year on several occasions to urge an independent stand. I

heard so many Democrats say they did not like the idea of a filibuster and I heard so many Republicans say they did not like the idea of the constitutional or nuclear option, but Democrats felt constrained to the filibuster and Republicans felt constrained to the nuclear or constitutional option.

I urged my colleagues to take an independent stand, that when you talked about the long-range composition and the long-range approach of the institution of the Senate, it was more important than the passions of the moment. I went into some detail and quoted how the Senate saved judicial independence in the impeachment proceedings of Supreme Court Justice Chase in 1805 and 1806 and how the U.S. Senate saved the independence of Presidential prerogatives in the impeachment proceeding of President Andrew Johnson. The Congress had passed a law saying there had to be consent by the Senate for the President to remove a Cabinet officer. Secretary of War Stanton bolted himself in his office. He would not leave. Because President Johnson would not tolerate that kind of usurpation of Presidential power, he was impeached. In this Chamber, he was saved. The Senate saved him.

When you talk about the institutions of the Senate, we do not need outsiders telling us when to filibuster. We do not need outsiders and political activists on either side telling us when to filibuster or when to exercise the constitutional option. We were elected. They were not.

When you have men of the stature of Senator LEAHY and Senator DODD and Senator LIEBERMAN taking a position, those positions ought to be respected. When you have hard-fighting Senators such as KENNEDY and BIDEN and SCHUMER fighting a nomination and voting no, their positions ought to be respected.

So I hope as to this headline in the Post about "Filibuster Showdown Looms in Senate," it is the last time we will hear the word "filibuster" and that we will have a nominee who will command respect, that we will have an orderly, dignified proceeding in the Judiciary Committee in another round of hearings, and that we will acquit ourselves with distinction.

At a time when the Congress is under a very heavy fire on all sides for so many items—or the response to the hurricane and for the highway bill and for spending and for a lack of offsets—I have heard many comments that the Senate has acquitted itself very well throughout the entire confirmation process, not just what was done in the Judiciary Committee, but what has been done on the floor of the Senate, and what will be concluded tomorrow when the full body votes.

So we do not need outsiders telling us how to conduct our business. They can make their suggestions. They have freedom of speech. But it ought to be within bounds. This sort of extreme, excessive partisanship has no place in

the selection of the next Supreme Court Justice.

In the absence of any Senator seeking recognition, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is it proper now to speak on the nomination of Judge Roberts?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is in order.

The President pro tempore is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, having lived and studied alongside one of the greatest legal minds of my generation, I believe Judge Roberts' capability and knowledge of the law is superior to any of his generation. When I was at Harvard Law School, my roommate was H. Reed Baldwin. He had abilities quite similar to those of John Roberts. He was the top of our class, No. 1, and on the Harvard Law Review. He was what I call a Renaissance man. He could handle almost any subject. Unfortunately, he suffered an untimely death; otherwise, he might have once been in the same place John Roberts is today.

During the Judiciary Committee's hearings, Juneau Mayor Bruce Botelho testified in support of Judge Roberts' nomination. Bruce, whom I know well, was Attorney General for the State of Alaska from 1994 through 2002. He employed John Roberts to represent our State before the Supreme Court on a wide range of issues, including the Venetie case involving Indian country claims and cases related to submerged lands issues, natural resource matters, and the Alaska Statehood Act. As a matter of fact, I met with Judge Roberts then and have met with him since. He has a brilliant legal mind.

I am not alone in that opinion. Judge Roberts has been to our State many times, and he has won the respect of Alaskans who hold a wide range of political beliefs and opinions.

Judge Roberts also won the respect of the bar association of the District of Columbia, of which I am a member. In 2002, when Judge Roberts was nominated to serve as a Federal court of appeals judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, more than 150 Members of the DC bar sent a letter to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate supporting his nomination. I know many of the bar members who signed this letter. They are a distinguished and bipartisan group of lawyers, law professors, and public servants. I think they said it best:

John Roberts represents the best of the bar.

I agree with their opinion and the opinion of many Alaskans who have

worked with him. I shall vote to confirm Judge Roberts as the 17th Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. I urge all of my colleagues in the Senate to do the same.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter I mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 18, 2002.

Re Judicial Nomination of John G. Roberts, Jr. to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Hon. TOM DASCHLE,
Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Hon. TRENT LOTT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS DASCHLE, HATCH, LEAHY, AND LOTT: The undersigned are all members of the Bar of the District of Columbia and are writing in support of the nomination of John G. Roberts, Jr., to serve as a federal court of appeals judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Although, as individuals, we reflect a wide spectrum of political party affiliation and ideology, we are united in our belief that John Roberts will be an outstanding federal court of appeals judge and should be confirmed by the United States Senate. He is one of the very best and most highly respected appellate lawyers in the nation, with a deserved reputation as a brilliant writer and oral advocate. He is also a wonderful professional colleague both because of his enormous skills and because of his unquestioned integrity and fair-mindedness. In short, John Roberts represents the best of the bar and, we have no doubt, would be a superb federal court of appeals judge.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donald B. Ayer, Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue; Louis R. Cohen, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Lloyd N. Cutler, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; C. Boyden Gray, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Maureen Mahoney, Latham & Watkins; Carter Phillips, Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood; E. Barrett Prettyman, Jr., Hogan & Hartson; George J. Terwilliger III, White and Case; E. Edward Bruce, Covington & Burling; William Coleman, O'Melveny & Myers; Kenneth Geller, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw; Mark Levy, Howrey, Simon, Arnold & White; John E. Nolan, Steptoe & Johnson; John H. Pickering, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Allen R. Snyder, Hogan & Hartson; Seth Waxman, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Jeanne S. Archibald, Hogan & Hartson; Jeannette L. Austin, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw; James C. Bailey, Steptoe & Johnson; Stewart Baker, Steptoe & Johnson.

James T. Banks, Hogan & Hartson; Amy Coney Barrett, Notre Dame Law School; Michael J. Barta, Baker, Botts; Kenneth C. Bass, III, Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox; Richard K. A. Becker, Hogan & Hartson; Joseph C. Bell, Hogan & Hartson; Brigida Benitez, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Douglas L. Beresford, Hogan & Hartson; Edward Berlin, Swidler, Berlin, Shreff, Friedman; Elizabeth Beske (Member, Bar of the State of California); Patricia A. Brannan, Hogan & Hartson; Don O. Burley, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner; Raymond S. Calamaro, Hogan & Hartson; George U. Carneal, Hogan & Hartson; Michael Carvin, Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue;

Richard W. Cass, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Geogory A. Castanias, Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue; Ty Cobb, Hogan & Hartson; Charles G. Cole, Steptoe & Johnson; Robert Corn-Revere, Hogan & Hartson.

Charles Davidow, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Grant Dixon, Kirkland & Ellis; Edward C. DuMont, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Donald R. Dunner, Finnegan Henderson Farabow Garrett & Dunner; Thomas J. Eastment, Baker Botts; Claude S. Eley, Hogan & Hartson; E. Tazewell Ellett, Hogan & Hartson; Roy T. Englert, Jr., Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck & Untereiner; Mark L. Evans, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans; Frank Fahrenkopf, Hogan & Hartson; Michele C. Farquhar, Hogan & Hartson; H. Bartow Farr, Farr & Taranto; Jonathan J. Frankel, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Johnathan S. Franklin, Hogan & Hartson; David Frederick, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans; Richard W. Garnett, Notre Dame Law School; H.P. Goldfield, Vice Chairman, Stonebridge International; Tom Goldstein, Goldstein & Howe; Griffith L. Green, Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood; Jonathan Hacker, O'Melveny & Myers.

Martin J. Hahn, Hogan & Hartson; Joseph M. Hassett, Hogan & Hartson; Kenneth J. Hautman, Hogan & Hartson; David J. Hensler, Hogan & Hartson; Patrick F. Hofer, Hogan & Hartson; William Michael House, Hogan & Hartson; Janet Holt, Hogan & Hartson; Robert Hoyt, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; A. Stephen Hut, Jr., Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Lester S. Hyman, Swidler & Berlin; Sten A. Jensen, Hogan & Hartson; Erika Z. Jones, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw; Jay T. Jorgensen, Sidley Austin Brown & Wood; John C. Keeney, Jr., Hogan & Hartson; Michael K. Kellogg, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans; Nevin J. Kelly, Hogan & Hartson; J. Hovey Kemp, Hogan & Hartson; David A. Kikel, Hogan & Hartson; R. Scott Kilgore, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Michael L. Kidney, Hogan & Hartson; Duncan S. Klinedinst, Hogan & Hartson; Robert Klonoff, Jones, Day Reavis & Pogue.

Jody Manier Kris, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Chris Landau, Kirkland & Ellis; Philip C. Larson, Hogan & Hartson; Richard J. Lazarus, Georgetown University Law Center; Thomas B. Leary, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission; Darryl S. Lew, White & Case; Lewis E. Leibowitz, Hogan & Hartson; Kevin J. Lipson, Hogan & Hartson; Robert A. Long, Covington & Burling; C. Kevin Marshall, Sidley Austin Brown & Wood; Stephanie A. Martz, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw; Warren Maruyama, Hogan & Hartson; George W. Mayo, Jr., Hogan & Hartson; Mark E. Maze, Hogan & Hartson; Mark S. McConnell, Hogan & Hartson; Janet L. McDavid, Hogan & Hartson; Thomas L. McGovern III, Hogan & Hartson; A. Douglas Melamed, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Martin Michaelson, Hogan & Hartson; Evan Miller, Hogan & Hartson.

George W. Miller, Hogan & Hartson; William L. Monts III, Hogan & Hartson; Stanley J. Brown, Hogan & Hartson; Jeff Munk, Hogan & Hartson; Glen D. Nager, Jones Day Reavis & Pogue; William L. Neff, Hogan & Hartson; J. Patrick Nevins, Hogan & Hartson; David Newmann, Hogan & Hartson; Karol Lyn Newman, Hogan & Hartson; Keith A.

Noreika, Covington & Burling; William D. Nussbaum, Hogan & Hartson; Bob Glen Odle, Hogan & Hartson; Jeffrey Pariser, Hogan & Hartson; Bruce Parnly, Hogan & Hartson; George T. Patton, Jr., Bose, McKinney & Evans; Robert B. Pender, Hogan & Hartson; John Edward Porter, Hogan and Hartson (former Member of Congress); Philip D. Porter, Hogan & Hartson; Patrick M. Raher, Hogan & Hartson; Laurence Robbins, Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck & Untereiner; Peter A. Rohrbach, Hogan & Hartson; James J. Rosenhauer, Hogan & Hartson.

Richard T. Rossier, McLeod, Watkinson & Miller; Charles Rothfeld, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw; David J. Saylor, Hogan & Hartson; Patrick J. Schiltz, Associate Dean and St. Thomas More Chair in Law, University of St. Thomas School of Law; Jay Alan Sekulow, Chief Counsel, American Center for Law & Justice; Kannon K. Shanmugam, Kirkland & Ellis; Jeffrey K. Shapiro, Hogan & Hartson; Richard S. Silverman, Hogan & Hartson; Samuel M. Sipe, Jr., Steptoe & Johnson; Luke Sobota, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Peter Spivak, Hogan & Hartson; Jolanta Sterbenz, Hogan & Hartson; Kara F. Stoll, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner; Silviya A. Strikis, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd & Evans; Clifford D. Stromberg, Hogan & Hartson.

Mary Anne Sullivan, Hogan & Hartson; Richard G. Taranto, Farr & Taranto; John Thorne, Deputy General Counsel, Verizon Communications Inc. & Lecturer, Columbia Law School; Helen Trilling, Hogan & Hartson; Rebecca K. Troth, Washington College of Law, American University; Eric Von Salzen, Hogan & Hartson; Christine Varney, Hogan & Hartson; Ann Morgan Vickery, Hogan & Hartson; Donald B. Verrilli, Jr., Jenner & Block; J. Warren Gorrell, Jr., Chairman, Hogan & Hartson; John B. Watkins, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering; Robert N. Weiner, Arnold & Porter; Robert A. Welp, Hogan & Hartson; Douglas P. Wheeler, Duke University School of Law; Christopher J. Wright, Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis; Clayton Yeutner, Hogan & Hartson (former Secretary of Agriculture); Paul J. Zidlicky, Sidley Austin Brown & Wood.

Mr. STEVENS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is it appropriate now for the Senator from New Mexico to speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is appropriate.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is there a time limit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is none.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, it is, indeed, a privilege to come to the Senate Chamber to speak on behalf of such a distinguished nominee for Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. I have a unique perspective on Judge Roberts because I practiced law for 16 years before I came to the Senate, during which time I got to meet and try cases, and read opinions by many judges. I have also been here for 33 years, during which time I have had the luxury and privilege of hearing

from, reading transcripts of, and voting for 10 Supreme Court nominees. So everyone sitting on the Supreme Court now I have had the luxury of considering through the confirmation process, which means I have heard what each of those eight justices said, and I have seen what qualifications they came before the Senate with.

Based upon my previous experiences, it is almost as if Judge Roberts were destined to be a Supreme Court Justice. As I have listened to him, read what he has written, reviewed his background, and watched his conduct before the Judiciary Committee, it has become clear to me that he exemplifies many great qualities. When I look at him in comparison with nominees of the past, considering those men and women that I have previously voted for, it has become clear to me that he was born to serve his nation on our highest court.

Frankly, in all deference to the judges I have voted for heretofore, I have never been more confident that the President picked the right person for the right job at the right time as I am today.

If there is a perfect judge that can be visualized based upon all of the judges I have seen, listened to, read about, and voted for, this man seems to me to be extremely close to such a picture. He will be a judge for whom I will be extremely proud to have voted for.

Many people have described the message I am trying to convey about Judge Roberts in different ways, and there have been some excellent analyses of his qualifications. The largest newspaper in my home state of New Mexico wrote: "In addition to his encyclopedic fluency in constitutional law and the flesh and blood history behind it, Roberts exhibited a fine quality for a Chief Justice: collegiality. Justices, like Senators, disagree. Roberts showed he can disagree without disrespect, leaving open the door to work toward consensus. If Democrats cannot accept Roberts, is there any suitable Republican nominee?"

I appreciate those words from the Albuquerque Journal, and I agree with the question they raise. Democrats who want a Democratic nominee who fits their mold and agrees with their positions will have to wait until there is another Democratic President for such a nominee to come before the Senate. That is the way it has always been, and my friends from the other side of the aisle cannot expect a Republican President to nominate an individual who will carry their beliefs onto the court. Such a belief is not consistent with history or with tradition.

I will close by saying that I have great confidence that in 5 years, God willing, in 10 years, God willing, I can look back at Judge Roberts' performance as our Chief Justice and say: I was right in how I analyzed what he has been, what he is today, and what he will be as a Supreme Court Justice. I don't think I will be surprised or let down.

And I know, looking back at nominees for whom I voted, that such is not an ordinary expectation. Some judges for whom I voted did not turn out to be what I expected. But I am quite confident that Judge Roberts will not be anything but the great judge I expect as I look back on his tenure in the ensuing years.

I congratulate the Judge on his nomination. I hope he will remain loyal to what he has said and the way he has said it when he pledged what he wanted to be and what he would be. I wish him the very best because if he is successful, it will be good for America. His success in this job is correlated with good relationships under our Constitution between the great powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

I yield the floor and thank the Senate for listening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the issue before us, which of course is Judge John Roberts. Certainly we have been hearing all about him for the last several days and nearly everything that is to be said has been said at least once. But I do want to take the opportunity to say I am very impressed with this candidate for Supreme Court Chief Justice. I am convinced that he will be a strong defender of the Constitution, that he has an exceptional ability to interpret the Constitution with respect to the law, and that certainly he has the background and qualifications to do that.

I am not an expert in law, but I do feel strongly that the Court is there to measure what is done in other places, what is done in the executive branch, and what is done in the legislative branch with respect to how it fits into the Constitution.

I have met with Judge Roberts, and I appreciated the opportunity to get better acquainted with him. I am very impressed with his demeanor and his character. It is comforting to see someone you think is extremely qualified for such an exceptional job and, at the same time, seems to see the world pretty much from the standpoint we all do, just as a human being, a person who wants to live in a country with freedom, in a country with constitutional law, in a country that does the best for everyone, and I have that impression. So I feel very good about him.

He has great respect for the rule of law and that, it seems to me, is one of the most important aspects of our country. I have had a chance to visit other places. I have had a chance to talk with kids about other countries. As I have gone about, one of the big differences is we have a rule of law, not a rule of people who happen to be in a strong position at the time, but a rule of law that exists and continues in the Constitution to be interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Of course, Judge Roberts has credentials that are outstanding. His edu-

cational background is great. He has been a White House Counsel, so he knows how that works. He has been a Deputy Solicitor General, so he knows how that aspect of it works, too. And he is a circuit judge, so he has a background as a judge. I believe that is very important.

I am very impressed, I am very pleased, and I am very proud to be a part of voting for him. I think the vote will be strong.

I shared with Judge Roberts a few areas about which I am concerned. I did not ask his opinion on them, but rather in the State I am from, Wyoming, we are very concerned about venue shopping. We are very concerned about the idea of people filing suit or going to the proper district court or area to get one that is sympathetic. That is not the way it ought to be. The Federal court that deals with the issue from an event in our history has to be in that history, and I wanted to share that with Judge Roberts.

I am very concerned about eminent domain, with regard to people's rights and property, gun rights, endangered species. Again, I did not ask him for his opinion on those issues because that is not the issue. The issue is, as legislation is passed, are they consistent with the Constitution, and that is, indeed, the role of judges—to listen to the facts and see how they apply to the rule of law.

I was very impressed, as most of us were as we watched some of the interrogation in the committee, with his conduct. Of course, he was pressed many times with different kinds of questions and tried to be pushed into making specific stands on his own opinion on issues, which really is not what it is all about. That is for him to decide when those issues come up with respect to the law, with respect to the Constitution. He handled that situation very well.

We have the opportunity—and a very pleasant opportunity—to support a man who has the qualifications, who has not politicized his background, a learned lawyer, a well-trained lawyer. I am persuaded he will be a strong defender of the Constitution.

I must confess that is the strongest point I support and seek to see the Court do. I think that will happen.

Mr. President, if I may, during this time, I wish to divert from this subject for a minute or two.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. President, I wish to talk about a condition that is very much important to us, where we have unusual events happening in our country. We have the situation in Iraq. We are defending ourselves there and the freedoms of this country there. I just came from a hearing. I am very proud of what is happening in Iraq, and I think we are making some progress towards getting people to take care of their own country. That, of course, is the goal, and I am sure we will be there until that goal is achieved.

Then comes along the problems with the disasters on the gulf coast. Both of those events, of course, have given us special needs for spending, and we have had to spend. It is right to spend when we have emergencies that arise of that nature, but then we find ourselves in the position of, what do we do about this excessive spending and how do we handle it?

I see it as the same thing we undertake in our families. If an emergency happens in the family, you have to handle it. You have to find some way to deal with that emergency. At the same time, your family activities go on and you have to take care of those. Then you have to decide: How can I make some changes in my economic situation to deal with this excessive spending because of an emergency.

That is where we are now. We are talking about all kinds of ways. I hope we take enough time to deal with these situations on the gulf coast and give the help those people need. That is the responsibility of the Federal Government. I hope we make sure there is accountability with those moneys spent, that we can be sure they are spent the way for which they are defined to be spent. I hope we make sure the Federal Government does what it is supposed to do and that the other units of government—State, local, and private sector—do what they are supposed to do. But we still will spend a great deal of money and, indeed, we should.

We also have to consider that over the past year, because of Iraq and other events, we have also had an increase in our deficit. Our deficit has gone up. So we need to find some ways to do something about it. Obviously, we will take a look at spending and see what areas we can reduce. I hope we do that as we finish our budget for this year. We need to.

We should take a look at some of the ways we raise money, in the case of some taxes, that probably we might otherwise change. Perhaps they will have to be left as they are for a while and continue to offset some of these costs.

I wish to specifically mention a bill I am currently sponsoring that requires the regular review of Federal programs. This should be done anyway, but it makes it particularly important as we look toward this business of spending. It is called the Government Reorganization and Program Performance Improvement Act. It creates the necessary mechanism, I believe, to set up some commissions to take a look, No. 1, at programs that have been in place, let's say, for 10 years, and to determine if, in fact, the program is still as needed as it was 10 years ago, to see if it accomplished what it was set up to do 10 years ago and now is completed, could be ended, or could be put in with some other program, or could be reduced because the situation may not be the same as it was when a program was put in place. Even though there probably was a very good reason to have

the program then, is the reason still good? Should we be changing it?

It is really a modernization effort, something we would do in every business, something we should do, which is take a look at what we have done historically and see if they are appropriate and can be done better.

The second half is to not only look at programs that might be unnecessary or wasteful, but take a look at programs that will continue, but are they being done as efficiently as they can be.

One of the issues we have to take a look at in terms of excessive spending is controlling the size of the Federal Government. It has continued to grow and grow. We have sort of developed a political notion that if there is anything needed anywhere, let's get the Federal Government to pay for it.

Well, that is a nice thing to do. The fact is we are supposed to be divided up, and there are local governments, State governments, and the Federal Government, each of which has its own responsibilities and its own areas and we ought to be seeking to define what the role of the Federal Government is and sort of restrict those things to that area so that we can control size.

So this program would inventory the programs, would have proactive steps toward improving and eliminating unnecessary and redundant efforts, and it would help us return to fiscal responsibility. It is kind of common sense in Government. It provides a framework to do that. I don't think anybody will disagree with the notion that we ought to evaluate programs to see if they are still efficient, effective, and needed, if they could be more productive. Nobody would argue that concept, but we don't really have a system to do that. I believe this is a good Government measure, and I certainly urge my colleagues to take a look at the bill S. 1399 and urge their consideration and sponsorship of this bill.

Mr. President, we always have a responsibility to make sure that Government is as efficient as possible, that spending is as effective as possible, that we hold spending to the minimum to do the things we need to do but not in excess of that, and I think we have an opportunity to put that kind of measurement into place and to ensure that those things can happen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next hour under majority control be allocated as follows: 20 minutes for Senator CORNYN, 5 minutes for Senator COCHRAN, 15 minutes for Senator BENNETT, and 20 minutes for Senator ALLEN.

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

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am going to talk about the nominee that we presently have before the Senate, Judge John Roberts, in a moment. First, let me express my concerns about a Washington

Post story that was published today entitled "Filibuster Showdown Looms in Senate." The curious thing about this article is it does not talk about the nominee for Chief Justice of the United States, John Roberts, the nominee that is actually pending before the Senate. Rather, what this article talks about is the next nominee of the President of the United States to fill the seat of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

I am afraid it is perhaps a sign of the times in which we are living and perhaps a sign of the contentiousness with which the nomination for a vacancy on the Supreme Court has met in the Senate that some of my colleagues are already talking about a filibuster of the next nominee of the President when that nominee has not yet been named. I think it takes partisanship to a new level, to threaten to block an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor when we do not even know who that person is yet and, indeed, some apparently cannot conceive of the possibility that this President would nominate someone on whom they would at least allow an up-or-down vote. We are not talking about a Senator not following their conscience but talking about Senators, a minority in the Senate prohibiting a bipartisan majority from casting an up-or-down vote without even knowing who that nominee is going to be.

We ask that nominees for the courts not prejudge cases that will come before them. I would think that we should also ask Senators not to prejudge nominees who have not even been nominated by the President yet. Whomever the President nominates should be entitled to an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor. We are not a country that believes in the tyranny of the minority but, rather, we believe in a fair process and an up-or-down vote and majority rule. That is all we would ask for this yet-to-be-named nominee.

But now let me go to the business at hand and say that I will vote to confirm Judge John G. Roberts as the next Chief Justice of the United States. Before I explain why I am going to vote for his confirmation, I first want to explain the reasons why I am not.

First, I am not voting for his confirmation because he told us how he would rule on cases or issues that might come before the Supreme Court. Some of my colleagues have said that they will not vote to confirm Judge Roberts because they are not certain how he would rule on cases or issues that will come before the Court. They are not certain whether he will vote in favor of abortion rights, for example. They are not certain that he will vote in favor of racial preferences and quotas. They are not certain whether he will vote to give the Federal Government unlimited regulatory power to the exclusion of State and local government. I am not certain how Judge Roberts is going to vote on these issues either, but although my constituents are as concerned and as interested in these issues as anyone, I am not going

to refuse to vote for this nominee on that basis. Judges are not politicians. They do not come to Washington to run on a political platform. They do not say: Vote for me, and I will put a chicken in every pot. They are not supposed to come before the Senate and promise to vote this way or that way on a matter that will come before them. Certainly, I understand as well as anyone why the American people, and Members of the Senate included, are curious about how Judge Roberts is likely to rule on future cases. I am curious about that, too. But sometimes we have to put our curiosity aside for a greater good. We do not want to create a situation where a Justice cannot win confirmation to the Supreme Court unless he pledges to vote this way or that way on certain hot-button issues of the day. Judges are supposed to be impartial, and they are supposed to be independent. That is why they have lifetime tenure once confirmed. Judges cannot be either impartial or independent if they are forced to make promises to the Senate of how they will vote in order to get confirmed.

Some of my colleagues have said they simply cannot or will not put promises to politicians aside for this greater good of independence and impartiality. One of my colleagues says she wants to know who will be the winners on certain issues when Judge Roberts is on the Court. I can tell you who the winners will be. The winners are going to be the parties whose positions are supported by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America. Judge Roberts eloquently explained this during his confirmation hearing. He was asked whether he would rule in favor of the little guy. His answer was that if the Constitution and laws of the United States supported the little guy's position, the little guy will win. But if the Constitution says that the big guys are supported, their position is supported by the Constitution and laws of the United States and the facts in the case, then he will vote in favor of the big guy.

This is exactly how it should be. Over the Supreme Court of the United States, as you look at that stately edifice, it says, "Equal justice under the law," not that justice will be rendered in favor of the little guy all the time or against the big guy all the time or, conversely, for the big guy all the time and against the little guy. That is the antithesis of equal justice under the law. As a matter of fact, we all recall that Lady Justice wears a blindfold for a very good reason—because justice is about the law, not about persons who are sitting in front of a judge.

Mr. President, second, I am not voting for this confirmation because he turned away clients with legal positions with which my constituents or some of us might disagree. Some of my colleagues have said they will vote against Judge Roberts because they are unsure of his heart. They are saying that his heart may not be pure because

in private law practice he would not turn down clients with positions anathema to liberal special interest groups. Now, although they acknowledge that Judge Roberts has donated his time to clients who, for example, were on the liberal side of a lawsuit over gay rights, they criticize Judge Roberts because at his confirmation hearings he said he would have donated his time to clients on the conservative side of that same issue had they approached him first.

This is perhaps the strangest argument of all against this nominee. My colleagues are going to vote against him because they think it is heartless to take on clients regardless of whether he agreed with them or not? That is the very essence of being a lawyer, a professional, an advocate. Lawyers are somewhat like public accommodations in a sense. Similar to hotels, restaurants, and the like, when lawyers place their shingle out and say, I am willing to entertain cases that people may bring to me, they are supposed to serve anyone who comes through the door, as long as they have an arguable legal position or factual position with which the Court might ultimately agree. As a matter of fact, our adversarial system of justice depends on lawyers not just taking cases with which they perhaps ideologically are inclined to agree but, rather, they are supposed to take the facts and the legal arguments and do the very best they can so that in a clash that plays out in our adversarial system of justice in the court room, the judge can make the best decision based on the best legal arguments and that jurors can decide what the truth is based on this clash of opposing positions.

People are not supposed to be judged by the lawyers. Rather, in our system they are supposed to be judged by a jury of their peers. But if lawyers were constrained or prohibited from representing people with whom they might personally not agree, then they would never have a chance to be judged by a jury of their peers because they would not have a lawyer to take their case so that it could be presented to that impartial conscience of the community.

I wish to ask where this reasoning of my colleagues might lead. There are any number of clients who few people would support politically but who need legal representation in our adversarial system. Criminal defendants are the most obvious example. Do my colleagues plan on punishing a lawyer who did not refuse to represent someone who is accused of a crime? Do they plan to disqualify anyone from service in the Federal judiciary who has ever represented someone accused of a crime? Or do they plan to disqualify only those lawyers who did not shun conservative clients or causes? I do not believe you can tell anything about a person's heart, that is, a legal professional, professional advocate by whom that person has represented as a law-

yer. But even more important, I do not think the confirmation process should be about the nominee's heart. I, for one, do not want judges sitting in judgment in a court of law who are going to be guided by their heart and sympathies, rather than the law of the land and the facts as found by the trier of fact. I want judges who will side with the party who has the best argument and whose position is most consistent with established law that we all can recognize and read and understand for ourselves.

Again, Lady Justice is blindfolded for a reason. Justice should not depend on who you are or who you know. It should depend on who has the law on their side.

Third, I am not voting for John Roberts because he will preserve some hypothetical quixotic ideal of balance on the Supreme Court. Some of my colleagues have said they will vote for Judge Roberts because he is not any more conservative than his predecessor, Chief Justice Rehnquist, whom he will be succeeding. But they issued the warning that I started out with: Mr. President, don't you dare nominate someone we disagree with next time or we will use this unconstitutional filibuster. We will break with 200 years of precedent in the Senate and the very premise of our law, which is based on majority rule. We will break with that and we will filibuster in the Senate and prevent your nominee from ever taking the bench if you nominate someone we perceive is more conservative than Sandra Day O'Connor.

My colleagues have said this is important because they want to preserve balance on the Court. Preserving so-called balance on the Court has never been the basis of a Supreme Court confirmation vote. The examples of this are legion. One of the last Supreme Court nominees to win confirmation was Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who replaced Justice Byron White. Justice Ginsburg, I think it is clear, I think we would all agree, was an unabashed liberal and one of the most zealous supporters of abortion rights who has ever been confirmed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Justice White, nominated by President John F. Kennedy, was fairly conservative by contrast and indeed was one of the dissenters in the celebrated case of *Roe v. Wade*. Yet Justice Ginsburg, a self-avowed liberal, replaced a moderate to conservative Justice on the Court, and she was confirmed by a vote of 96 to 3. No one argued that Justice Ginsburg should be defeated because she would somehow shift this ideological balance on the Court.

But she is only one example. Justice Clarence Thomas, one of the most conservative members of the Court, was nominated and confirmed to succeed Justice Thurgood Marshall, arguably one of the most liberal.

Chief Justice Burger, President Nixon's antidote to judicial activism, replaced Chief Justice Earl Warren,

whose name, in the minds of some, was synonymous with the phrase judicial activism.

Justice Goldberg, who believed the ninth amendment gave the Supreme Court a license to invent new constitutional rights, replaced Justice Frankfurter, the father of judicial restraint.

So it is clear this has never been the way it has been, historically. Nor is there any precedent or any obligation of a President to try to seek ideological balance when nominating someone to the Supreme Court. The reason why is very simple. Elections are supposed to have consequences. The President is entitled to put the people on the Supreme Court who share his values and his judicial philosophy; in this case one who believes the policymaking ought to primarily emanate from the elected representatives of the people in Congress, not life-tenured judges who are unaccountable.

If Presidents were not entitled to change the Supreme Court, then Abraham Lincoln could not have changed the *Dred Scott* case, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt could not have changed the *Lochner* Court. I doubt my colleagues who are arguing for this ideological lockstep, or uniformity, would have favored that.

But that brings me to why I am supporting this nominee, and the reasons are actually pretty simple. First, Judge Roberts is simply one of the most qualified individuals ever nominated to serve on the Supreme Court. Indeed, he may very well be the best qualified. We have heard it before. He graduated the top of his class, he clerked for two of the finest judges in the Nation, he served, with great distinction, two Presidents. He has argued 39 cases before the U.S. Supreme Court and is widely regarded as the finest oral advocate before the Court living today.

In only 2 years on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, he has already acquired a reputation as one of the most respected judges in America. Even the *New York Times*, which has editorialized against this nomination, has conceded that few lawyers in America could compete with Judge Roberts in professional accomplishments.

There was a time not too long ago when a brilliant career such as Judge Roberts' was sufficient to win confirmation to the Supreme Court, when we did not have ideological tests, litmus tests; when we didn't have filibusters that blocked the majority from actually having an up-or-down vote to confirm a nominee.

Whereas Judge Roberts has spent his career representing clients on both sides of every issue, we saw in Justice Ginsburg, whom I mentioned a moment ago, a jurist spending most of her career representing the single client, the American Civil Liberties Union, on one side of these issues. She voiced support for some pretty extreme positions. She

supported taxpayer funding for abortions. She thought there was a constitutional right to polygamy and prostitution. Suffice it to say, her ideas were far outside of the legal, not to mention the political, mainstream of America.

Finally, I am going to vote to confirm this nominee because this judge understands the proper role of an unelected Supreme Court Justice in a democratic Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. To repeat, Judge Roberts understands the proper role of an unelected Supreme Court Justice in a democratic Nation. Ours is not a nation where nine judges sit in a marble edifice and decide what is good for us. Nor is it a Nation conceived on the premise that these nine unelected judges should be primarily policymakers. Rather, our notion of justice and law is based on consent of the governed. You can read it in the Declaration of Independence. Obviously, were unelected, lifetime-tenured judges to depart from the text of the Constitution, depart from precedent, and get into a mode of sort of freewheeling ad hoc public policymakers, they would have departed in the extreme from the framework laid down by our Founders and from the framework ensconced in our Constitution.

I will vote to confirm this nominee. I hope my colleagues will do likewise. I hope further that my colleagues, who have already stated their intention to filibuster the next nominee, will wait until the President has in fact named a nominee to succeed Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. It is just possible—it is just possible they will be surprised and they will find the President has, indeed, selected another nominee in the mold of John Roberts, who will be overwhelmingly confirmed as Chief Justice of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of Judge John G. Roberts' nomination to serve as Chief Justice of the United States. The Members of the Senate may disagree on many legal and political issues, but I am confident a majority of the Senate will agree that Judge John Roberts should be confirmed. He has provided the Judiciary Committee with the story of his life. He has answered questions on a wide range of issues. In the process, he has demonstrated the ability, the temperament, and the wisdom to serve as Chief Justice of the United States.

The process of providing advice and consent on a Supreme Court nomination is one of the Senate's most significant constitutional responsibilities, although it is not something we are called upon to do very often. Eleven

years have passed since the Senate last exercised its duty to provide advice and consent to the President on his selection of a Supreme Court nominee; 19 years have passed since the Senate last considered a nominee for Chief Justice.

By now, all Senators and most Americans have come to know the impressive life story of John G. Roberts, Jr. He is a summa cum laude graduate of Harvard University and an honors graduate of the Harvard Law School. He was an editor of the Harvard Law Review.

After graduating from law school with high honors, Judge Roberts served as a law clerk to a judge on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals and as a law clerk to then Associate Justice Rehnquist on the U.S. Supreme Court. He has also served as a Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States and as an associate counsel to President Ronald Reagan.

After those years of public service, he spent 3 years in private practice at a well-respected law firm, specializing in civil litigation. Judge Roberts then returned to public service as the Principal Deputy Solicitor General of the United States.

During these years of service at the Department of Justice and as a lawyer in private practice, Judge Roberts argued 39 cases before the U.S. Supreme Court. His performance before the Court earned him a reputation as one of the Nation's premier appellate court advocates.

Two years ago Judge Roberts was unanimously confirmed by this Senate to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. This circuit court is considered by many to be the Nation's second highest court.

Judge Roberts is a devoted husband, a dutiful father of two young children, and he is a good and honest man. I closely followed the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearings on his nomination to be Chief Justice. It is clear to me that he is the right person for this very important responsibility. Judge Roberts has served with distinction in every job he has ever had. His record is compelling evidence that he would be an able and thoughtful member of the Supreme Court, and that his experience and his respect for the rule of law demonstrate he would be an outstanding Chief Justice of the United States.

The quality and correctness of opinions and decisions by the Supreme Court will depend upon the conscientious application of reason and the rule of law by Chief Justice Roberts and his colleagues on the Supreme Court. I think Judge Roberts fully understands the role of the Supreme Court Justice and is totally qualified to discharge the duties of Chief Justice. I believe he will be fair to all and, in the application of the rule of law, impartial and unbiased.

This is serious business. The members of the Federal judiciary are charged with the responsibility of protecting our rights as American citizens, adjudicating our grievances, pro-

moting order and justice, and serving as stewards of the rule of law. The Chief Justice of the United States is the highest ranking official in the judicial branch of our Federal Government. He is in charge of the management and administration of the highest Court in the land. I believe Judge Roberts has what it takes to be an outstanding Chief Justice.

I congratulate the President for his selection of Judge Roberts and I commend the President for his nomination. His nominee will be in an important position in our Government. I am pleased, indeed, that I will be able to vote in favor of his confirmation by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, most of the speakers who have discussed this subject have talked about Judge Roberts' qualification. There is no point in my referring to them or repeating them again.

There is a point that I do wish to make with respect to the entire process, which I think needs to be emphasized and stressed. It is this: Nominations are not elections.

Read the Constitution, and we see that it allows for elections. It provides for elections. It says there are places where elections are appropriate. The President is elected. The Vice President is elected. The Members of the Senate and House are elected. But members of the Cabinet are not; they are appointed by the President. And to allow the election process to have an influence, they have to be confirmed by the Senate. But they are not elections.

The same thing is true very much with respect to the judicial branch. A nomination for the Supreme Court is not an election.

The reason I make such stress of that is because there are many groups out there who think this is an election. There are big ads on television. They are organizing demonstrations. They are walking around with placards. That is what you do when you try to influence voters in an election. This is not an election. The Founding Fathers understood that it should not be an election.

There are some who have made up their minds long in advance of any nomination as to what they are going to do. I think, quite frankly, if President Bush were to somehow resurrect John Marshall and send his name to the Senate to be the Chief Justice of the United States, People For the American Way and Ralph Neas would insist that he was badly out of the mainstream and unqualified to be Chief Justice, even though history says he was the greatest Chief Justice in our history. But if he were picked by George W. Bush, that group would immediately say he is radical, he is out of the mainstream.

We are getting the same thing with respect to Judge Roberts—an election

campaign complete with television ads and placards and demonstrations saying that Judge Roberts is out of the mainstream.

I do not know where you go to find mainstream today. I do not know exactly where the mainstream is. I know where the left bank of this particular stream is. The New York Times is against Judge Roberts. That was predictable. That was as sure as the Sun would rise—that the New York Times would be opposed to anybody George W. Bush proposed.

The Washington Post is usually thought of as being fairly close to the left bank, but the Washington Post looked at this nominee and said this is a qualified nominee.

The American Bar Association tries to be as much of the mainstream as they can. They have given Judge Roberts' nomination their highest support, "well qualified," unanimously. Maybe they are not mainstream enough for some of these people who are using this argument.

The Los Angeles Times is not thought of as a rightwing organization. The Los Angeles Times said it would be a travesty if we didn't confirm Judge Roberts by a wide margin.

Why do we want to confirm somebody like Judge Roberts? Why is the President's nomination a good one? In my view, it is because Judge Roberts understands one fundamental truth. Along with the one I have just given, a second fundamental truth, if you will, is that nominations are not elections and judges are not politicians, or more appropriately judges are not legislators. You have elections for legislators. You should not have elections for judges.

Judge Roberts put it this way in describing his understanding of his responsibility. We have heard this before with respect to this nominee, but it is worth repeating. He said to the committee:

I come before the committee with no agenda. I have no platform.

Again, judges are not legislators.

Judges are not politicians who can promise to do certain things in exchange for votes. I have no agenda but I do have a commitment. If I am confirmed, I will confront every case with an open mind. I will fully and fairly analyze the legal arguments that are presented. I will be open to the considered views of my colleagues on the bench, and I will decide every case based on the record, according to the rule of law, without fear or favor, to the best of my ability. I will remember that it is my job to call balls and strikes and not to pitch or bat.

In other words, he is the umpire, he is not a player. We have seen an example brought up in an effort to try to derail Judge Roberts' nomination of how he called "balls and strikes" and how he was not a legislator. It has been dropped now because those people who raised it didn't realize that it was going to be analyzed properly and turn out to be embarrassing to them rather than to the judge.

But there was the case of the 12-year-old girl in Washington who, while wait-

ing with her friend at the Metro station to buy a Metro ticket, happened to eat a single french fry, and she was arrested, handcuffed, and taken down to the station. Judge Roberts upheld the action of the Metro Police.

Horrors, came the groups. There is an election. We can grab onto this as an example that we can sensationalize and win votes on. Then they examined the matter very carefully, and we got Judge Roberts' actual opinion in this case. He did not victimize a 12-year-old girl who was arrested for eating a french fry. This is what he said in his opinion that once again outlines the truth of his position that he will be an umpire, not a player, not a legislator.

He said:

No one is very happy about the events that led to this litigation. A 12-year-old girl was arrested, searched and handcuffed, all for eating a single french fry in a Metro rail station. The child was frightened, embarrassed, and crying throughout the ordeal. The District Court described the policies that led to her arrest as "foolish," and, indeed, the policies were changed after those responsible endured the sort of publicity reserved for adults who make young girls cry. The question before us, however, is not whether these policies were a bad idea but whether they violated the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution.

He put the emphasis in the right place. This was a stupid law. It was passed for some other reason and turned out in administration to be a stupid law. It was passed by legislators, people with legislative responsibility. It was repealed by legislators. It should not be repealed by the judge just because it is stupid.

I remember a conversation that took place after the Supreme Court ruled on the bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. It is no secret that I opposed that act as vigorously as I could. We passed it nonetheless. The President signed it. Then a lawsuit was filed. It went all the way to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court found that the law was constitutional and upheld it.

I will not reveal names because these were private conversations, but a Member of the Senate had the occasion to have a conversation with a member of the Supreme Court. The Member of the Senate said to the member of the Supreme Court: How could you uphold that law? That is a terrible law.

The member of the Supreme Court appropriately said: You are right. It is a terrible law. You shouldn't have passed it.

In other words, the Supreme Court should not be the one that corrects our mistakes unless we violate the Constitution. The Supreme Court should not take a position unless we violate the Constitution. The Supreme Court is not made up of legislators who fix things; it should be made up of people who examine the law.

Even if the law is foolish enough to punish a 12-year-old girl for eating a french fry on the Metro, the Supreme Court should say: Legislators, this is a dumb law. You ought to fix it. But it is not our responsibility to legislate.

The real reason so many groups have tried to turn Judge Roberts' nomination into an election rather than a nomination is because they lost the election and they are hoping they can turn the Supreme Court into a super-legislature that is beyond the reach of voters. Clearly, that is not what the Founding Fathers had in mind. Clearly, when they put the responsibility to make the choice in the hands of the President, they were saying this will be a nomination and not an election. If the Founding Fathers had wanted the Supreme Court at the national level to be open to the electoral process, they would have done what others have done at the State level. There are States where the appointment to the supreme court of the State is an electoral process. Whether that is good or bad is the subject for another conversation. But in this circumstance, we are talking about the U.S. Constitution, which every Member of this Chamber has taken an oath to uphold.

If we are going to uphold the Constitution of the United States and defend it against all enemies who would undermine it, be they foreign or domestic, we should preserve the constitutional process of nominations coming from the President of the United States. He has to answer to the people for his decisions. He should be the one to make the nomination. He is the one who is given the powers specifically.

We can say, Mr. President, we don't consent to that because we think you made a mistake, but we in the Senate should not condone those who are trying to turn the nomination process into an electoral process. Because we should understand as Members of the legislature that members of the judiciary are not legislators, and we should not move in a direction of turning them into legislators by participating in an election-type process in vetting their credentials. If this man is qualified, he should be confirmed. If he is unpopular with the electorate, that should be irrelevant. The Constitution does not allow for that to intrude upon the confirmation process.

There is no question but that John Roberts is qualified.

I end with a conversation I had with one of my colleagues who made up his mind to oppose Judge Roberts. I said to him: In a theoretical situation, suppose you had everything you own on the line in a nasty lawsuit, and you had a legal problem where you could lose everything. Who would you choose to defend you? Which lawyer would you hire, John Roberts or a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee? He laughed immediately. He said: Bob, it isn't even close. If John Roberts is the obvious choice for a personal attorney for someone who needs real help, why should he not be the obvious choice for the Nation that needs real help?

He will be a superb Chief Justice, and I will vote for him with great confidence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Virginia is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise this afternoon in strong support of the confirmation of Judge John Roberts to be the 17th Chief Justice of the United States.

When we first learned of this vacancy on the Supreme Court earlier this summer, I laid out the principles of what kind of judge I believe the President should nominate and how the nomination process should proceed. It should be a dignified approach as a due process. It should be fair, and there should be a vote.

Federal judges are appointed for life. When one recognizes those debates in the founding of our country, Mr. Jefferson wanted judges appointed for terms, and Mr. Hamilton wanted them for life. Unfortunately, in my view, Mr. Hamilton won. The only time there is any scrutiny on the part of the public is at this time of confirmation. While some may not like the editorials, some may not like the TV ads, the demonstrations, and all the speeches. I don't think judges ought to be legislators, and I don't agree with some of their perspectives in our free country. Let us as Senators not say that people are wrong to demonstrate, run TV ads, advocate and express their views, even if we may not be in agreement with them. That is one of the foundational principles of our country. Ultimately our role is to listen, to examine judicial nominees based upon our criteria. Obviously, we can listen to the people and then ultimately it is our responsibility to vote.

The following are the criteria I use to judge a judge. I have always believed the proper role of a judge is to apply the law, not invent the law. The proper role of a judge is to uphold the Constitution, not amend the Constitution by judicial decrees. The proper role of a judge is to uphold the intent of the Constitution and the principles of our Founders, not to indulge in self-satisfying judicial activism. The proper role of a judge is to protect and, indeed, to defend our God-given rights, not to create or deny rights out of thin air.

I believe it is my responsibility and the responsibility of all Senators to make sure that America's courts, including, of course, and most importantly, the Supreme Court, are filled with qualified men and women who possess the proper judicial philosophy in our representative democracy.

Laws are to be made by the representatives of the people. The people are the owners of the government. At the local level, they elect city councils, parish leaders, county boards of supervisors. Then we have State legislators, Governors, and, of course, Federal legislators, Congress, and the President.

However, colleagues, every week, and almost every day, we see the consequences of activist judges who do not properly respect our representative de-

mocracy. They do not understand or respect the proper role and responsibilities of a judge not to be an executive and not to be a legislator.

Let me share with my colleagues two examples of judicial activism, decisions where the rule of law which is one of those foundational bedrock pillars of a free and just society, where these concepts have been eroded and ignored by judges.

Exhibit A comes from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Ninth Circuit has trampled upon the will of the people of California by ruling that the Pledge of Allegiance cannot be recited in California public schools because it contains the words "under God." They fail to see that the Pledge of Allegiance is not the establishment of any religion. It is a patriotic act. If a student does not wish to recite the Pledge of Allegiance, he or she is not compelled to do so. They can sit there quietly as the pledge is recited.

This is a terrible ruling, not just because it violates the will and the values of the people of California, which it surely does, but it is also a terrible ruling because it actually displays a woful and inexcusable ignorance of America's legal and historical traditions going all the way back to Mr. Jefferson's statute of religious freedom. This is all sacrificed on the altar of judicial activism.

Unless the Ninth Circuit reverses itself, then the Supreme Court of the United States should ultimately reverse this prohibition of the Pledge of Allegiance in schools.

Exhibit B comes from, I regret to say, the highest Court in the land, the Supreme Court of the United States. This past summer, in the case of *Kelo v. City of New London, Connecticut*, five Supreme Court Justices willfully ignored the Bill of Rights, allowing local governments, acting as commissars, the right to take someone's home, a person's home to be taken not for a road, not for a school, not for a legitimate public use, but simply because they think they can generate more tax revenue from the property upon which that home is located.

Colleagues, home ownership is the greatest fulfillment of the American dream. Every American should have the opportunity to own the home in which they live. Every child is enriched by learning and appreciating the value and pride of home ownership. That is why I advocate economic policies that make home ownership more affordable to more people. It is not just good economic sense, it is also an issue of fairness. It is an issue of opportunity in this land we call home, America.

This outrageous decision that is forcing people out of their homes, the very definition of the American dream, in the name of expanded government tax revenue, is amending the Bill of Rights by judicial decree and is contrary to what I believe is a fair and just society.

These are just two examples of judicial activism. We do not need any more

judicial activists on the Ninth Circuit, on the Supreme Court, or any court in this land. The only way to stop this insidious effect of judicial activism is to confirm well-qualified judges who possess good legal minds and understand their role in our Republic. Judges are not to be legislators or executives. Judges should fairly adjudicate disputes based upon the law and the Constitution.

I believe Judge Roberts is precisely that kind of judge. I believe Judge Roberts has the credentials, the values, and the temperament to be an outstanding Chief Justice.

Let me briefly touch on some of his outstanding credentials. He graduated *summa cum laude* from Harvard College, *magna cum laude* from Harvard Law School, was a law clerk for both Judge Friendly and later for Chief Justice William Rehnquist, a Justice Department aide for the Reagan administration, the Principal Deputy Solicitor General in the first Bush administration, a private attorney with Hogan & Hartson, and since 2003, an esteemed judge on the D.C. Court of Appeals.

I supported Judge Roberts' confirmation to the D.C. Court of Appeals, and his service there has confirmed my confidence in his outstanding capabilities. I have been impressed not only by his keen judicious mind but also his commitment to the Constitution and understanding the importance of the rule of law and the role of a judge.

I met with Judge Roberts back in August. We discussed things one on one. I found him to be a very well grounded individual. He possesses the right judicial philosophy. I know people are concerned that some judges might get in there and somehow get out of touch in the rarefied air of judgeships, particularly on the Supreme Court. I thought it was good he cuts his grass every now and then—not that it is a qualification to be a judge, but it shows he understands how people live in a relatively normal way.

Most importantly, we talked about the importance of precedence, individual rights, the interpretation of Federal and State laws, and what deference should be given to laws passed by the representatives of the people, as well as a variety of other issues.

I am very comfortable with Judge Roberts and his understanding of the role of a judge, the importance of the Constitution, and that the Constitution should not be amended by judicial decree.

I enjoyed asking him what he thinks the role of international law or laws from other countries should be for judges. We will not have others from another country tell us what our laws ought to be. I love his judicious approach that any judge who uses international laws or the laws from other countries to make decisions upon cases in the United States, those judges are trying to accrue to themselves more power than they should have. The powers of Federal judges in this country

come from the laws that are passed by the people in the United States. If you start trying to get extraneous laws, that is judicial expansion. He understands the modest and respectful way a judge should handle cases.

Later in his confirmation hearings, we saw how Judge Roberts continued to show a rare reverence for our Constitution and the Supreme Court's responsibilities under our Constitution. He declared:

Judges are not to put in their own personal views about what the Constitution should say, but they are supposed to interpret it and apply the meaning that is in the Constitution.

Judge Roberts went on to say:

[J]udges need to appreciate that the legitimacy of their action is confined to interpreting the law and not to making it, and if they exceed that function and start making the law, I do think that raises legitimate concerns about [the] legitimacy of their authority to do that.

It is refreshing to hear those words from the lips of a Supreme Court nominee. May other judges in the Federal court system understand and respect that, as well.

As we get ready to vote tomorrow on Judge Roberts, this is exactly how this system and this process ought to work—fair and open hearings where the nominee explains his or her judicial philosophy but refuses to prejudge individual cases, and following all of the scrutiny and the questions and examination, there is a fair, up-or-down vote on the Senate floor. This is the American tradition. This should not be an exception. This should be the rule and the way we treat judicial nominees, not just this nominee but future nominees.

I remind my colleagues, we will soon have another Supreme Court vacancy to fill. We will need to fill it very soon. We should be fair and dignified, we should be deliberative, and when it is over, we should vote. Yes, that is our responsibility, to vote.

I am looking forward to having John Roberts serve as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. I am also looking forward to confirming other well-qualified judges who understand and appreciate the foundational principles of our country and who will reinforce the rule of law by fairly adjudicating disputes protecting our freedom of religion, protecting our private ownership of property, and our freedom of expression.

John Roberts, I believe, will go down in history as one of the great Chief Justices of the Supreme Court. Let him also become a role model for all other men and women who will follow on Federal benches.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Under the previous order, the time from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. will be under the control of the Democratic side.

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, those of us who are privileged to serve in the Senate literally cast thousands of votes during the years we spend here. Some votes are procedural in nature and of little consequence. Others are far more meaningful. Katrina relief, pension reform, and trade agreements come to mind. Once in a great while, though, we are called upon in this body to cast a vote of such importance to our Nation that it will resonate for years to come—whether to authorize the use of military force against another nation or whether to impeach a President. There are few votes, however, we will cast in our time here that are likely to leave a more lasting impact on America than the one we will cast tomorrow morning. In confirming the nomination of John Roberts—something that is all but certain—we not only will authorize him to serve as the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, we will also make him the leader of the judicial branch of our Government. God willing, he will hold that post for as long as most of us in the Senate are likely to live. A great deal is riding on this vote for our country and its people, both today and for a long time to come.

For many of us, this one is a close call. Understandable concerns have been raised on a number of fronts about what kind of Chief Justice John Roberts ultimately will make. Do the writings of a young man in his twenties reflect the views of this 50-year-old man today? If not, why was he reluctant to clearly say so publicly when given that opportunity? Why did the current administration refuse to allow any scrutiny of the writings of Judge Roberts from when he served as the No. 2 person in the Solicitor General's Office of former President Bush? What direction would Chief Justice Roberts seek to lead the Supreme Court in the coming years on issues relating to privacy, to civil rights, and to the prerogatives of the Congress to set policy that may be at odds with the views of State and local governments? How will Judge Roberts seek to interpret and apply the Constitution and a wide variety of laws, both State and Federal? Will the Roberts Court respect precedent or aggressively seek to establish new ones?

The honest answer to most of these questions is that none of us really know for sure—not the President, probably not even Judge Roberts himself. That uncertainty explains at least in part why this vote is so difficult for many Members of this body. So we are asked to make a leap of faith. For some, that leap is large. For others, it is not.

For myself, I have decided to take that leap of faith. After a great deal of

deliberation, conversations with many Democrats and Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee, as well as with others back home and here, I have decided to vote tomorrow to confirm the nomination of John Roberts to serve as our Nation's Chief Justice. Time will determine the wisdom of that decision, along with the decisions of each of our colleagues who join me in casting our votes tomorrow.

Yesterday, I had the privilege of meeting with Judge Roberts in my office. There, we discussed many of the concerns and question marks I mentioned just a few minutes ago. His responses were forthright. They were insightful. And I believe they were sincere.

Our conversation also provided me with insights into how a young man from a small town in Indiana could grow up, attend Harvard, become one of the most admired lawyers in America, be nominated for the Supreme Court, not once but twice, and then sit through 3 days of often grueling questioning before the Senate Judiciary Committee, responding calmly and respectfully to questions on a wide range of legal issues without the benefit of any notes or even a pad of paper.

Judge Roberts and I spoke with one another at length about our respective childhoods and of our parents and the roles they played in our lives and the values they instilled in us and in our siblings. We also talked about our educational opportunities, our careers, our mentors, our spouses, and even about the children we were raising.

It was a revealing and encouraging conversation. It was a revealing and encouraging conversation in that it provided me with important insights into his personal values and with a measure of reassurance on the direction he may ultimately seek to lead the highest Court of our land.

I shared with him that in the 8 years before coming to the Senate, I served as Governor of Delaware. In that role, I nominated dozens of men and women to serve as judges in our State courts, several of whom enjoy national prominence given my State's role in business and corporate law.

Ironically, and I think wisely, Delaware's Constitution requires overall political balance on our State's courts. For every Democrat who is nominated to serve as a judge, Delaware Governors must nominate a Republican, and vice versa. The result has been an absence of political infighting and a national reputation for Delaware's State judiciary regarded by some as the finest of any State in our land.

The qualities I sought in the judicial nominees I submitted to the Delaware State Senate included these: unimpeachable integrity, a thorough understanding of the law, a keen intellect, a willingness to listen to both sides of a case, excellent judicial temperament, sound judgment, and a strong work ethic. In applying those standards to Judge Roberts, I believe he meets or

exceeds all of them. To my knowledge, no one has questioned his integrity, his intellect, or his knowledge of the law. Democrats and Republicans alike watched, along with a national audience, as Judge Roberts fielded any number of tough questions over the 3 days of hearings and responded knowledgeably, respectfully, with humility, and occasionally with self-deprecating good humor. In all candor, I am not sure any of us would have done as well.

Having said that, though, questions and doubts remain about where Chief Justice Roberts will come down on a number of issues—reproductive rights, civil rights, and respect for congressional prerogatives, to mention a few. I might add that, if truth be known, all of those doubters are not liberal Democrats. Some of them are conservative Republicans.

The answers to these questions will come in the years ahead as Chief Justice Roberts assumes this important post and begins to lead this Court and the judicial branch of our Government. In the end, some of the decisions he helps to formulate may surprise and confound people on all sides of the political spectrum. That is something one of his earliest mentors, Judge Henry Friendly of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, has done for years.

Let me pause and ask my colleagues today to think back just for a moment. How many of us would ever have imagined that a Texas Congressman and Senator with Lyndon Johnson's early civil rights record would go on to champion the civil rights of minorities like no other American President in the 20th century? Who among us, watching former Representative and Senator Richard Nixon, a Cold War warrior for decades, would have foreseen the role he played in opening the door for U.S. relations with Communist China? Then, too, recall, if you will, the loathing many conservatives came to feel toward the late Chief Justice Earl Warren, a nominee of President Eisenhower, or the disdain many liberals came to feel toward former Justice "Whizzer" White, a nominee of President Kennedy.

The truth is that life and its experiences do change us and some of our views in ways that cannot always be predicted. Having children of our own and later welcoming those children into our lives as well as learning from our mistakes and from the mistakes of others can combine to make us wiser, to temper our views, to broaden our horizons and deepen our understanding of the views of others with whom we share this planet. And so it is likely to be with Judge Roberts.

As I prepare to take a leap of faith tomorrow—albeit not a reckless one, in my view—let me close with a few words of advice, respectfully offered, to our President. A second nomination looms just around the corner. President Bush's choice of that nominee is, in many respects, as important as this one. The next choice can divide this

Congress and our country even further or it can serve to bring us a little closer together. We need a choice that unites us, not one that divides us further.

We also need a choice that reflects the diversity of this country in which we live. There are any number of well-qualified women, and maybe even a few men, who would be a good choice for the seat now held by Justice Sandra Day O'Connor. On behalf of all of us, Mr. President, let me encourage you to send us one of those names.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to announce my vote on the nomination of Judge John G. Roberts, Jr., to be the 17th Chief Justice of the United States.

I do not cast this vote lightly. I recognize how critical the courts are in protecting and advancing the rights of all Americans. I know what is at stake. I am also mindful that John Roberts has been nominated for a lifetime appointment to the highest seat on the highest Court in our country. In our system, there is no backstop or review of a Supreme Court Justice once he or she is confirmed. That means under the Constitution we in the Senate have the responsibility to fully evaluate each nominee before voting, and that is exactly what I have done.

For me personally, casting a vote on a nominee to the Supreme Court carries special meaning. Thirteen years ago the nomination of another Supreme Court Justice, Clarence Thomas, helped launch my own path from the kitchen table in Shoreline, WA to this historic desk on the floor of the Senate. During the Thomas confirmation, I was deeply frustrated that the questions I believed needed to be answered were not even raised. I was troubled that average Americans, moms and dads, had no voice in a process that would affect their rights and liberties.

This time I had the opportunity to ask those questions directly to the nominee. I was pleased to work with my Democratic women colleagues to open the process and empower people across the country to submit questions to the nominee via a Web site that Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI created. Today not only did I have the opportunity to ask those questions directly, but the weight has also been on my shoulders.

For days I have struggled with whether this nominee represents the fear I have of the worst motives of this administration or whether he represents the best hopes of a country for wise decisions that protect our rights and our freedoms and our responsibility

ities. No one of us can know for sure. There is no doubt that anyone I would have nominated would have come from a different background with a different history, but this was not my choice. There is much I do not know about how Judge Roberts will rule, but as history has shown, none of us can predict that. And without a crystal globe, I must make this very difficult decision based on what I do know and upon the criteria I have long used to evaluate nominees for judicial appointments.

This evening I talk about how I have applied my standards to other nominees for the Federal bench. I am especially pleased that in Washington State we do judicial nominations the right way, through a careful, bipartisan process that helps us select qualified candidates without regard to politics. In Washington State, I have worked with different administrations to craft a process that helps us identify and confirm qualified individuals for the Federal bench. We solicit input from a wide variety of respected individuals within the Washington State legal community, and then we personally interview each recommended candidate prior to submitting his or her name to the White House for consideration.

During the Clinton administration, my colleague Senator Gorton and I worked together to recommend and support individuals for appointment to the Federal bench. Senator Gorton and I disagreed on a lot of issues, but we did agree that when it came to our duty in confirming individuals to the third and coequal branch of our Government, we should set aside partisanship and focus on qualifications. That tradition has continued with my colleague Senator CANTWELL. We got off to a rough start on this approach because the Bush administration at first did not want to continue the fair process Senator Gorton and I had established, but eventually the wisdom of our process prevailed. While there have been hiccups along the way, we have used it to confirm qualified people to serve on the bench.

Through this fair and deliberative process, I have supported nominees with a wide variety of backgrounds. I have supported people who have come from privileged backgrounds and those who beat the odds to realize their achievements. I have supported Democrats and Republicans. Each time, though, I was confident that I was supporting an individual who would serve every American who came before them well, and I have not been disappointed.

My home State of Washington is 2500 miles away from Washington, DC. In many ways it is even further than that in terms of our independence of thought. The White House would do well to learn from the example we set in Washington State, and I hope the Bush administration will do a better job of consulting with the Senate on its next nominee and providing a more complete record of that nominee's background and writings.

Some have suggested to me that I use my vote to register my disapproval at things the Bush administration has done or that I use my vote to send a message to the President. While I am angry about mistakes and miscalculations and misrepresentations and misdirected priorities of the Bush administration, this vote is not the place to vent those frustrations. Fairness requires that I evaluate each nominee on his or her own merits, without a predetermined outcome, just as I expect every judge to do when a case comes before them. My vote is based on the same standards I have used for years, not on anger or in sending messages or ignoring a nominee's actual record.

This would be an easier decision if we had a complete record. The White House has refused to provide more recent memos from Judge Roberts' work in the Solicitor General's office which would have provided us with a clearer picture of the nominee. I, frankly, think the White House's position is a reflection of the general breakdown in the process that we use to select and confirm judges today. With this administration, consultation with the Senate is cursory at best, and from the very beginning there has been often a kind of "spoils of war" approach to how they view appointments to the Federal bench. I believe this approach has resulted in unqualified individuals being forwarded by the administration to the Senate for consideration. This approach has contributed to the partisan rancor regarding nominations to the courts.

These actions are even more concerning in light of the second vacancy the Bush administration is set to fill in the coming weeks. I do not believe that an honest, fair evaluation could be completed with any less material information than we were provided during this confirmation process. I believe the Bush administration is attempting to set a dangerous precedent with its words and actions or lack thereof, and I fear that future court nominations could be even more contentious as a result.

In looking at nominees for our courts, I always follow a very deliberative process of having a set of standards and comparing individuals who come before us as nominees to that set of standards. I examine their record and their experience and their testimony. I see if they meet the basic standards of honesty and ethics and qualifications and fairness. Then I evaluate if they will be independent, evenhanded in deciding cases, and if they will uphold our rights and our liberties. Those standards help me ensure that when any American, regardless of background, comes before the court, he or she receives a fair hearing and that the resulting decision renders justice according to the law.

In reaching a decision on Judge Roberts, I reviewed all of the information that was available, and then I examined how Judge Roberts measured up

to my criteria for judicial nominees. I followed the Judiciary Committee hearings closely. I read the transcripts. I have spoken directly with Judge Roberts twice, once in a meeting in my office and once by phone.

Looking at my standards, I found Judge Roberts to be honest, ethical, qualified, and fair. I believe he will be evenhanded in deciding cases. On those criteria, Judge Roberts clearly met my test. It was my last criteria, upholding the rights and liberties of all Americans, where I had a harder time evaluating Judge Roberts. I wish the White House had been more forthcoming in making available more documents that would have shed light on some of his more recent work and opinions. I wish the nominee himself had been more responsive to questions in his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Through this process, I have concluded that Judge Roberts is a decent person with keen intellect and high ethical standards. I believe he does know the difference between the role of advocacy, which he has held in the past, and the role of judge. I think he has the capacity to be fair, and I think he aims to serve all of the American people.

On the question of upholding the hard-won rights and liberties of the American people, I believe Judge Roberts has a healthy regard for precedent and intends to apply a thoughtful approach to interpreting the law. This is not to say I would expect or even hope to agree with every decision he might make or every opinion a Chief Justice Roberts might author. In making my decision, I recognize that history has shown no one can accurately anticipate what type of Justice a nominee may ultimately become.

For many weeks I have known some people in Washington State will be disappointed in my decision regardless of what that decision is. I have heard from friends and colleagues, constituents and strangers, on all sides of the question. Many of them have surprised me in their candor and in their position. All this has led me to struggle with the decision for many days now. I have read up on Judge Roberts. I have listened to the thoughts of others. I have talked with the judge himself. All the while, it has been an extremely close call in my mind, for I know the gravity and the consequences of this important vote. I have had deep and lasting concerns. But I have had strong, heartfelt hopes as well.

In the end, I returned to the basic criteria I use on any tough question and to the values the people of Washington State sent me here to protect. In examining that criteria and those important values, I have made a decision that I hope everyone can understand and appreciate and even be proud of. I am satisfied that Judge Roberts meets my long-held criteria and, therefore, I will vote to confirm his nomination.

I believe Judge Roberts is well qualified to serve. I believe he is intelligent and honest and fair. Is he wise? Only time can answer that. I cast this vote with the hope that John Roberts will be an individual who will combine common sense and decency with a real respect for how the law affects each American as he serves out his tenure on the Supreme Court. In spending time with him and reviewing the available record, I believe Judge Roberts has the capacity to be that kind of justice.

Throughout our history, America has always had to confront challenges and enjoyed a lively debate on how to meet them. Today is no different. Our great Nation is confronting enormous challenges, and the debate over how to address those challenges has caused great divisions in our country. Many people, as I do, fear the direction in which this country is headed. They fear for our security. They fear we are not doing enough at home to secure a stronger future, and they fear the progress we have made in the last several generations is being eroded by a political agenda. Those fears are well founded, and they are real. But our country was also founded on hope, hope that by securing individual liberty, a free people could govern themselves in the interest of promoting the common good, hope that despite our differences, we could band together to create strong communities and a better future for generations of Americans to come. That spirit of hope is alive today and should help guide us at least as much as our fears.

My vote tonight is a vote of hope—hope that despite our differences, we can unite around the common good; hope that equal justice under the law means something powerful to every American, regardless of background or political persuasion; and hope that John Roberts responds to the needs of this Nation to have a Supreme Court that honors our past and helps secure the rights and liberties of every American into the future.

When I asked Judge Roberts what kind of judge he wanted to be, he said: A Justice for all Americans. I hope my vote, along with the diverse group of my Senate colleagues, reminds him every day that he must be a judge for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I compliment my colleague from Washington State for the incredible job she does here every day, for the thoughtfulness she brings to this process, and the wonderful job she does representing the people of Washington State. She is a delight to work with and someone who I think brings to the table thoughtful consideration, with a strength and a courage and a wisdom that should make the people of Washington State proud, and I know it does.

I come here today after much thought and prayer over a decision

that is incredibly important. I agree with my colleague from Washington State that this is a time where our Nation needs much hope, whether it comes from the devastation we have seen in the gulf coast in the southern region of our Nation, whether it is the families of our soldiers who find themselves giving of themselves and of their families to protect the rights and the freedoms in which we in this Nation take great pride, and it is also as we come to the consideration of a Supreme Court nomination by the Senate which I find to be one of the most important and consequential duties we have as an institution in our system of Government.

I think the American people look to us now with hope that we will work in a bipartisan way, in a way of union, in uniting our Nation to bring about a coequal branch of our Government that can reassure the American people of justice and of hope.

This is especially true when the candidate being considered has been nominated to the position of Chief Justice of the United States, not simply an Associate Justice but someone who is going to provide the leadership to the highest Court in our land.

As the Senate performs its duty under the Constitution with regard to this nominee, I am also mindful this is the first Supreme Court nominee I have been called upon to evaluate as a Senator from the great State of Arkansas. I have no doubt this is one of the most important nominations I will consider during my tenure in public service.

Given the import of this decision for the future of this Nation and the responsibilities I have to my constituents and my country, I have examined all of the information available about Judge Roberts' nomination to ensure I have given this matter the full attention it needs and, most importantly, that it deserves.

In making my decision, I very carefully and deliberately reviewed the record compiled by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Further, I have considered the views of Arkansans, both those who think Judge Roberts will make a fine Supreme Court Justice and those who have real concerns about the direction he might lead this very important Court.

I have also met with Judge Roberts privately to get a better sense of who he is as a person, his temperament, and, most importantly, what his experiences have been in his life that may form his views and the interpretation of the Constitution.

Additionally, I have considered the views of his peers and colleagues in the legal community on both sides of the political spectrum who know Judge Roberts, who have worked with him firsthand and have a firsthand knowledge of his works and abilities.

Finally, I have prayed. I searched my conscience and reflected on my principles as a Senator for the people of the

State of Arkansas, using my experience, coming from the salt of the earth in east Arkansas, a farmer's daughter, my experience as a wife, a mother, a neighbor, to make what I believe is the right decision and one I will have to live with for the rest of my life.

I want to say at the outset this has been one of the hardest decisions I believe I have been called upon to make since I came to the Senate more than 6 years ago. It has been difficult because the consequences of confirming a new Chief Justice are so profound.

Judge Roberts will likely serve on the Court for several decades, and I believe he will have more influence on the future of our Nation than any Member who serves perhaps in this body today.

This decision has also been difficult for me because of the manner in which this administration has handled this nomination, in some respects, and certainly many other nominations that have come before it.

When President Bush first ran for office in 2000, he told the American people he was a uniter, not a divider. He talked about how well he had worked with Democrats as Governor of Texas and that he was going to continue that approach as President to change the tone in Washington. And, oh, how that tone in Washington needed to be changed.

But sadly, that did not happen. President Bush has not followed through on that promise, and judicial nominations, unfortunately, are one of the most glaring examples of where his administration has fallen short. In my opinion, this administration has gone out of its way to divide this Nation and the Senate on judicial nominations, which I think is truly a disservice to our judiciary and to the American people.

When the Senate rejected only a handful of Federal appeals court nominees during the President's first term in office, I expected a uniter who would work with Senators, who expressed concerns, and nominate other qualified candidates who could win confirmation with broad bipartisan support. Instead, after winning reelection, the President renominated many of the same controversial nominees and essentially dared the Senate to challenge him again.

Reflecting on the last 5 years, his administration apparently believes it is better for them politically to pick a fight over judicial nominees than it is to pick sometimes qualified nominees who have earned the support and respect from those on both sides of the aisle in the legal community in which they work and in the Senate.

As a pragmatic Democrat who has always been willing to find common ground and to work in good faith with members of both parties to serve the best interests of my constituents, I am alarmed by the confrontational approach this administration has taken.

We can all be proud of the Founders of this great Nation who created our

system of government, where they wisely divided the power of appointment and confirmation of the Federal court Justices between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. They did this to ensure only the most qualified candidates who had the confidence of the President and the Senate would be confirmed to a lifetime seat on the Federal bench.

I truly worry that the political tug of war over the judiciary, which President Bush has encouraged, threatens to undermine the judicial selection process and with it our framework of checks and balances which has preserved for centuries the rights and freedoms we cherish as Americans, not to mention the sense of pride and comfort or peace of mind it provides the American people to know that in that third coequal branch of Government, they can rest assured that their freedoms, their rights will be justly directed.

To work properly, the process depends on mutual trust and respect between the executive and the legislative branches, and when that trust and respect is strained, our ability to do our very best as a government, to preserve and to protect a fair and independent judiciary for future generations, becomes in jeopardy.

So it is into this atmosphere of political confrontation that Judge Roberts was nominated to the Supreme Court. And it is why, frankly, I have had difficulty separating my profound disappointment with the administration and the distrust it has fostered from my opinion of Judge Roberts as an individual. So to separate that opinion of Judge Roberts that I needed to develop as an individual, as a lawyer, and potentially the next Chief Justice of the United States, ultimately, I concluded it is unfair to hold Judge Roberts accountable for the actions of the President who appointed him.

As I have set aside the history of the last 5 years to take a closer look at this nominee, it has become apparent to me that Judge Roberts does meet the test I believe we should strive to achieve in the judicial selection process. After careful thought and deliberation, I have concluded Judge Roberts is a very smart man who has an enormous respect for the law.

There is no question in my mind that Judge Roberts has the legal skills and the intellect necessary to perform his duties on the Supreme Court. He has impeccable academic credentials and has demonstrated an impressive command of the law and Constitution throughout his professional career and during his recent confirmation hearings.

I also believe that above all else, Judge Roberts is devoted to the Constitution and the institutional integrity of the judiciary and the vital role it plays in our system of Government.

I have no doubt John Roberts is a Republican, like the President who appointed him. But I don't believe his party affiliation will prevent him from

giving both sides in each case before the Court a fair and impartial hearing.

Simply put, I believe John Roberts cares more about following the law and maintaining the respect for the judiciary than he does about politics and ideology.

I base this conclusion on the respect and support he has earned from lawyers and colleagues on both sides of the aisle who know Judge Roberts well—they know him far better than I do—on the evidence in the record from his own comments and those of his colleagues that he has had an abiding respect for the Court's decisions and that he understands the value of continuity in the law, and on his distinguished career as a lawyer and advocate before the Federal judiciary over many years.

I regret Judge Roberts has made this decision more difficult than it needed to be by refusing to be more forthcoming about his views on protections in the Constitution for individuals, especially as those protections and guarantees relate to civil rights and gender equality.

As many of my colleagues have already mentioned, Judge Roberts wrote several memos when he worked in the Reagan administration in which he advocated for a narrow application of Federal antidiscrimination statutes, specifically the Voting Rights Act and title IX. Judge Roberts indicated in his response to questions about these memos during his confirmation hearings that he was representing the views of his client, the administration, without elaborating on whether he held those same views today.

He stated he could not say more regarding his views on those subjects because to do so might undermine his ability, if confirmed, to impartially consider similar cases that are likely to come before the Court.

I believe he could have said more on those and other issues before crossing that line, but I don't believe Judge Roberts is entirely to blame for failing to be more responsive.

The partisan atmosphere which pervades the confirmation process today almost guarantees that Senators are left with no choice but to ask legitimate questions of a Supreme Court nominee they know will not be answered. So the Senate is left to make a decision based on the limited information provided during the confirmation process and from a nominee's previous work and life experience.

My vote for John Roberts is by no means an endorsement of his nomination process, nor is it an endorsement of the decision by the administration to withhold documents from Judge Roberts' tenure in the Solicitor General's Office during the first Bush administration. That would be helpful to Senators in forming an opinion about this nomination. These are the types of documents previous administrations have made available to the Senate during the consideration of Supreme Court nominees in the past. There is no rea-

son to have not made them available in this instance. Future nominees to the Supreme Court, or any lifetime judicial position, may not possess the same outstanding personal qualities and impeccable reputation that helped Judge Roberts overcome his failure, and the failure of the administration, to respond more fully to legitimate requests for information. Indeed, there have been past nominees who have failed to receive Senate confirmation, at least partially because they refused to answer questions or release documents.

I feel that I have done my level best, despite my misgivings about the actions of this administration in the past, to fairly and carefully and in good faith evaluate this nomination, which is my duty as a Senator. I believe I have done that. It is my hope and expectation that, if confirmed, Judge Roberts will do likewise with respect to every litigant who comes before the Court, especially those who have not experienced the same opportunities with which he has been so richly blessed.

I believe Judge Roberts will do that, and therefore I will support his nomination. I join my other colleagues who look to leadership in hopes, in hopes that we can mend many of the fences and the difficulties that have been conjured up by very partisan attitudes in these nomination processes, but to look toward Judge Roberts in a way that understands and takes in full faith his commitment that he will administer the law through the courts in a just way, without regard for his political or personal views but with the kind of sincere devotion to the Constitution and the rule of law and the precedent of the courts that he has expressed to many of us personally; that he will move forward, and deal with every litigant who comes before him in Court in a fair and just way.

In closing, I wish to comment briefly on the future as we move beyond this nomination. When I first ran for office as a young single woman in the early 1990s, I did so because I had hope, hope that I could improve my Government and make it more responsive to the needs of the citizens of my State. Perhaps my greatest attribute was the fact that I was naive. It never occurred to me that I didn't belong here; perhaps that as a young woman, this might have been a place a little bit out of touch for me. But I ran because I believed in my country, I believed in the people of my home State, and I believed in what I had to offer.

I see a good bit of that in Judge Roberts as well. I have tried my best each day that I have been privileged to serve in public office to fulfill that commitment, and today I still have great hope for our Nation's future and its government. I also have hope that we can improve the judicial nomination process as we move forward if all people of good will on both sides of the aisle will work together in a spirit of cooperation and good faith. I stand ready to do

my part to overcome our differences as a nation because I believe our country is so much stronger if we are united and not divided.

As we prepare to consider a second Supreme Court nominee in the coming weeks, I hope President Bush will take that opportunity to do the same.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I note the time is under Democratic control.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I was aware of that. I was asking if there are any Democrats who would object to my starting my comments at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arkansas goes, I do not have prepared remarks, but to try to put her a little bit at ease about these decisions that we have to make on the Supreme Court because they are very important decisions, I would reflect on some history.

For instance, I probably had the same concerns about President Clinton and Justice Breyer and Justice Ginsburg when I voted for them. Regarding the political positions that Justice Ginsburg stood for in her life before coming to be a judge, I wouldn't agree with many of them. But she was totally qualified to be on the Supreme Court, and I voted for her based upon the proposition that Alexander Hamilton said that the purpose of our activities here of confirming people for the courts is basically two. Maybe there is some historian around who will say GRASSLEY has it all wrong, but I think it was, No. 1, to make sure that people who were not qualified did not get on the courts. In other words, only qualified people get appointed to the courts and that political hacks do not get appointed to the courts.

That is somebody who was around when the Constitution was written, and the Federalist Papers, stating those things about our role. So I have a fairly flexible point of view of how I ought to look at people, even those with whom I disagree.

In regard to what the Senator said about hoping what President Bush would do, or what he has done in the past in regard to these appointments, I would want you to look at that as I looked at President Clinton being elected in 1992. I don't know whether court appointments were an issue in that campaign as they were in 2000 or 2004, but I assume that he had a mandate to appoint whom he wanted appointed, as long as they were not political hacks and as long as they were qualified. So I gave President Clinton that leeway.

I am hoping that even more so with President Bush, since he made very clear to the people of this country that he was going to appoint strict constructionists and people who were not going to legislate from the bench. You may not like what he is doing, but he

is doing exactly what he said he was going to do, and I hope that would enhance credibility to the American people of at least one more politician who keeps his word when he is in office. He appoints whom he said he was going to appoint, and that is what he is doing here. It should not be any surprise, and I hope he would be respected for doing that and have leeway in doing that, as long as they are not political hacks but they are qualified.

The other one is, over a long period of time, to maybe take away some worry about whether or not we have to be concerned about this specific person doing exactly what he said he was going to do. I would refer to Judge Souter. I was thinking Judge Souter was maybe not exactly whom I would want on the Court, but he would be pretty close to it. During that debate—I think it was in committee and not on the floor—there was one of the Senators on your side, who I have named but I will not name him this time, who made this point about Justice Souter—that he didn't have respect for the right to privacy and then was a threat to *Roe v. Wade*.

Here is one Republican who thought maybe Souter would work out OK, from my point of view. There was a Democrat over there who thought Souter would be a threat to *Roe V. Wade*. We were both wrong.

So it is difficult to predict what people are going to do down the road, so you have to look at are they qualified. I don't have any doubt but that Judge Souter is qualified to be on the Court. But I misjudged him and this Democratic Senator also misjudged him.

The other one is, if you worry about Republicans, to look at what they might appoint versus what Democrats might appoint, and you end up getting something from a Republican you don't like. I assume you are more to the liberal end than the conservative, and you have to stop to think that a Republican appointed John Paul Stevens and a Republican appointed Justice Souter, two of the four most liberal people on the Supreme Court.

To some extent, you get what you want from a Republican President as much as you do from a Democratic President because the other two were appointed by President Clinton.

Then, also, from a historical standpoint, time brings a great deal of balance to the Court. Justices change their views sometimes over a period of 25 or 30 years on the Court. Or Presidents that you might be thinking are appointing conservatives end up appointing liberals—they end up being liberals on the Supreme Court.

History is going to bring balance to the Court. Right now, if Justice Roberts is appointed, we will have four liberals. I don't need to name them. Everyone understands who they are. You are going to have three conservatives: Roberts, Scalia and Thomas. And then you are going to have two moderates, Kennedy and O'Connor—O'Connor for a

little while now. So you have some balance, but it is tilted a little bit more toward the liberal side than it is to the conservative side.

Maybe, when President Bush gets done with this next nominee, there will be even more balance, four conservatives and four liberals and one moderate, Justice Kennedy left as a moderate.

Then I keep thinking about what we ought to do if we want to bring balance to the Court, and I hear more about that on your side than I do on this side: Let's just say that Justice Ginsburg, obviously a woman, and Justice O'Connor is obviously a woman; we have two women, so maybe we ought to have a woman appointed to the Supreme Court.

The liberal women of America have Justice Ginsburg as voting the way that they think Justices ought to vote. Maybe the conservative women of America are entitled to a seat on the Supreme Court. We might be fortunate enough to get appointed a very qualified woman who is also a strict constructionist. Then we would have one liberal woman and we would have one conservative woman on the Supreme Court, and we have even more balance brought to the Court.

So you see history kind of takes care of these things. I hope 25 years from now—and you are a lot younger than I am and you will be around here 25 years from now—that you are satisfied that history will take care of all these problems that are brought up about what the Supreme Court might do 10 or 15 years from now.

Mrs. LINCOLN. If the Senator will yield, I want to say how grateful I am to my chairman because he always does provide hopefulness, without a doubt, as well as a bipartisan attitude, in trying to get things done.

I guess you are exactly right. Some of my fear comes from the role that I have in helping to create history and the thoughtfulness that I need to put into it.

Some of it also certainly comes from recognizing that there is a right way and a wrong way to do everything. My hope is, as we go through these processes, that we become a more united body, looking at the right way to go about things and a more unified way.

I am grateful to the chairman. He is always a wonderful Member of this body to work with and he always brings balance and hopefulness and I am glad he is my chairman.

Mr. GRASSLEY. She said she is glad I am her chairman. She means she and I serve on the Finance Committee together. I don't want to mislead the audience, I am not chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I will proceed, then, with the remarks I wanted to make in regard to my support for Judge John Roberts to be the next Chief Justice of the United States. I do support that nomination. Judge Roberts has earned our vote. He understands the proper

role of a judge in our constitutional democracy. He understands the courts are not superlegislatures.

He understands that I am elected to be a legislator, to make law. If people do not like the law I make, they can vote me out of office. But if Judge Roberts makes law, with a lifetime appointment to the Court, he can never be voted out of office unless he is impeached. He understands that the courts are not responsible for addressing every social ill or injustice that, in fact, ought to be settled through law and public policy. He understands that courts do not create new rights. Rather, courts protect those liberties and rights guaranteed by our Constitution and the laws appropriately enacted by Congress and State legislatures.

He also understands that there are a great deal—infinitesimal—number of unenumerated rights out there for you and me that are reserved under our Constitution to the States and to the people thereof.

Judge Roberts said this to the committee:

Judges and Justices are servants of the law, not the other way around. Judges are like umpires. Umpires don't make rules, they apply them.

Judge Roberts underscores that "judges and Justices" make sure everybody plays by the rules. But these rules limiting the power of Government over the people apply to the courts as well. He made it very clear to us. In Judge Roberts' view, "Not everybody went to a ball game to see the umpire."

That is the right approach to the job of a Supreme Court Justice.

Judge Roberts has demonstrated, particularly to the committee, that he understands the limited nature of judges, and especially the humility and the modesty necessary to be the kind of judge we need on our highest Court. Judge Roberts believes that courts may act only to decide cases and controversies. That is exactly what it says in article III of the Constitution. So judges cannot address every unaddressed and unremedied social problem.

Judge Roberts said:

Judges have to decide hard questions when they come up in the context of a particular case. That is their obligation. But they have to decide those questions according to the rule of law, not their own social preferences, not their policy views, not their personal preferences but according to the rule of law.

That is what he told us in committee.

Judge Roberts also said:

We don't turn a matter over to a judge because we want his view about what the best idea is, what the best solution is. It is because we want him or her to apply the law. Let me say parenthetically, as I would interpret that, not to make law, but to apply the law.

He went on to say:

They—

Meaning judges—

are constrained when they do that. They are constrained by the words that I choose to

enact into law in interpreting that law. They are constrained by the words of the Constitution. They are constrained by the precedents of the other judges that became part of the rule of law that they must apply.

This answer he gave to the committee demonstrates that Judge Roberts believes in and will exercise judicial restraint on the bench. This principle of judicial restraint is a cornerstone of our constitutional system, best defined by the tenth amendment—that that power is not specifically given to the Federal Government or reserved to the States and the people thereof. This is the defining characteristic of the judiciary in our Government of divided powers.

In particular, I was pleased when Judge Roberts told the committee that he has no agenda to bring to the bench. I want to remind you what Judge Roberts said in a very short opening statement. To quote a little bit of it:

I come before the committee with no agenda. I have no platform. Judges are not politicians who can promise to do certain things in exchange for votes. I have no agenda but I do have a commitment. If I am confirmed, I will confront every case with an open mind. I will fully and fairly analyze the legal arguments that are presented. I will be open to the considered views of my colleagues on the bench, and I will decide every case based on the record according to the rule of law, without fear or favor, to the best of my ability, and I will remember that it's my job to call the balls and strikes and not to pitch or bat.

I was also pleased when Judge Roberts told the committee that:

I had someone ask me in this process: Are you going to be on the side of the little guy? And you obviously want to give an immediate answer. But as you reflect on it, if the Constitution says that the little guy should win, the little guy is going to win in court before me. But if the Constitution says that the big guy should win, well, then the big guy is going to win because my obligation is to the Constitution. That's my oath.

So, obviously, Judge Roberts will strive to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States, regardless of his personal beliefs.

I want to take a little time to commend Chairman SPECTER for conducting a fair and respectful hearing. I am pleased we are looking at a timely up-or-down vote on this nominee. Obviously, so many people for so long were inclined to filibuster judges, and to have this important person—this “well-qualified” person—go through in the tradition of the Senate doing what the Constitution says to do, give its advice and consent with a 51-vote margin, is something that surprises me to some extent after the last 2 years. But to have it happen gives me a very warm feeling toward all my colleagues for having that up-or-down vote.

Article II of the Constitution puts the appointment power in the executive, and says the President gets to nominate the person of his choice to the Supreme Court. And President Bush in an unprecedented manner consulted with more than 70 Senators on both sides of the aisle before sending up Judge Roberts' nomination. Presi-

dent Bush didn't have to do that under the Constitution. But it was wise for him to do so.

Even though I have been a member of the Judiciary Committee for my 25th year, I don't remember a President who has talked to me about who I think ought to be appointed. I wouldn't want to say over 25 years that I couldn't have forgotten some Republican or Democrat talking to me about it, but I don't remember. I was consulted by this President on the type of person I thought should be nominated. I was even offered to give names, if I wanted to. And I took advantage of giving my advice to him.

At the hearing which Senator SPECTER conducted, Senators were able to ask numerous questions of the nominee over a period of 3 days. The Judiciary Committee also reviewed thousands of documents, opinions, and other information produced by the White House.

Throughout the process, Judge Roberts was patient; he was candid and forthcoming in his responses.

Judge Roberts clearly has been the most scrutinized judicial nominee to come before the Senate in my years on the committee. No nominee in these years before the committee has testified as thoroughly and comprehensively on his judicial philosophy as Judge Roberts. I have gone through 10 Supreme Court hearings. Judge Roberts' command of the law and the facts of cases was without precedent.

Still, some of my colleagues objected to Judge Roberts' refusal to review the results of cases. But his refusal was absolutely the right thing to do. Judge Roberts wisely resisted the bait to confuse results and reasoning when it comes to the judicial function. No doubt this greatly frustrated some of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, who wanted to impose litmus tests on all judicial nominees, who want to extract commitments from nominees to rule in a predetermined way, their political way, regardless of the facts of the law.

If they can't get that, if they can't get allegiance to their personal political predilection, and work with their far-left activist groups, well, then it seems as though that nominee isn't worthy of their vote.

It stymies me why it would be wrong for the President of the United States to ask a nominee if they support *Roe v. Wade* or not—and Judge Roberts under oath answered the question of whether the President discussed it with him, and the President didn't discuss it with him—but a lot of Senators were saying, or at least implying, that it would be wrong for the President to get that sort of litmus test type of commitment from a nominee, but some of those very same Senators found it not in the least bothering their conscience to ask him exactly that same question and expect an answer from him.

Frankly, I have no way of knowing how Judge Roberts will rule on the hot-button issues in the next 25 years.

I acknowledge that he might rule in ways that will disappoint me in some of the same ways that I was disappointed by Justice O'Connor, Justice Kennedy, and Justice Souter in the years since they have been on the Court. These were all nominees I supported through the Supreme Court confirmation process, but no Senator has a right to impose his or her particular litmus test on an otherwise qualified nominee.

I voted, as I said earlier to the Senator from Arkansas, for Ruth Bader Ginsburg, as did almost all of my Republican colleagues, because we acknowledge the President's—that was President Clinton—primacy in the appointments to the Supreme Court, even where we knew this Justice Ginsburg had a different philosophy. I knew then that I shared very little in terms of political, social, or philosophical views of Ruth Bader Ginsburg. As everyone knows now, Judge Ginsburg was then affiliated very closely with extremely liberal views—views a majority of the American public would deem way out of the mainstream. But the Judiciary Committee evaluated her as a fully competent person to serve on the Supreme Court. And then because of that, because we were doing what we should constitutionally be doing, we voted her in 96 to 3.

As I said in committee, it seems there is a whole new ball game out here when we have an individual with the competence, intelligence, and brilliance of Judge Roberts who nonetheless is going to get a lot of Democrats voting against him. This says far more about the Democrats today than it does about the nominee John Roberts.

The truth is that at another time Judge Roberts would have been confirmed 100 to 0, and properly so, as Justice Scalia 20 years ago was approved almost unanimously. Today's Democrats have made the needle's eye for approving so small, so impossibly tiny, even the Supreme Court giants of the past could never pass through it.

The reality is that today's Democrat Party seems to be beholden to far left pressure groups who know their radical agenda for America can only be implemented by judicial fiat. I am sad to say that the other party has expressed an unquestionable loyalty to what is probably their base but a base out of touch with the vast majority of Americans.

When we finally cast our vote on the nomination of Judge Roberts, most Senate Democrats will show they will be voting in lockstep with the demands of their leftwing interest groups regardless of how qualified, brilliant, or worthy the nominee is.

On the other hand, I have to admit since I prepared these remarks, I have heard speeches by two Members of that party within the last hour who I did not think would come to the conclusion of voting for him, who have said within the last hour they were going to vote for Judge Roberts. I am pleased with that.

But we still have a situation that has been demonstrated over the last 3 years, up until May of this year when some judges finally got through for the circuits, that judges were being held up for very partisan reasons. The other party and their outside groups have their own agenda. They want the Supreme Court or courts, generally, to implement it, particularly things they might not be able to get through the Congress of the United States.

My colleagues like to say they voted for more judges appointed by Republican Presidents than judges appointed by Democrat Presidents. But my friends on the other side of the aisle who say this, are not telling the whole picture. Sure, they voted for a lot of Republican nominees during my time in the Senate. More Republican nominees have been sent up for consideration than Democrat nominees. The point is, the Democrats have stuck like glue to their outside interest groups through thick and thin and voted in lockstep against more Republican-appointed judges than Republicans have voted against Democrat-appointed judges. That has been by a landslide margin.

The fact is, a majority of the Democrats voted in lockstep against Judge Bork and Justice Thomas. A majority of Democrats voted in lockstep against Justice Rehnquist when he was elevated to Chief Justice.

On the other hand, Republicans voted overwhelmingly for President Clinton's two liberal nominees, Justices Ginsburg and Breyer. So I think my party has shown it is not wedded to the single-issue interest groups.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are weaving revisionist history saying the more conservative Justices of the Court, such as Scalia and Thomas, are the ones who are really the judicial activists on the bench. But we all know this is just not true.

The American people know what is really going on. The liberal leftwing interest groups and Senate enablers, as my friend, Senator HATCH, has sometimes called them, want to win in the courtroom what they cannot win in the ballot box. The Democrats have taken this to a new level. They are already talking about filibustering the next nominee, and we do not even know who that is yet. They are really the ones who are judicial activists.

We should take care because the independence of the Federal judiciary is at stake. Our entire framework of government as we know it and was intended by the Framers is at stake.

We are told the Democrats are laying the groundwork for the next Supreme Court nominee by sending a message, I presume, to the President and those of this party. These messages are an argument that Justice O'Connor must be replaced by a liberal or moderate, and that individual should be a woman or another minority, claiming the balance of the Court must be maintained at all costs.

I hope I made this clear in my comments that Senator LINCOLN listened to so closely, and that was that history takes care of a lot of this. Of the four liberals on the Supreme Court today, two were appointed by Republicans, President Ford and President Bush 1. The moderates, O'Connor and Kennedy, were appointed by a Republican President. So we do not know what we get. I wish we did. I wish we could predict 25 years from now, but we can't.

The Democrats did not expect President Clinton to appoint a moderate judge to replace Justice Byron White. I remind my colleagues that Justice White was one of the two Justices who dissented in *Roe v. Wade*. We Republicans did not say: Well, Justice White is retiring so we need to make sure we appoint another person like Justice White to the Supreme Court. President Clinton wasn't elected to appoint people the Republicans wanted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time from 6:20 to 7:20 is under the control of the Democrat side, if the Senator would like to ask unanimous consent to finish his remarks.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent for 3 or 4 more minutes.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. So we get appointments such as Ruth Bader Ginsburg, totally qualified to be on the Court. I voted for her; Justice Breyer, totally qualified to be on the Court, I voted for him. We did not try to second-guess President Clinton.

Clearly, Justice Ginsburg does not share Justice White's philosophy. Yet Senate Republicans overwhelmingly confirmed her, with only three "nay" votes. The fact is, the President picked people they thought would be good Justices.

The bottom line is we should not be thinking of liberal, conservative, or moderate judges—men or women for that matter. We ought to think of who is qualified. If you are qualified for the job, you ought to get the vote of the Senate. Someone who has the right temperament and integrity on the job is also a requirement. But these liberals I voted for have had that as well.

Judge Roberts recognized this problem, politicizing the Federal bench, and in particular the Supreme Court, when some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle attempted to pin him down on certain litmus test questions at his nomination hearings. Judge Roberts said:

[I]t is a very serious threat to the independence and integrity of the court to politicize them. I think that is not a good development to regard the courts as simply an extension of the political process. That's not what they are.

Judge Roberts went on to say:

Judges go on the bench and they apply and decide cases according to judicial process, not on the basis of promises made earlier to get elected and promises made earlier to get confirmed. That's inconsistent with the independence and integrity of the Supreme Court.

I am in total agreement with that statement. So when Judge Roberts testifies his oath is to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States and that he won't impose a political or social agenda in his decision-making, that is what we need to hear. That is because the bottom line is, irrespective of Judge Roberts' impressive resume, brilliant intellect, and personal integrity, he would not be qualified to be a Supreme Court Justice unless he was truly willing and able to subject himself to that judicial restraint.

Judge Roberts says his obligation is to the Constitution and that is his oath. He says he will not impose his personal views on the people but will make decisions in an impartial manner in accordance with the Constitution, the laws enacted by Congress. He says he will be modest in his judging and exercise judicial restraint. He says he will respect the limited role of a judge in society. That is the kind of Justice we need to see on the Supreme Court. That is the kind of Justice the Senate should support.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, generally when we vote, the decisions we make can be revisited within a few months or years. This year's appropriations policy can be replaced by a new one next year. Unintended consequences can be rectified, legislation fine tuned.

But the consequences of confirming a Supreme Court Justice last well beyond a Senator's term and maybe even his or her life. Given Judge John Roberts' age, he may be making critical decisions on constitutional rights when my newborn grandson is welcoming children of his own into this world.

Not surprisingly then, I consider voting on the confirmation of a Supreme Court Justice, and especially the Chief Justice, one of the most important responsibilities of a Senator.

While I have considered and voted on four Supreme Court nominees during my tenure in the Senate, the nomination of Judge Roberts to be the 17th Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court is my first chance to consider the nomination of an individual to be the Chief Justice.

I have spent a great deal of time the last few weeks considering this nomination. I looked at Judge Roberts' decisions during his tenure on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, reviewed the memorandums he wrote while working in the Reagan administration, watched the nomination hearing, and listened to what my Senate colleagues have said on this nomination. After considering all of this, I have decided to support Judge Roberts' nomination to be Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

My decision to support Judge Roberts did not come easily. As my father, who served as the Chief Justice of the Vermont Supreme Court, first taught me, the law trumps any personal beliefs when a judge is working to reach

a decision on a case. A fair, equal application of the law is what Olin Jeffords was known for, which is a reflection of Vermont's view of the judiciary.

As the former attorney general in Vermont, and as a lawyer, I have always been deeply devoted to the Framers' concept of an independent judiciary filled with intelligent, capable individuals serving the law and the public. As a Senator, I have watched in dismay as this independence has increasingly been threatened and demeaned by partisan bickering.

It has been my general policy while in the Senate to support the executive branch nominations made by a President, provided the individual is appropriately qualified and capable of performing the duties required of the position. However, while a position in the executive branch lasts only as long as the President remains in office, an appointment to the Federal bench is for the life of the nominee.

I believe it would be illogical to assume that our Founding Fathers used the phrase, ". . . with the Advice and Consent of the Senate . . ." in the Constitution to mean the Senate can only look at the legal experience and character of a judicial nominee. So in addition to those factors I also look at a nominee's judicial temperament and ideology and whether these factors will influence the decisions they make.

This higher standard is especially appropriate for a nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court. This Court is the final authority on the meaning of laws and the U.S. Constitution. The Supreme Court gives meaning to what is the scope of the right of privacy; whether Vermont's limits on campaign contributions and spending are constitutional; what is an unreasonable search and seizure; how expansive the power of the president can be; or whether Congress exceeded its power in passing a law. These are issues that affect everyone, and it is the responsibility of the Senate to closely and carefully review every nominee to the Supreme Court.

There are clearly many stances Judge Roberts took as a lawyer in the Reagan administration that I do not agree with. Here it is unfortunate the Senate has been denied access to the memorandums Judge Roberts wrote while part of the Solicitor General's office. These documents would have provided a more complete picture.

From the record we have, nobody has raised a question on whether Judge Roberts has the proper legal experience or character to be the next Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. It also appears to me from a review of his judicial decisions that Judge Roberts has not allowed his judicial temperament or ideology to influence his decision-making process.

This belief was reinforced by Judge Roberts himself in sworn statements he made to the Senate Judiciary Committee. In his opening statement Judge Roberts stated, "I have no platform."

He also said, that he would "confront every case with an open mind . . . And I will decide every case based on the record, according to the rule of law, without fear or favor, to the best of my ability." Near the end of 3 days of testimony Judge Roberts reiterated this view when he said, "I set those personal views aside."

With the information and sworn testimony on the record it is clear Judge Roberts has the necessary legal experience and character to be the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. It also appears that Judge Roberts will use the law and the Constitution to make his judicial decisions, not his ideological or personal beliefs. Judge Roberts gave this pledge at the conclusion of his opening remarks, "I will be vigilant to protect the independence and integrity of the Supreme Court, and I will work to ensure that it upholds the rule of law and safeguards those liberties that make this land one of endless possibilities for all Americans." I trust he will stay true to these words during his tenure as Chief Justice. History will be the judge.

Finally, let me acknowledge and thank the Senate Judiciary Committee. Senators SPECTER and LEAHY led a dignified, bipartisan and thorough hearing on Judge Roberts. For all this hard work they deserve our thanks and appreciation.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the nomination of Judge John Roberts to become Chief Justice of the United States. If confirmed, which is widely expected, Judge Roberts would be the seventeenth Chief Justice in Nation's history. As such, this nomination is historically significant, both in its relative rarity and its potentially lasting impact on our judiciary. The confirmation process therefore warrants serious, meaningful, and dignified consideration by the Senate. I believe that the Senate has met this responsibility over the past weeks, in spite of the efforts by outside groups and the urgings of some members to turn the process into something much different. After closely following the confirmation hearings and careful review of the nominee, I strongly support President Bush's nomination of Judge Roberts to be the next Chief Justice.

Let me first start by saying the obvious, Judge Roberts is an incredibly talented and gifted attorney. Armed with a sharp legal mind and extensive experience making arguments before the Supreme Court, this man is truly one of the best in a very select group of legal superstars—namely, the exclusive club of Supreme Court appellate specialists. Judge Roberts has therefore rightfully received broad praise from coworkers and from all corners of the legal community. He also is respected by the very Justices whom he may soon be sitting alongside, and he has served our Nation ably on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. We are all familiar with these facts, and even my col-

leagues who somehow oppose this nomination have not questioned Judge Roberts' intellect or legal skills.

Judge Roberts has testified, under oath, about his views regarding the proper constitutional role of a Supreme Court Justice and the judiciary branch overall. Consistently and repeatedly, he has said that Justices and judges should approach each case with an open mind and decide cases according to the rule of law—and not based on their own personal preferences or policy views. Judge Roberts has testified, again under oath, that he would fully and fairly analyze the legal arguments that come before the Court. He has made it clear that judges are not politicians or legislators, and that he is committed to upholding the cherished liberties and rights that are enshrined in our constitution. Roberts also has stated, under oath, that he is mindful of precedent, recognizes constitutional protections for the right to privacy, and strongly believes in protecting the judiciary's independence.

During 20 hours of oral testimony and after responding to approximately 500 questions, Judge Roberts made it clear—consistent with past precedent for other nominees—that he is not going to comment on unsettled areas of law that may come before the Supreme Court. Although some outside groups and some of my colleagues chafe at such comments, it is wholly appropriate and, in fact, ethically required to protect the Court's integrity. Moreover, many of these same individuals seeking a change in precedent did not complain when previous judicial nominees invoked this requirement, such as now Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, whom I supported back in 1993 during her confirmation proceedings. But now, sadly, it appears that some of my colleagues want judicial nominees, or at least those nominated by President Bush, to start issuing opinions on future cases even before the nominees are confirmed, before the facts of the cases are ascertained, and before both sides present their legal arguments before the Court.

This focus on litmus tests and political, even religious, ideology during the confirmation process not only undermines the Supreme Court's role—namely, that of an impartial arbiter of the most important cases—but also represents a potentially dangerous evolution in the history of the confirmation process. Throughout the history of the Senate, Supreme Court nominees have not been expected to swear under oath what their opinions will be on unsettled areas of law. I believe that this is a good thing. If the confirmation process were to become a series of litmus tests and ideological hurdles, the Senate would be politicizing the one branch of government that the Founding Fathers intended to be above politics. The men and women who serve on the Federal bench would no longer be determined on the basis of their legal qualifications and dedication to uphold

the rule of law, but mainly based on who wins at the ballot box and on certain hot button issues. Is this what we or the American people want?

I am hopeful that the Senate will not go down this path and establish a precedent that we will someday look back on with regret. Fortunately, most of my colleagues, led by the majority leader, share this same hope and have done an admirable job throughout the Senate's review of the Roberts nomination. They have stayed true to the Senate's proper role under the Constitution and to what truly matters when confirming a judicial nominee. I would never want to come before a court knowing that the judge already has made up his mind based on certain personal views and therefore I will never get a fair hearing. Rather, I want someone who is bright, considerate of different viewpoints, experienced, and dedicated to upholding the rule of law with the Constitution as his guide. In his life, career, and under oath, Judge Roberts already has shown that he would be precisely this type of Chief Justice. In fact, I cannot recall a judicial nominee in recent memory that lives up to this ideal as much as Judge Roberts. As a result, I am pleased to support this nomination and applaud President Bush for making such an outstanding choice.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I had the privilege and honor of meeting with Judge Roberts. I was impressed by his legal scholarship, but expressed a hope that he would be forthright and open with the American people as he progressed through the Senate confirmation process. Although I must regretfully conclude that there are still questions outstanding on Judge Roberts' record, in light of the urgency of ensuring that our Nation's Supreme Court has its full complement of Justices, I agree with my Democratic and Republican colleagues that his nomination should be given an up-or-down vote.

I have studied the development of the Supreme Court by our Founding Fathers, and it is apparent to me that our Nation's leaders did not want this group of citizens to be subjected to the political pressures of the day, so they provided for lifetime appointments, with no termination date. Further, candidates were not required to be lawyers, perhaps as a reminder that legal brilliance alone does not qualify a man or woman to sit on the bench of our highest court. Integrity, compassion, and wisdom are also required in equal—or perhaps greater—measure.

Reconciling lifetime appointments with the demands of democratic elections, created understandable consternation. After much debate, our Founding Fathers provided that the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government would employ every means available to them to make certain that the selection is a wise one, and one that a nation could live with for the lifetime of the judge. Today, we walk again the careful path laid out by

the Founding Fathers to ensure for the American people that Judge Roberts is a man worthy of their trust.

Fully realizing that Judge Roberts will most certainly receive substantial support from the Senate, I will cast my vote against this appointment. I do not object to Judge Roberts' politics, nor do I object to his personal beliefs. Our democracy guarantees him both the freedom to think and speak as he chooses, and the opportunity to ascend to any position in our government for which he is qualified.

My concerns lie instead with the failure of the Department of Justice and the White House to honor the request of members of the Senate Judiciary Committee to make available certain documents relating to 16 cases Judge Roberts worked on when he served as Principal Deputy Solicitor General. These documents, written during Judge Roberts' tenure in his most senior executive branch position, are relevant to the Senate's evaluation of his fitness to serve as the Chief Justice of the highest court of this land.

I am not suggesting that these documents might contain dark shadows—far from it. The refusal of the White House to allow the American people to see this corner of Judge Roberts' record, however, deviates from the careful road our Founding Fathers paved for us so many years ago, and leaves Americans wondering, "Do those papers hide something I should know?"

Many groups have questioned Judge Roberts' position on civil rights. His early writings outline defiance toward review of civil rights violations by Federal courts, and many have asked how his views have evolved over the years. As one who has spent his life fighting against baseless prejudice and discrimination, I share these concerns. Would the papers withheld from our sight have answered these questions? We will never know.

Throughout my career I have supported a woman's right to choose. I have supported *Roe v. Wade*. I have also supported stem cell research. The responses Judge Roberts provided when questioned about these issues did not assure me that these questions would be seriously considered. I hope I am wrong. Perhaps the papers hidden from our sight would have allayed my fears.

Similarly, my questions on Judge Roberts' thoughts on the death penalty, and habeas corpus review by the Federal courts will never be answered.

I am not against the person. As I noted, I am impressed by his legal scholarship. Although we seem to differ on the fundamental issues of the day, I respect his right to freely form and hold his own opinions. I do, however, object to the failure of the White House, the Department of Justice, and ultimately Judge Roberts himself, to make available documents from his past. The American people deserve a nominee unclouded by needless secrecy—and our democratic heritage demands that the President and the Con-

gress work together to confirm the worthiness of any man or woman to sit as a Supreme Court Justice. To affirm my allegiance to these most American of principles, I will vote, "no."

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, after careful consideration, I will support the nomination of Judge John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

When he was nominated by President Bush in July, it was clear that Judge Roberts had the necessary professional qualifications to sit on the Supreme Court. He graduated from Harvard College, *summa cum laude*, in 1976, and received his law degree, *magna cum laude*, in 1979 from the Harvard Law School where he was managing editor of the *Harvard Law Review*.

Mr. Roberts clerked for Judge Henry J. Friendly of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and for then-Associate Justice William H. Rehnquist.

John Roberts has served his country twice, working for the President. First, he served as Special Assistant to United States Attorney General William French Smith. He returned to government service in the first Bush administration, serving as Principal Deputy Solicitor General of the United States.

As a lawyer, Roberts has presented 39 oral arguments before the Supreme Court covering the full range of the Court's jurisdiction, including admiralty, antitrust, arbitration, environmental law, first amendment, health care law, Indian law, bankruptcy, tax, regulation of financial institutions, administrative law, labor law, federal jurisdiction and procedure, interstate commerce, civil rights, and criminal law.

During the hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senators extensively probed the judicial philosophy of Judge Roberts. I think our colleagues Senator SPECTER and Senator LEAHY did an excellent job and conducted a fair and thorough hearing.

We do not know how Judge Roberts will rule in many cases. What we do know is that he was nominated by a President who, in the glare of the lights of a campaign, clearly indicated the type of Supreme Court nominee that he would favor. We also know that Judge Roberts is an extraordinarily accomplished man with the right temperament.

I have long noted that I believe we must retain an appropriate balance on the Supreme Court. I was pleased that during the hearings, Judge Roberts unequivocally acknowledged that the Constitution contains a right to privacy. He further testified that the right to privacy is not a narrow right. He explained his belief that the right to privacy was sufficiently broad to allow the courts to apply it to changing circumstances. It was important to hear Judge Roberts state that as a Supreme Court justice, he would strive to follow precedent in order to ensure stability in the law.

I wish Judge Roberts well as he takes his seat as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, 25 years from now most of the events and personalities of September 2005 will have passed into the pages of history. New Orleans will once again stand proudly as one of America's most vibrant cities; America will have been forced to address our need for energy independence; and the legacies of today's politicians will be the work of tomorrow's history professors. However, the confirmation of John Roberts as the 17th Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court could well be even more significant in 2030 than it is today. The Roberts Court will have a profound and historic impact on the preservation of liberty for decades to come.

I first met John Roberts when we both served in the Reagan administration in the early 1980s. He is a person of enormous intelligence, character and judgement. His performance in his Senate confirmation hearings earlier this month transcended television ads, internet blogs, television talking heads, and the million dollar industry that reduces the judicial nominations process to caricatures and buzz words across the political spectrum. As many of my colleagues have noted, the Roberts confirmation hearings forced a serious examination of the role of the Supreme Court and the Federal Government in our society.

My beliefs about the role of Government were shaped and molded when I served on the staff of Nebraska Congressman John Y. McCollister in the 1970s. I remember him warning America about the wholesale disregard of the 10th Amendment to the Constitution which states:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In the late 1930s and early 1940s, the Supreme Court used Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution which gives the Federal Government the power to "regulate commerce," as a crowbar to pry open the lid of federalism and more fully insert the Federal Government into the lives of the American people. By the 1970s, we saw an expansion of the Federal Government's power our Founders could not have imagined.

At the same time that Congressman McCollister was invoking the 10th Amendment in the House of Representatives, Justice William Rehnquist was frequently the lone voice on the Supreme Court for the discretion of States and the integrity of the 10th Amendment. Much has been said about William Rehnquist in the last month. He was a giant of our time. As history considers his legacy, I believe his ability to move the Court back to a responsible position concerning federalism will be his greatest accomplishment. In this, he had a strong ally in Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

The Founders did not arrive at the 10th Amendment by accident. It was a

necessary compromise in order to get the Constitution ratified. The Founders believed that the Constitution must protect the citizens of the United States from the consolidation of the Federal Government's power. History has proven them wise. Well meaning politicians never have enough power to do all the good things they believe are essential to the Nation's well-being. History shows that the growth of central governments is no substitute for the ingenuity and energy of individual citizens.

It was President Woodrow Wilson who said:

The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

As we work to address 21st century challenges like terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and incredible advances in technology, we will constantly be confronted with the need to balance the expansion of the Federal Government's power with States rights, individual liberties and national security. As we act to secure our Nation, we must also guard against Federal overreaching. That is why measures like the sunset provisions in laws like the Patriot Act are so important.

In years to come, Congress will be under great pressure to reach into areas of law historically reserved for State and local governments, including land use, education, economic development, law enforcement and contract law, including marriage. A wise and judicious Supreme Court will be as critical as it has ever been to see America through this volatile time.

Decades from now, if John Roberts can look back upon a legacy of having protected the rights of States and individuals while helping strengthen America from within, and constraining the power of the Federal Government, then it will be a legacy worthy of succeeding William Rehnquist.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote to confirm Judge John G. Roberts as the next Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Before I discuss my reasons for supporting Judge Roberts, however, I would like to make a few remarks about the judicial confirmation process. Judge Roberts is the first nominee to the Supreme Court since I have been a Senator. I have been very pleased with how his nomination has been handled by both the White House and the Judiciary Committee and hope that this confirmation process will be a model for future confirmations.

I want to compliment the President, and in particular the President's Counsel Harriet Miers, for doing an excellent job in reaching out to Senators prior to Judge Roberts' nomination. Ms. Miers called me prior to Judge Roberts' nomination and asked me what qualities I thought the President's nominee should possess. Our conversation gave me confidence that

the President wanted to work with Senators to make sure that he nominated an excellent candidate—which I believe he succeeded in doing. I hope the White House undertakes the same outreach to the Senate prior to the President's nomination of the next nominee to the Supreme Court.

I also want to compliment Senator SPECTER and Senator LEAHY for the superb job they have done in handling the confirmation hearings for Judge Roberts. The hearings were fair and orderly and did not significantly interfere with the Senate's other business. I was very pleased that the questioning and debate on Judge Roberts was largely devoid of personal attacks. Indeed, I think the hearings gave the country an opportunity to see what type of judge and person Judge Roberts is. They also gave the country a wonderful lesson in constitutional law. I hope that Judge Roberts' confirmation hearing will serve as a model for future confirmation hearings for nominees to the Supreme Court.

Turning now to Judge Roberts' nomination, I believe that Judge Roberts is among the finest candidates to the Supreme Court in our Nation's history. I believe history will look back on the nomination of Judge Roberts as one of the most important legacies of the Bush administration.

When I spoke with White House Counsel Harriet Miers on the qualities I looked for in a Supreme Court nominee, I told her there were two qualities I valued most. First, a nominee must have outstanding professional credentials. Second, a nominee must be committed to the rule of law. I am very pleased to say that Judge Roberts is extraordinarily qualified on both of these counts.

It is difficult to see how Judge Roberts could have more impressive professional credentials. From his academic record to his Government service to his law practice, Judge Roberts has accumulated a remarkable record of achievement.

As my colleagues have previously noted, he graduated from Harvard College *summa cum laude* in 3 years, and graduated from Harvard Law School *magna cum laude*, where he served as the managing editor of the Harvard Law Review. During his time at Harvard, he was awarded numerous academic accolades, including being inducted into Phi Beta Kappa.

He has excellent Government experience, having served as a law clerk to then Justice William Rehnquist and in several top positions in the Reagan and Bush administrations, including as Associate Counsel to President Reagan and as Principal Deputy Solicitor General for the first President Bush.

Prior to his unanimous confirmation to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, Judge Roberts was widely regarded as the best Supreme Court litigator in the Nation. Throughout his distinguished career, he argued an impressive 39 cases before the Supreme Court.

He has now served for 3 years as a judge on the D.C. Circuit, which is regarded as among the most important appellate courts in the Nation. As a judge, he has developed a reputation for fairness and producing well-written and well-reasoned opinions.

This impressive background has made Judge Roberts well prepared to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. As he displayed during his confirmation hearings, he has an encyclopedic knowledge of the Supreme Court and of constitutional law. Yet, he also has real world experience in Government and in how law interacts with the actual day-to-day operation of Government. Judge Roberts has the perfect balance of academic and practical experience.

Judge Roberts also has an impeccable ethical record. No question has been raised regarding his integrity or professionalism. On the contrary, the record is full of testimony praising his honesty and propriety from friends and former colleagues. Moreover, during his confirmation hearings he properly resisted the temptation to discuss cases and legal disputes that could come before him as Chief Justice so he would not bias his consideration of those cases and debates. While some would like to hear how Judge Roberts would decide future cases, it is clear that legal ethics prevent him from doing so. Furthermore, knowing how a nominee is going to decide future cases is not necessary to select good judges. When I was Governor, I appointed scores of judges and never—not once—did I ask how they would decide a case. Instead, I examined their credentials, reviewed their writings and past decisions and, on several occasions, personally interviewed them.

Given his professional achievements and ethical record, it is not surprising that the American Bar Association has given him a unanimous well-qualified rating, its highest rating.

I also believe that Judge Roberts has shown a commitment to the rule of law. Now, no two people will agree on how to interpret every provision of the Constitution or every statute. I may not agree with all of Judge Roberts' future decisions. However, I think that it is essential that any nominee displays a conscious commitment to deciding cases based on the law rather than on his or her own personal views.

During Judge Roberts' confirmation hearings, I was struck by how dedicated he is to the law and to correctly applying the law as a judge. As he stated during his testimony, "Judges and Justices are servants of the law, not the other way around." He also revealed his dedication to the law by recognizing that the judiciary has a limited role in our government. This means that judges are, to use Judge Roberts' words, "constrained by the words of the Constitution" and "by the precedents of other judges." Judges must interpret the law based on the text of the Constitution or statute, as

the case may be, and based on precedent, rather than on their own personal beliefs about how the case should be resolved. It is the role of Congress to pass legislation and the role of the courts to apply that legislation to particular cases. I believe Judge Roberts not only understands this distinction, but also will prove to be both a skilled practitioner and an eloquent advocate of judicial restraint.

Accordingly, I have every confidence that parties who appear before Judge Roberts will see a fair and brilliant judge who will decide their case according to the dictates of the law, not his own personal preferences.

When I initially spoke to Ms. Miers about the qualities I was looking for in a nominee, we were discussing a replacement for Justice O'Connor. Now that Judge Roberts has been re-nominated to be Chief Justice, I believe that Judge Roberts' management skills are an important aspect to consider. The Chief Justice is the top administrator of the Federal Courts, so any nominee to Chief Justice must possess management skills. Former Chief Justice Rehnquist was an excellent administrator, so Judge Roberts has some shoes to fill.

I had an opportunity to sit down with Judge Roberts, and I asked him about his management experience. We discussed his management responsibilities while he was at his law firm where he helped manage the firm's litigation group. While Judge Roberts has never managed anything as large as the Federal court system, our conversation convinced me that he has the management skills necessary to be Chief Justice. He clearly has already thought about how he will undertake his management responsibilities and what he needs to do in order to effectively carry out those responsibilities.

Finally, I want to offer some personal observations about Judge Roberts. Too often we view executive and judicial nominees through political or ideological glasses and not as human beings. Nominees quickly get labeled as being a "Republican Nominee" or a "Democratic Nominee" or as belonging to a particular "school of thought" or as being a follower of a particular thinker or politician. This is unfortunate, as each nominee's own personality gets overlooked and we fail to see the most important aspect of a nominee. It is, however, a nominee's character that can have the biggest impact on his or her work.

In Judge Roberts, I believe the Senate has before it not only a nominee who has the capability to be a great Chief Justice, but also a nominee who is simply a wonderful person. During my meeting with him, I was struck by his gracious manner and humble attitude. He is clearly very smart and engaging, and it is a pleasure to hear him explain Supreme Court cases. But, he is also a very open minded person, who listens to others with sincerity and a willingness to hear their views. Yet

what struck me most about him was his humility. For such a brilliant and successful person, I did not detect a hint of arrogance. He is a dedicated family man with a good sense of humor whom I believe all Americans will be able to respect and admire.

I have been struck by how my regard for Judge Roberts has been echoed by so many others, including many whose politics may differ from his. I would like to encourage my colleagues to get a hold of an interview C-SPAN recently aired of Professor Richard Lazarus and Patricia Brannan, two longtime friends of Judge Roberts. Both Professor Lazarus and Ms. Brannan are Democrats, but they both expressed the highest respect for Judge Roberts and supported his nomination. Now, such testimonials may concern some of my Republican friends, but to me they are further signs that Judge Roberts has the ability to persuade people across the spectrum about the importance of judicial restraint.

In short, I believe Judge Roberts displays the openmindedness and humility that should serve as the paradigm of judicial temperament for members of the Federal bench.

In reviewing Judge Roberts' impeccable academic and professional record, his firm commitment to the rule of law, and his strong character, I believe that Judge Roberts is a nominee of the highest caliber. Indeed, I wonder if a stronger nominee could be found.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the nomination of Judge Roberts to be the next Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, the nomination of Judge John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States is a matter of tremendous consequence for future generations of Americans. It requires thoughtful inquiry and debate, and I commend my colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee for their dedication to making sure that all questions were presented and that those outside of the Senate had the opportunity to make their voices heard. After serious and careful consideration of the committee proceedings and Judge Roberts' writings, I believe I must vote against his confirmation. I do not believe that the judge has presented his views with enough clarity and specificity for me to in good conscience cast a vote on his behalf.

The Constitution commands that the Senate provide meaningful advice and consent to the President on judicial nominations, and I have an obligation to my constituents to make sure that I cast my vote for Chief Justice of the United States for someone I am convinced will be steadfast in protecting fundamental women's rights, civil rights, privacy rights, and who will respect the appropriate separation of powers among the three branches. After the Judiciary hearings, I believe the record on these matters has been left unclear. That uncertainly means as a matter of conscience, I cannot

vote to confirm despite Judge Roberts's long history of public service.

In one memo, for example, Judge Roberts argued that Congress has the power to deny the Supreme Court the right to hear appeals from lower courts of constitutional claims involving flag burning, abortion, and other matters. He wrote that the United States would be far better off with 50 different interpretations on the right to choose than with what he called the "judicial excesses embodied in *Roe v. Wade*." The idea that the Supreme Court could be denied the right to rule on constitutional claims had been so long decided that even the most conservative of Judge Roberts's Justice Department colleagues strongly disagreed with him.

When questioned about his legal memoranda, Judge Roberts claimed they did not necessarily reflect his views and that he was merely making the best possible case for his clients or responding to a superior's request that he make a particular argument. But he did not clearly disavow the strong and clear views he expressed, but only shrouded them in further mystery. Was he just being an advocate for a client or was he using his position to advocate for positions he believed in? The record is unclear.

It is hard to believe he has no opinion on so many critical issues after years as a Justice Department and White House lawyer, appellate advocate and judge. His supporters remind us that Chief Justice Rehnquist supported the constitutionality of legal segregation before his elevation to the high court but never sought to bring it back while serving the court system as its Chief Justice. But I would also remind them of Justice Thomas's assertion in his confirmation hearing that he had never even discussed *Roe v. Wade*, much less formed an opinion on it. Shortly after he ascended to the Court, Justice Thomas made it clear that he wanted to repeal *Roe*.

Adding to testimony that clouded more than clarified is that we in the Senate have been denied the full record of Judge Roberts's writings despite our repeated requests. Combined, these two events have left a question mark on what Judge Roberts's views are and how he might rule on critical questions of the day. It is telling that President Bush has said the Justices he most admires are the two most conservative Justices, Justices Thomas and Scalia. It is not unreasonable to believe that the President has picked someone in Judge Roberts whom he believes holds a similarly conservative philosophy, and that voting as a bloc they could further limit the power of the Congress, expand the purview of the Executive, and overturn key rulings like *Roe v. Wade*.

Since I expect Judge Roberts to be confirmed, I hope that my concerns are unfounded and that he will be the kind of judge he said he would be during his confirmation hearing. If so, I will be

the first to acknowledge it. However, because I think he is far more likely to vote the views he expressed in his legal writings, I cannot give my consent to his confirmation and will, therefore, vote against his confirmation. My desire to maintain the already fragile Supreme Court majority for civil rights, voting rights and women's rights outweigh the respect I have for Judge Roberts's intellect, character, and legal skills.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, this Thursday the Senate will have the opportunity to vote on the nomination of Justice John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States. Few decisions made by this body are as consequential as this one. If Judge Roberts is confirmed by the Senate—and I believe he will be confirmed—he will be the youngest Chief Justice in more than 200 years. With the blessing of a long tenure on the Court, his influence as Chief Justice will not just affect us and our children but also several generations to come.

In nominating Judge Roberts, the President clearly was mindful of the serious and lasting nature of the vote before us. He respected the Senate's advice and consent role and engaged in a thorough, deliberate, and fair nomination process. The President and his staff consulted with more than 70 Members of the Senate, and the President reviewed the credentials of many well-qualified candidates. The President also met personally with a number of potential nominees. I believe that this is the process envisioned by the so-called Gang of 14, and that it resulted in an excellent nominee.

Judge Roberts has impeccable legal credentials and a strong reputation and record as a fair- and sharp-minded lawyer and jurist. The American Bar Association and many others of all political stripes agree that his distinguished career as a lawyer and a jurist makes him very well qualified for the position of Chief Justice. Indeed, some observers have pointed out that if one were to imagine the perfect training to be a Supreme Court Justice, Judge Roberts's career would be the model. I could not agree more.

As an appellate judge, Judge Roberts has built a record of measure, control, and fair-mindedness—all crucial characteristics for a member of our Nation's highest court.

Prior to his tenure as a Federal judge, John Roberts was a widely respected appellate lawyer. The Washington Post recently characterized him as "among the country's best-regarded appellate lawyers, both in private practice and as deputy solicitor general during the administration of George H.W. Bush."

The Senate Judiciary Committee has engaged in an extensive review of Judge Roberts' record. During his nomination hearings, the judge acquitted himself with dignity and honesty, answering directly questions that he believed he could address without hin-

dering his ability to carry out his functions on the Supreme Court or in his current position on the DC Court of Appeals. The editorial board of the San Francisco Chronicle wrote some days ago that Judge Roberts "passed the key tests before the Senate Judiciary Committee. His command of the law is impressive. He carries no trace of ethical taint. His ability to stay calm and on point in the face of exhaustive questioning from a panel of highly inquisitive—and occasionally posturing—U.S. senators was indicative of judicial temperament."

The committee has voted to recommend that the full Senate confirm Judge Roberts as the Chief Justice of the United States. Several Democratic members of the committee joined in that recommendation, and rightly so—this nominee's exceptional credentials and temperament should place him well above the fray of partisanship.

I agree wholeheartedly with the nomination of the President and the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee. I will vote for John Roberts, a man who has proven to be an extraordinarily talented lawyer and judge who approaches the law with modesty and a deep respect for the Constitution and our Nation's laws.

EMERGENCY HEALTH CARE RELIEF ACT OF 2005

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I am in the Senate to mention that there is ongoing discussions between the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, and a number of Members who have been concerned about S. 1716, the Emergency Health Care Relief Act of 2005. I fully support the desire of the Senator and members of the Committee on Finance to provide health care relief for the victims of Hurricane Katrina. We have noted that it has about a \$9 billion price tag, and we have been in ongoing discussions which I believe will bear fruit with the Senator from Iowa.

It is important to know that the administration also objects to S. 1716, and I ask unanimous consent the letter from Secretary Leavitt be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 27, 2005.

Hon. WILLIAM H. FRIST,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FRIST: I am writing to express the views of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) with respect to S. 1716, the "Emergency Health Care Relief Act of 2005".

We understand and appreciate that the intent of S. 1716 is to help provide, in the most timely manner possible, emergency health care relief to the victims of Hurricane Katrina. The Department is strongly committed to this same objective, and we have

engaged in our utmost efforts to furnish such relief directly to Katrina victims as well as to support State efforts to provide emergency health care and related services (see addendum below). We believe these ongoing efforts largely preclude the need for the activities proposed under S. 1716. Moreover, we have serious concerns with S. 1716, as enunciated below.

In addition, the bill spends significant amounts on adjustments to the Medicaid FMAP (Federal medical assistance percentage) for individuals who are not survivors of Hurricane Katrina. We think this is inadvisable and that resources should be targeted to services for these survivors.

TITLE I—EMERGENCY HEALTH CARE RELIEF

Title I of S. 1716 establishes a new Disaster Relief Medicaid (DRM) program for survivors of Hurricane Katrina. Survivors of the hurricane would be entitled to five months of Medicaid coverage, and the President is given the option to extend the program for another five months. Individuals who were previously receiving Medicaid before the hurricane are deemed eligible for this assistance. In addition DRM eligibility is also available to pregnant women and children with incomes up to 200% FPL, disabled individuals up to 300% SSI, and other individuals with incomes up to 100% FPL. As a result, a new eligibility category for childless adults is established. There are no resource or residency requirements for DRM. DRM recipients will receive the benefits package available to categorically needy beneficiaries under the Medicaid state plan. States may also provide extended mental health benefits and coordination benefits to DRM eligibles, which are not limited to conditions directly resulting from the hurricane.

The legislation requires a new Medicaid entitlement for Katrina survivors, regardless of whether that will work best for those survivors or the states. This new program is unnecessary. CMS is already acting to meet the health care needs of hurricane survivors through the establishment of a new Medicaid/State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) waiver program that builds upon existing Medicaid/SCRIP eligibility and other program rules to provide immediate, comprehensive relief without the need for congressional action. This waiver program allows individuals who otherwise would be eligible for Medicaid in their home states to receive 5 months of temporary eligibility without going through a complex and burdensome application process. Texas, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi now have these programs in place, and more states with significant numbers of evacuees are very close to establishing similar programs. With this new waiver program, we are providing relief quickly, rather than waiting to implement an unprecedented new federal program as envisioned by S. 1716.

The bill (section 108) also establishes a massive new Federal program which would be administered by the Secretary of HHS, rather than states. The fund would provide \$800 million for direct payments to Medicaid providers to offset their costs incurred as a result of Hurricane Katrina, and for payments to state insurance commissioners for health insurance premiums for individuals otherwise eligible for DRM. Again, S. 1716 is duplicating efforts which are well underway at CMS through the uncompensated care pools referenced in the new waiver program. The Federal uncompensated care fund envisioned by S. 1716 would create uncertainty and delay progress being made right now. To make the system envisioned by the bill work, CMS would have to develop a brand new Federal system with new forms and applications, eligibility criteria, program re-

quirements, criteria for reviewing applications and determining payment amounts, as well as other rules and procedures. Providers would need to learn this new system and provide new kinds of documentation. It is far more expeditious to use existing state systems.

We believe states are better equipped than the Federal Government to work directly with local providers to solve the problems of uncompensated care. The state-based uncompensated care pool in the CMS waiver will pay providers more quickly through the existing state payment systems without establishing a new bureaucratic process. It will also allow for care in settings and from providers that do not usually participate in Medicaid, enabling evacuees to get the best care and the providers in the state to deliver it as effectively as possible. The waiver program also allows for new interactions with expanded community-based health care centers, mobile units for providing basic care at convenient locations for evacuees, and new referral networks. The pool will permit states to pay for additional services needed by evacuees, such as additional mental health services, that are not generally covered by Medicaid.

While we prefer the state-based uncompensated care pool referenced in the CMS waiver, we look forward to working with the committee to ensure care to evacuees and solve the problems of uncompensated care.

We believe that S. 1716 does not appropriately target spending to the true victims of Hurricane Katrina. Section 103 spends \$4 billion on a 100% FMAP rate for services (and related administrative activities) provided from August 28, 2005 through December 31, 2006 under the State Medicaid or SCHIP plan to any individual residing in a major disaster parish or county, regardless of whether the individual was affected by Hurricane Katrina. Section 108 spends almost \$700 million for 29 states, most of which were not affected by the hurricane, by preventing a drop in the FMAP for Medicaid that otherwise would have occurred on October 1. We believe that these provisions are inadvisable and that federal resources should be targeted to meeting the needs of those harmed by Hurricane Katrina.

In addition, S. 1716 includes several provisions that affect the timely implementation of the new Medicare Part D program. We do not support any changes to the Medicare Part D program. We note that under S. 1716, DRM dual eligibles are excluded from the low-income subsidy program. We think it would be far more advantageous to ensure that dual eligibles are timely enrolled in a Part D plan so that they receive the low-cost drug coverage available to them under the new Medicare drug benefit.

TITLE II—TANF RELIEF

Under title II, S. 1716 would also make a number of adjustments to P.L. 109-68 the "TANF Emergency Response and Recovery Act of 2005," which was signed into law on September 21. For the most part, these adjustments would be unnecessary and would complicate State administration of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.

HHS believes that the existing administrative authority under the TANF program under title IV-A of the Social Security Act (as extended through December 31, 2005 by P.L. 109-68 and several earlier temporary extensions), coupled with the special hurricane-related provisions of the new law, has given States the ability to be responsive to the most significant issues confronting them as a result of Hurricane Katrina. We provided early administrative guidance remind-

ing States of their flexibility to amend their TANF plans to meet the special circumstances of the hurricane aftermath such as adjusting State plans, streamlining the eligibility process, making residency optional, and using in-kind and non-Federal cash expenditures to meet the maintenance of effort requirements.

In addition to this program flexibility, which continues under title IV-A (as so extended), P.L. 109-68 also provides special flexibility for TANF in areas such as the contingency fund, loan program, and penalty waivers.

We are especially concerned about the dual contingency fund provisions in S. 1716, under which a State may be reimbursed from the contingency fund if it qualifies as a "needy State" based on Hurricane Katrina-related criteria, while still remaining eligible to receive reimbursement from the fund if it meets the current law definition of a "needy State" (based on certain Food Stamp and unemployment-related criteria).

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this letter to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL O. LEAVITT.

Mr. MCCAIN, I say again to my friend from Iowa, I think he does a tremendous job as chairman of our Committee on Finance. He continues to distinguish himself in that role. But I do believe—and we had, I think, a very productive meeting with the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SUNUNU, and Senator LOTT, who, obviously, has a very deep and abiding interest in this situation, as well as the Senator from Iowa. I hope we can work out the objections that the administration has, as well as the concerns that others of us have on this issue.

Again, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his diligent efforts in trying to get this legislation done and, at the same time, satisfy the concerns of many who are concerned about the scope of it, as well as his efforts to attempt to satisfy the concerns of the administration.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1716

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to insist that the Senate act on the emergency health care needs of Katrina victims. They need help. They need help now—not tomorrow, not the next day, now. The Senate must pass the Katrina health package that Chairman GRASSLEY and I put together. Why? Obviously, to help the victims of Katrina. That is why. They need the help now.

I might say, Senator GRASSLEY and I have worked for weeks on this legislation. It has been 4 weeks since Katrina hit—4 weeks.

Now, some suggest the administration was slow to respond, that FEMA was slow to respond, that FEMA was inadequate in responding. We have heard these complaints. A lot of them are accurate.

Where is the Senate? Where is the Congress? Where? I ask Senators, where is the Senate? Where is the Congress? I will tell you where. We are poised to pass legislation, but the same people and the same political party that were slow with respect to FEMA and the administration are now here today slowing down and stopping this legislation from passing. The same group. The same group. I cannot believe it. I cannot understand it.

This legislation has very broad support. It has the support of Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Republican chairman of the Finance Committee, who, I might say, is a very good man. He is a good man. He cares. He puts people above politics. He puts the needs of the Katrina victims above politics. He wants to do the right thing. And I very heartily and soundly congratulate him. He has done such a wonderful job.

We have also consulted for weeks with the Senators from the States affected, working out the details of this legislation, crossing the T's, dotting the I's, making changes to make sure it works right. We have consulted with the Senators from the States affected, who are from both political parties. They want this legislation. They are from both political parties, and they want it.

We spent a lot of time working on this—a lot of time. We have done the right thing. We made changes, as Senators suggested. We are trying to make it balanced, trying to make it fair, trying to make it respond to the needs of the people in Louisiana, Alabama, Texas—the States affected. We have tried our very best to do this right.

I might repeat, not only the Senators of the States want this legislation, but the Governors of the States want this legislation. If we want to get to labels here, two of those Governors are Republicans. Today, publicly, I asked the question and Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman, asked the question: Governors, what do you think of this legislation? Yes, they want it, they want it now.

Ask Governor Blanco of Louisiana. They know the needs. They are there. They know the stakes. They are the Governors. They want this legislation passed now.

Governor Riley of Alabama, he wants it now. Governor Barbour of Mississippi, he wants this legislation passed now. Governor Blanco of Louisiana, she would certainly like it passed now.

I might say, too, this is a compromise. There are Senators here who

would like to offer more sweeping legislation and try to get that legislation up for a vote. I daresay, if that legislation were up for a vote, it would pass by a very large margin.

But there are Senators here who do not want to vote. They do not want to vote on that legislation. They do not want to vote on it. They do not want to vote on it. What is my evidence of that? Many times I have asked unanimous consent to bring up this legislation. Many times the chairman of the committee has asked to bring up this legislation. And we get objections from the other side of the aisle. We get objections from the other side of the aisle. Oh, it costs too much, I heard. That is one complaint.

I do not know. This legislation is temporary. It is only for several months. It is only basically until the end of the year. It is basically to help people get health care under Medicaid, to get health care now.

There are countless examples of people who cannot get health care today, victims of Katrina who cannot get health care today. Why in the world is the Senate, controlled by the same party as the White House, saying no? Oh, we hear: We want a compromise. Let me tell you this. What is the compromise I heard? The compromise I heard is: Take it all out of the \$65 billion appropriated for Katrina. Take it out of that. That is what I have heard.

Can you believe that? Can you believe that? They say some of that money has been misspent. So people who need health care shouldn't get the dollars? They shouldn't get support? They shouldn't get their health care because some of the FEMA dollars might have been misspent? Give me a break. Give me a break.

What is going on here? What, in fact, is going on here? I don't understand it. I thought we were Senators. I thought we were elected to do the right thing, to rise up and help people who need help, particularly immediately. Sure, we should scrub this stuff and look at it closely. And we have. We have. Senator GRASSLEY and I have. Our staffs have—very closely. We have tailored this down and cut it back down compared to what other Senators in the body want passed, some of the Senators in the committee wanted passed. We said: Oh, no, no, we are not going to go that far. We will take this a step at a time. We will pass limited legislation, only until the end of this year.

These provisions, the Medicaid provisions, the FMAP provisions, the eligibility requirements only apply for several months, to the end of this year. Then they stop.

Let me tell you, we met today, the Finance Committee, with experts—one was George Yin, head of the Joint Tax Committee staff—trying to learn some lessons from New York that might be applied in this case. He made a very interesting point to us. He said: You must know, Senators, it is very hard to know the effectiveness of tax breaks

because we don't have a lot of evidence. He also said something else. He said: Because these are of a short duration, the ones proposed in this bill, they probably will not be utilized very much because people don't know about them. People don't know they are there. It is hard to get the word out.

So those Senators should not be too concerned this bill will be "too expensive." If they are concerned about fraud, FEMA fraud, if they are concerned about waste, if they are concerned about money not being properly spent under FEMA, and so forth, I suggest when the next appropriations bill comes up to spend more money at FEMA, to give more cash, that is the proper place to look at any potential waste, any problems, if any, that occur under FEMA. I don't know what occurs and does not occur, but the Senators I have heard don't want this bill passed because they say: Oh, it is wasteful. FEMA wasted money. If that is the case, don't take it out of the hides of poor people who need help. You take it out of the hide of FEMA. You take it out of the hide of additional appropriations.

I heard something else here tonight. I have heard the administration is opposed to this legislation. They quietly kind of are. I don't think they want to admit it. They sent this letter that the Senator from Arizona put in the RECORD. They say: Well, maybe we can do it with waivers. Maybe we can do it a little bit better. Come on. That is not going to work. Why isn't it going to work? It is not going to work because this waiver process is so vague, it is so amorphous. Nobody knows what it is. Nobody knows when it might go into effect.

Let me give you an example of that. Today at the Finance Committee hearing, I raised the question: Governor Barbour, Governor Riley, Governor Blanco, what about waivers?

Governor Barbour did not know anything about it. This is 4 weeks since Katrina. He said: I have to plead ignorance. I don't know. You would think if this waiver process is going into effect a little bit, if there has been discussion between the administration and some of these States, you would think the Governor of Mississippi, if this waiver program is worth anything, would know about it. No, he did not know anything about it. He wants this legislation passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter Senator GRASSLEY and I wrote back to Secretary Leavitt in response to that White House letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,

Washington, DC, September 27, 2005.

Hon. MICHAEL O. LEAVITT,
Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The aftermath of Hurricane Katrina has left hundreds of thousands of Americans displaced and in need of

assistance. We want to, first and foremost, thank you for your assistance with Katrina relief. We share the goal of addressing the immediate health care needs of people affected by this disaster.

We have, however, chosen different paths for achieving our shared goal. We have introduced and sought to pass the Emergency Health Care Relief Act, S. 1716, which would provide immediate coverage for a temporary period for Americans displaced by Hurricane Katrina, directly assist the states of Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, and provide a means for survivors to retain private health insurance coverage. We believe that this program can be very quickly and efficiently implemented by the Department. We have noted your opposition to our bill and are puzzled at how you expect to achieve our shared goal through the Department's waiver process. Specifically, we would raise the following questions:

1. After the September 11, 2001, attacks on New York City, the Department quickly approved a waiver to provide Medicaid coverage for New Yorkers, even those not normally eligible for Medicaid, for a temporary basis. While you refer to the coverage provided through the waiver program as "comprehensive relief," the waiver in Texas does not provide for the same eligibility for Katrina evacuees as was provided through the New York waiver. Could you please explain to us why the Katrina evacuees do not deserve the same assistance provided the people of New York.

2. Your waiver process appears to contemplate having those Katrina evacuees without health care coverage covered by an uncompensated care fund. Providers will provide charity care and then seek reimbursement from the uncompensated care fund. This raises numerous questions for us. First, how does the Department believe it has the statutory authority to provide funding for this uncompensated care fund when we believe it is fairly obvious the Department does not have statutory authority to do so? Second, it is unclear to us how much money will be needed for the uncompensated care fund for Texas and all other host states. How much money does the Department anticipate needing for the fund? Finally, the Medicaid program has known costs, payment rates and control systems, which is why we sought to use the Medicaid program for the temporary assistance program. How does the Department plan to control expenditures for the uncompensated care fund to protect against fraud and abuse? What accountability measures will apply to these new funds?

3. The states of Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama have suffered tremendous devastation that will drastically affect their ability to meet state obligations, including their share of Medicaid. The Department's waiver process simply bills claims for Katrina evacuees in Texas (and other host states) back to Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama. When the bill comes due for those claims we would anticipate that the Department is going to expect payment since the Department does not have the statutory authority to waive those payments. Will the Department be seeking a statutory response or does the Department believe that the affected states do not need assistance? If the Department does support relieving Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama of some portion of the state share requirement, what is your projection for the cost of the assistance you might provide those states? New York provided disaster relief Medicaid after September 11, with the hope that their state match costs would be paid for through FEMA grants, but they are still appealing FEMA's denial of payment and have not received any funds. What assur-

ances can you give states that they will not find themselves in similar circumstances?

4. We believe that allowing individuals to preserve their private insurance coverage is an important principle. The bill that you oppose, the Emergency Health Care Relief Act, provides for Disaster Relief Fund so that people may keep private coverage. Your waiver process does not appear to provide for assistance to people wishing to keep private coverage except perhaps through the uncompensated care fund which we have already established has no money. Do you oppose preserving private coverage for Katrina survivors?

5. We believe that the welfare provisions of S. 1716 are very important. Though H.R. 3672 the TANF Emergency Response and Recovery Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-68) makes some modest progress towards getting states the help they need to provide vital support services to evacuees and those in the directly impacted states, we remain concerned that P.L. 109-68 falls short in several ways. Working in close conjunction with members from the directly affected states, the Senate bill makes a number of improvements to P.L. 109-68. P.L. 109-68 limits assistance to non-recurrent short-term cash benefits S. 1716 allows funding to be available for any allowable TANF expenditure. We understand that states would like the flexibility to use these funds to provide non-cash services such as employment readiness and job training for a period of time that is not limited to four months. Do you agree that it is appropriate to give states the greatest amount of flexibility to serve the broad needs of these families? Additionally, the Senate bill lifts the "cap" on the Contingency Fund which would direct additional resources to states that are providing services to Katrina survivors. Do you agree that states should be confident that they will be reimbursed for the costs of helping these families?

6. We note that in your letter, you took special exception to the provision in Title II—TANF RELIEF that would allow states, such as Tennessee, that are currently drawing down Contingency Funds in order to meet the needs of their existing caseload to also qualify for the Contingency Fund in order to meet the needs of evacuees. Are we to infer from your letter that states like Tennessee should be prohibited from accessing the Contingency Fund to provide services to evacuees simply because of a dire state fiscal condition that made them eligible for the Contingency Fund under existing law?

We would also like to bring to your attention certain provisions of our bill that we would be surprised to find the Department opposes.

The bill provides the Secretary with the authority and funding to assist providers whose ability to stay in business has been jeopardized. We consider it critical that hospitals, physician practices and other providers get immediate assistance so that they may continue to function. If the doors close on a hospital, it makes rebuilding that community that much more difficult. We hope you would agree.

2. The bill provides additional assistance for people who have lost their job through extensions of unemployment insurance. We feel that it is appropriate and necessary.

3. The bill provides additional funding for the Office of the Inspector General to ensure that relief funds are appropriately spent. We certainly hope you approve of that provision.

4. The bill protects the taxpayer by reducing the micro-purchase threshold which limits purchases made outside of existing federal procurement laws. These purchases are commonly made through the use of government credit cards, a medium which has a history of fraud, waste and abuse of taxpayer

dollars. The micro-purchase limits were capped by law at \$2,500 with an emergency limit of \$15,000 domestically and \$25,000 abroad. These limits were drastically raised to \$250,000. While we understand the need for increased credit limits to help deal with a disaster of Katrina's magnitude, any increase should address the problem at hand, not create new ones.

We truly believe that we have similar interests in assisting people displaced by this disaster. While we are troubled that you have chosen to oppose our effort, we will continue to work with you to meet our common goal. In that spirit, we respectfully request that you respond to the questions by this Friday, September 30, so that we may better understand how you intend to proceed.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY.
MAX BAUCUS.

Mr. BAUCUS. That letter points out the glaring defects of the waiver process the administration talks about.

First, the Government is amorphous, as I said. Second, the waiver kind of promises money to hospitals for uncompensated care. It does not say how it is going to happen. It is very unclear. It is very amorphous.

I might say, at that point, for 9/11 FEMA was billed for several items, and FEMA did not pay for it. In this case the administration, in the waiver process, says, well, there might be some money for hospitals for all the uncompensated care they have provided. It is a promise. Who knows if it is empty or not empty. There are no dollars behind it.

We have dollars in our legislation. It is \$800 million. It goes for uncompensated care to hospitals. You talk to the administrators of the hospitals in these areas—Louisiana, New Orleans; other States, Arkansas, Texas—that are overwhelmed—and most of this is uncompensated care—they need help. We are providing it in this bill, \$800 million.

We also provide help for people who need care, who do not have health insurance, who live up to 100 percent of poverty. They are not wealthy people: only up to 100 percent of poverty, and 200 percent of poverty for mothers who have children, pregnant women and children. That is not very much. But no, we cannot pass that. Senators say that is too much. That might be wasteful.

I don't get it. I don't get it. It reminds me of when I graduated from high school. This fellow sent me a congratulation card for graduating from high school. He said basically: Congratulations, and all this stuff. He said: Best of luck in those interstitial spaces when your brain runs against headlong perversity. This is one of those interstitial spaces in the sense that I don't get it. I can't fathom why people would not want to get this passed.

We can go to conference. We can modify this bill in conference if there are real problems. That is what we do around here. If something is not perfect—nothing is ever perfect—you don't let perfection be the enemy of the good

around here. We go to conference. By that time, little wrinkles crop up, little problems. We take care of them in conference. No, we can't do that. We can't even pass the legislation. Some Senators say: No, we can't pass it. Wrong. Take it out of FEMA. It won't work. For the life of me, I don't understand why we are here.

One small example, not so small for Tina. Who is Tina? Tina Eagerton is a lady who fled Louisiana 7 months pregnant but could not find a Florida doctor who would accept her Louisiana Medicaid card, wouldn't do it. With this legislation, Tina can get some help.

I can talk about Rosalind Breaux, who has colon cancer and was scheduled for her third round of chemotherapy on August 31, the day after the flooding began. Her husband has lost his job. There is no health insurance. Rosalind is in a real bind.

I mentioned the letter the administration has sent. The Senator from Arizona has mentioned that letter. I also mentioned the letter we sent in response, the chairman of the committee, Senator GRASSLEY, and I. That letter from the administration says the administration claims it can provide relief without the need for congressional action. It can't. I must also say they do not have the authority. They do not have the authority to provide additional appropriations. That takes an act of Congress. They say, apparently, by implication, they do not need any dollars. That is the implication of that process. They don't appropriate dollars. It is against the law. We have to do that. They do not want us to do it.

The waivers, I might say, also limit eligibility for Medicaid coverage to only those groups of people traditionally eligible for Medicaid. Adults without children, no matter how poor they are, or how much they need health care, would not be covered under the administration's waiver policy suggested by the letter the Senator from Arizona mentioned.

The woman with diabetes would not be covered. She would not be covered. Diabetes is a very time-sensitive illness. Limiting access to benefits in the waiver would mean leaving tens of thousands of Katrina victims without aid.

After Katrina, Louisiana dispatched Medicaid eligibility workers to more than 200 shelters to enroll evacuees in Medicaid. Of the 4,000 potentially eligible families screened in these shelters, more than 1 in 5 were screened out as ineligible. They did not meet Louisiana's traditional eligibility rules—1 out of 5. No help there. One out of five: You do not meet the traditional screening test.

Our legislation would address that. One out of every three people who have applied for Medicaid in Louisiana following Katrina have been denied coverage. Let me repeat that. One out of every three people who applied for Medicaid in Louisiana following

Katrina have been denied coverage. The waiver process is not going to help that out because the eligibility requirements are not raised. Most of these people are denied because they don't meet the eligibility criteria.

Adult Katrina survivors need access to health care. A recent study of Katrina evacuees in Houston shelters found that most of the adult evacuees without children were uninsured. Among those, more than 40 percent reported having a chronic condition. A third reported having trouble getting the prescription drugs they need. I can't believe it. What is going on here?

Differentiating among individuals during this time of need is not right. This isn't legislation that is usual; this is an emergency. People need health care right now. Katrina did not differentiate. Katrina hit all the residents of the gulf hard. We should not differentiate in our efforts to help those in need.

The second key difference between the administration's policy and what our bill does is the funds provided to defray the cost of uncompensated care that thousands of health care providers across our Nation are giving to Katrina survivors. I have already mentioned that. Let me repeat that point. The administration has said it will provide an uncompensated care fund. But the administration, in this waiver letter referred to on the floor a few minutes ago, has not given any further information about how much would be provided, not one iota, whether it be \$1 or zero dollars. The administration has not even given information about how it will be spent.

By contrast, the Grassley-Baucus bill includes an uncompensated care fund of up to \$800 million to be spent on compensating those health care providers—that is, hospitals—who have seen a dramatic increase or drop in their patient load as a result of Katrina. The administration promises, but under our bill, there would be no doubt. We would be there. It is not words but deeds. The administration is words. Our legislation is deeds. It is getting it done.

Third, our bill provides 100 percent Federal funding for all evacuees covered under Medicaid, wherever they are, and for the affected States. By contrast, the administration's waiver policy promises to make States whole. What does that mean? I have serious questions about how they can deliver on that without legislation, because it is unclear that the administration could, under its current statutory authority, provide these additional funds to States. I referred to that earlier. I don't think they have the legal authority to provide additional funds. I have no doubt they intend to do so. I am sure they do. Why wouldn't they? I just do not believe they have the legal authority to do so. So why should we get involved in this legal morass—do they have the authority; do they not have the authority? Are we going to sit

down and argue about this, while the people need health care? I don't get it.

At the same time the administration has asked for the three most affected States to sign a memorandum of understanding making them financially responsible for paying the cost of evacuees' care in other States. Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama need our help, not more bills to pay—not now. We could straighten that out later.

It is an outrage that a small number of willful Senators continue to stall this bill. Hurricane Katrina's health costs continue to spill in waves across the gulf coast region. Victims continue to suffer without proper medical care. Our bill will restore immediate access to basic health care. Our bill would relieve the financial burden health care providers have shouldered. We must act. Thus, at the appropriate time, I intend to join with my colleagues and ask unanimous consent for the Senate to pass our bill.

In fact, I do so now. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 214, S. 1716; that the Grassley-Baucus substitute amendment which is at the desk be considered and agreed to, that the bill as amended be read a third time, passed, and that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and that all of this occur with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from Oklahoma, I object.

Objection is heard. The unanimous consent request is not agreed to.

The Senator from Iowa.

MORNING BUSINESS

MR. GRASSLEY. 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.

NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS AND PATRIOT ACT REAUTHORIZATION

MR. DURBIN. Mr. President, the USA PATRIOT Act greatly expanded the Government's authority to use national security letters, documents issued by FBI agents without judicial or grand jury approval that allow the Government to obtain sensitive information about innocent American citizens. The recipient of a national security letter is subject to a permanent automatic gag order.

The Justice Department claims that they are not interested in the library records of innocent Americans. However, they acknowledge that they do not know how often FBI agents have obtained library records since enactment of the PATRIOT Act. And just 3 weeks ago, the Justice Department again refused my request to make public the number of national security letters that FBI agents have issued since

the PATRIOT Act became law. As a result, the American people have no idea how often the FBI is using this controversial power to obtain their sensitive personal records, including library records.

I commend our Nation's librarians for defending our Constitution and leading the fight to reform the PATRIOT Act. Unfortunately in the past this Justice Department has criticized librarians for exercising their first amendment rights. Now they have gone even further—preventing a librarian from speaking publicly about a legal challenge to the national security letter power.

In our democracy, the government is supposed to be open and accountable to the people and the people have a right to keep their personal lives private. This Justice Department seems to want to reverse this order, keeping their activity secret and prying into the private lives of innocent American citizens.

The President has asked Congress to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act. In order to have a fully informed public debate, the American people should know how often the national security letter authority has been used and they should be able to hear from librarians and others who are concerned about this power.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On June 1, 2004, a man was attacked and stabbed by three men in the downtown area of Seattle, WA. The apparent motivation for the attack was sexual orientation.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

U.S. GRAIN STANDARDS ACT

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate passed S.1752, a bill to reauthorize the U.S. Grain Standards Act. I understand that the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider this legislation today and look forward to its swift approval, as the act expires September 30, 2005.

This reauthorization bill is identical to the administration's requested lan-

guage provided to the committee earlier this year, a simple 10-year extension of current law.

The Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee held a hearing to review the U.S. Grain Standards Act on May 25, 2005. Testimony provided on behalf of the National Grain and Feed Association and the North American Export Grain Association highlighted industry's desire to be cost-competitive and remain viable for bulk exports of U.S. grains and oilseeds in the future. Specifically, these organizations proposed the U.S. Department of Agriculture's, USDA, utilization of third-party entities to provide inspection and weighing activities at export facilities with 100-percent USDA oversight using USDA-approved standards and procedures. Support for this proposal in the hearing was provided by the American Farm Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Grain Sorghum Producers, and the American Association of Grain Inspection and Weighing Agencies. Testimony provided by USDA stated that the "proposal of the industry establishes a framework for changing the delivery of services without compromising the integrity of the official system."

During the hearing, the Committee also learned of workforce challenges currently facing the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, GIPSA. The majority of official grain inspectors will be eligible for retirement over the next several years. Testimony presented explained that transitioning the delivery of services through attrition would minimize the impact on Federal employees.

Since the hearing, I have extensively reviewed legislative proposals and discussed the issue of improved competitiveness with various Senators, organizations, and USDA. Chairman BOB GOODLATTE of the House Agriculture Committee and I wrote to USDA to determine if they had existing authority to use private entities at export port locations for grain inspection and weighing services, and if they did, how they would implement this authority.

Accompanying this statement is a copy of the letter we received from USDA responding to our questions. The letter clearly states that the U.S. Grain Standards Act "currently authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with private persons or entities for the performance of inspection and weighing services at export port locations." The letter further explains that GIPSA considers the use of this authority as an option to address future attrition within the Agency and to address expanded service demand. I fully expect USDA to use this authority in a manner that improves competitiveness of the U.S. grain industry, that maintains the integrity of the Federal grain inspection system, and

that provides benefits to employees who may be impacted.

The committee greatly appreciates the work provided by GIPSA, and we are pleased to extend the authorization of current law for 10 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2005.

Hon. SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition,
and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of this date, also signed by Bob Goodlatte, Chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture, posing two questions regarding legislation which is currently pending before the Congress. The legislation would reauthorize, for an additional period of years, the United States Grain Standards Act, 7 U.S.C. §§71 et seq. (Act), which is presently scheduled to expire on September 30, 2005. Your questions and our responses are as follows:

1. Would existing authority under the U.S. Grain Standards Act allow USDA to use private entities at export port locations for grain inspection and weighing services?

Response. The Act currently authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with private persons or entities for the performance of inspection and weighing services at export port locations. See 7 U.S.C. §§79(e)(1), 84(a)(3).

2. If so, how would USDA implement this authority?

Response. The Act currently authorizes the Secretary to contract with a person to provide export grain inspection and weighing services at export port locations. The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA) has reserved this authority to supplement the current Federal workforce if the workload demand exceeded the capability of current staffing. GIPSA has also considered use of this authority as one of several options to address future attrition within the Agency and to address expanded service demand as several delegated States have decided or are considering to cancel their Delegation of Authority with GIPSA.

In accordance with federal contracting requirements, GIPSA would contract with a person(s) (defined as any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other business entity) to provide inspection and weighing services to the export grain industry. The person(s) awarded the contract would adhere to all applicable provisions of the Act to ensure the integrity of the official inspection system during the delivery of services to the export grain industry. The person(s) would charge a fee directly to the export grain customer to cover the cost of service delivery and the cost of GIPSA supervision. Contract terms would require reimbursement to GIPSA for the cost of supervising the contractor's delivery of official inspection and weighing services.

GIPSA would comply with OMB Circular No. A-76 for any contracting activity that may replace or displace federal employees. The Circular would not apply if the contract for outsourcing services intends to fill workforce gaps, not affect Federal employees, or supplement rather than replace the federal workforce. The A-76 process typically takes two years and involves an initial cost-benefits analysis, an open competitive process, and an implementation period.

I hope that the explanations provided above are fully responsive to the questions

you have asked. A similar letter is being sent to Chairman Goodlatte.

Sincerely,

MIKE JOHANNIS,
Secretary.

BREAST CANCER RESEARCH
STAMP REAUTHORIZATION ACT
OF 2005

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to thank very much all of my colleagues for their support in extending the Breast Cancer Research Stamp for another 2 years.

This bill has the strong bipartisan support of Senator HUTCHISON and 68 other Senators from both sides of the aisle.

Without congressional action, this extraordinary stamp is set to expire on December 31 of this year.

During the past 7 years, the U.S. Postal Service has sold over 650 million semipostal breast cancer stamps—raising \$47.4 million for breast cancer research.

These dollars allow the National Institutes of Health, NIH, and the Department of Defense, DOD, to conduct new and innovative breast cancer research.

So far the NIH has received approximately \$31 million and the DOD about \$13 million for breast cancer research—helping more people become cancer survivors rather than cancer victims.

In addition to raising much needed funds, this wonderful stamp has also focused public awareness on this devastating disease and provided hope to breast cancer survivors to help find a cure.

The breast cancer research stamp is the first stamp of its kind dedicated to raising funds for a special cause and remains just as necessary today as ever. For example: breast cancer is considered the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in every major ethnic group in this country; over 2 million women in the U.S. are living with breast cancer, 1 million of whom have yet to be diagnosed; this year, approximately 211,240 women in this country will get breast cancer and about 40,410 women will die from this dreadful disease; and about 1,300 men in America are diagnosed with breast cancer each year though much less common.

Extending the life of this remarkable stamp is crucial so that we can continue to reach out to our women and men who do not know of their cancer and to those who are living with it.

This bill would permit the sale of the breast cancer research stamp for 2 more years—until December 31, 2007.

The stamp would continue to have a surcharge of up to 25 percent above the value of a first-class stamp.

Surplus revenues would continue to go to breast cancer research programs at the National Institutes of Health, 70 percent of proceeds, and the Department of Defense, 30 percent of proceeds.

This bill does not affect any other semipostal proposals under consideration by the Postal Service.

With this stamp every dollar we continue to raise will help save lives until a cure is found.

Again, I thank my colleagues for supporting this important legislation to extend the breast cancer research stamp for 2 more years.

THE 2005 BRAC PROCESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Base Realignment and Closure, or BRAC, process that occurred this year. I have always voted to authorize base closure rounds in deference to the Department of Defense's stated need to restructure our military facilities to meet current and future needs. Nevertheless, the ceding of significant authority by Congress to an independent commission is an extraordinary step that should not be undertaken frequently or lightly. When Congress does lend its power to an independent commission, we retain the responsibility to closely monitor the commission's deliberations and actions. I have done so with respect to the 2005 BRAC Commission, naturally paying the closest attention to the issues before the Commission that affect Iowans.

My observation of the Commission's final deliberations raised some concerns about the information and reasoning used in making its decisions. I followed up with a letter to the Commission to clarify these concerns and have recently received a response that did nothing to allay my concerns. As a result, I have now concluded that I do not have full confidence that this was a thorough and fair process.

A joint resolution to disapprove the 2005 BRAC recommendations has been introduced in the House and has just been marked up by the House Armed Services Committee. It will now be considered under expedited procedures. I would urge my colleagues in the House to approve this resolution. Obviously, if this resolution is not approved by the House, Senate action will be meaningless. But, if the Senate does take up such a resolution, I will vote to disapprove the 2005 BRAC recommendations.

The BRAC Commission is charged with reviewing the recommendations of the Department of Defense and altering those recommendations if they are found to deviate substantially from the BRAC criteria. On that basis, the Quad Cities community in Iowa and Illinois challenged some recommendations for the Rock Island Arsenal and did not challenge others.

One issue on which I thought we had a clear-cut case of a substantial deviation of the BRAC criteria was the proposed move of the U.S. Army Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command, or TACOM, organization at the Rock Island Arsenal to the Detroit Arsenal. This proposal was essentially a footnote to a consolidation of what is called inventory control point functions from 11 separate organizations

around the country that would now report to the Defense Logistics Agency. The consolidation of inventory control point functions would affect 52 people at TACOM Rock Island and was not challenged by the community. However, the DOD recommendation then, puzzlingly, proposed to move the rest of the approximately 1,000 employees of TACOM Rock Island to the TACOM Headquarters at the Detroit Arsenal in Michigan.

The facilities at the Detroit Arsenal are already strained to capacity. The base is encroached on all sides and has no room to grow. In fact, the Detroit Arsenal is rated far lower in military value than the Rock Island Arsenal. Moving in 1,000 new employees will require major military construction. That includes building two parking garages to replace the already limited parking space that would be used up. What's more, because of higher locality pay in the area, it will cost significantly more in the long term to pay those employees at the new location. You also lose some unique facilities currently used by TACOM Rock Island, like a machine shop and live fire range. In addition, there will be no space to house the outside contractors currently embedded with TACOM Rock Island, who would also need to move but aren't counted in the BRAC data.

The Quad Cities community challenged this proposed move on the basis of military value, and the enormous costs both up front and in the long run. In fact, the move would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars more out into the future. This point was made clear when Commissioner Skinner visited the Rock Island Arsenal. It featured prominently in my testimony before three BRAC Commissioners at the regional hearing in St. Louis. My colleagues, Senators DURBIN, OBAMA, and HARKIN and Representative EVANS also made this point at the regional hearing. This was followed by a detailed presentation by community representatives. Members of our bistate congressional delegation reinforced this point in follow-up phone calls to commissioners. Finally, community representatives and congressional staff met with the BRAC Commission staff to make sure they knew about the costs.

When it came time for the final deliberations, the Commission considered the TACOM move with the consolidation of inventory control point functions. I question this approach to start with since the TACOM move was completely unrelated to the other moves in the recommendation. It was obvious by Commissioner Skinner's questions to the BRAC staff that considering these unrelated moves in one recommendation confused the commissioners. Commissioner Skinner asked twice how the move being considered would affect another move from the Rock Island Arsenal to the Detroit Arsenal that he believed would be considered separately. He had to be corrected twice by staff who explained that it was all part of one recommendation.

Furthermore, despite all the briefings from the community, the BRAC staff presented a summary of the community's concerns that omitted the critical issue of the long-term costs of the move. The summary's only reference to cost was a relatively minor concern that the number of positions to move were underestimated. When Commissioner Skinner asked how increased estimates of the military construction costs at the Detroit Arsenal would affect the payback, the BRAC staff responded that "Payback with the new scenario, new MILCON, is \$1.8 billion savings over 20 years, still a large savings." However, that figure refers to the entire recommendation package, not just the otherwise unrelated TACOM move. I believe that response by the BRAC staff was intellectually dishonest and misleading.

The disturbing fact is that the TACOM move will actually squander \$128.23 in taxpayer money. I pointed out this problem in a message delivered to Commissioner Skinner before the Commission's final vote on the BRAC report, but no action was taken. Only after the final vote has the Commission admitted to me in a letter that the TACOM move, taken by itself, would cost \$128.23 million over the 20 year time frame used in their estimate. The Commission's letter also confirmed that the Commissioners were never briefed about the cost of the TACOM move by itself.

In its response to me, the BRAC Commission continued to justify considering the cost of the TACOM move in terms of the net present value of the entire recommendation. However, in reference to another portion of the same recommendation regarding a cryptological unit at Lackland Air Force Base, the slide used by the BRAC staff for its presentation read, "The extent and timing of potential costs outweigh potential savings with no payback of investment." The same could have been said about the TACOM portion of the recommendation. The Commission then voted to overturn the portion of the recommendation to realign Lackland Air Force Base. In this case, the Commission did consider one portion of the larger recommendation separately, including a staff analysis of the payback for just that portion of the recommendation, and voted to overturn that component of the larger recommendation. The Commission's justification for its failure to do so with respect to the TACOM portion of that recommendation therefore falls flat.

In fact, there is evidence that the selective presentation of facts by the BRAC staff resulted in Commissioners misunderstanding the issue when voting. In justifying his decision on the TACOM move in an interview with the Rock Island Argus, Commissioner Skinner said of the BRAC staff's analysis, "They said there's still significant payback by doing that and that was the major objection that they (the community) had." Commissioner Skinner

should have known the most about this proposed move from his site visits to both the Rock Island Arsenal and the Detroit Arsenal, but his statement is inaccurate. It seems clear from this quote that he was misled by relying on the faulty presentation by the BRAC staff.

Of course, while cost is a major consideration in BRAC, it is not the only consideration. Still, if a recommendation contains significant costs, like the TACOM move, there must be a very compelling case for an increase in military value to justify the costs. In this case, I think it is clear that more is lost in terms of military value than is gained. Moreover, the Commission never got to this point since the BRAC staff represented that the move was justified based on cost.

I don't believe that DOD made this recommendation based on a conclusion that consolidating TACOM in one location would increase military value in the first place. Several smaller components of TACOM in other locations were not proposed for consolidation. Still, if there was a compelling case for merging the two TACOM organizations together, then why wasn't the Rock Island Arsenal considered as a receiving site? The Rock Island Arsenal could accommodate all the personnel at Detroit Arsenal without major military construction, possibly even allowing Detroit Arsenal to be closed entirely. The Rock Island Arsenal was never considered as a receiving installation by DOD since it was assumed to be closing during much of DOD's internal BRAC process.

In fact, the preliminary assumption that the Rock Island Arsenal would close is why it was not considered as a receiving site for the consolidation of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Installation Management Agency, and Civilian Personnel Operations Center. In the case of the Civilian Personnel Operations Center, the BRAC staffer who presented this issue to the Commission pointed out that this was not fair and equal treatment, which is a violation of the BRAC rules. The Commission then voted to overturn the recommendation based on the fairness issue. I asked the BRAC Commission to answer why this same logic did not apply to their actions in each of these areas. The response stated that each recommendation was developed and briefed separately by DOD supporting different initiatives. This does not answer my question as to why the Commission did not overturn each of these recommendations on the basis of fairness as they did, rightly, with the Civilian Personnel Operations Center.

For instance, like the Civilian Personnel Operations Center at the Rock Island Arsenal, the Defense Finance and Accounting site was ranked No. 1 in military value of all such sites. Given the low labor costs and room to expand, it would be an ideal location to which to consolidate other sites if it

were given fair and equal consideration. The Commission even questioned the sites chosen by DOD as receiving sites based on higher costs and lower value. Yet, in the end, the Commission chose to rearrange the sites to receive the consolidation and keep open two smaller sites with lower value than Rock Island. At a minimum, the Commission should have voted to keep open the Defense Finance and Accounting Service at the Rock Island Arsenal based on the same fairness consideration as the Civilian Personnel Operations Center. Ideally, it should have chosen the Rock Island Arsenal as a receiving site.

I knew going into this BRAC process that the Rock Island Arsenal could lose jobs. In fact, I am relieved that DOD did not recommend full closure as first contemplated. Moreover, as I testified before the BRAC Commission, if it was determined that an organization would be more efficient and less expensive somewhere else, then I could have lived with that. On this basis, I was even prepared for the BRAC Commission to disagree with my assessment about the proposals for the Rock Island Arsenal that I didn't think made any sense.

However, what I saw in the BRAC Commission's final deliberations took me by surprise. The Commission did not refute the concerns raised by the community. No evidence was produced that the TACOM move made economic sense or would be more efficient. Instead, the staff gave a misleading presentation that gave the impression that the move made economic sense when it did not, based on the data used by the Commission. That doesn't mean I absolve the Commissioners from responsibility in this either. Four of them had seen a presentation by the community and all of them had been contacted by Members of Congress. They had a responsibility to challenge the staff when the staff analysis didn't match what they had heard previously. In this respect, both the BRAC staff and the Commissioners failed in their responsibilities. In the end, what I have seen has caused me to lose confidence in the work of the BRAC Commission. As a result, I cannot endorse their final product.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Rock Island Argus article to which I referred printed in the RECORD.

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

SKINNER: ARSENAL DODGED A BULLET

(By Edward Felker)

WASHINGTON—BRAC Commissioner Samuel K. Skinner on Thursday said the Rock Island Arsenal "dodged a major bullet" in the base closing process by losing jobs but not closing completely.

During a brief interview, Mr. Skinner, who visited the Arsenal on behalf of the commission, defended the panel's vote to send 1,129 Quad-Cities jobs to the Detroit Arsenal. The panel approved the move despite protests that the transfer will cost too much and not further Army integration.

Mr. Skinner said that he looked into arguments that the Detroit Arsenal did not have

the space for the incoming workers, but was satisfied that additional construction costs will not hamper expected savings to the taxpayers.

"They said there's still significant payback by doing that," he said of the BRAC staff's review of the move, "and that was the major objection that they had."

He said the commission felt it was only fair to keep open the Arsenal's 251-job Civilian Personnel Office and Civilian Human Resource Agency. It was originally slated to move to Fort Riley, Kan., as part of a sweeping consolidation of defense personnel offices.

But Mr. Skinner urged the panel to delete it because it was targeted as part of a complete closure of the Rock Island Arsenal, and the move was never re-examined after the Pentagon decided to keep the Arsenal open.

"They had no chance to be heard, it wasn't even considered, and on that basis it wasn't fair. So we got a little life," Mr. Skinner said.

He also defended the closure of the Arsenal's 301-job Defense Finance and Accounting Service office. The commission voted to keep other offices open that the Pentagon targeted for closure, but Mr. Skinner said they were on bases of higher military and had the worst economic closure impact among DFAS locations.

He said the overall result for the Arsenal was better than it could have been. "They dodged a major bullet. Not perfect, but it could have been a lot worse."

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are facing times of record spending. Whether it is in the form of relief to the hurricane ravaged gulf coast, financing the war on terrorism, or meeting our obligations to seniors with the Medicare prescription drug benefit, Federal spending is higher now than ever. We have committed ourselves to funding these priorities.

In doing so, I believe we must also look for ways to save in other areas to offset some of these costs. I would liken our current fiscal situation to that of any common American household. When emergencies or unforeseen obligations arise, such as an illness or a major repair, you find a way to pay the bill. But in doing so, you must also look at your household budget and find places to save.

So I come to the Senate floor today to speak a little bit about legislation I recently introduced to require regular review of Federal programs with the goal of identifying areas where savings can be made. S. 1399, the Government Reorganization and Program Performance Improvement Act, will create the necessary mechanisms to require Congress and the executive branch to regularly and formally examine whether Federal programs and agencies are achieving, or have achieved desired results for the American people, and make the necessary adjustments.

The bill would do this through the creation of a sunset commission and individual results commissions. The sunset commission would hold the Federal Government accountable for per-

formance by reviewing and providing recommendations to retain, restructure, or end Federal agencies or programs. Congress and the President would enact a 10-year schedule for the administration to assess the performance of all Federal agencies and programs. Acting on those assessments, the seven-member bipartisan sunset commission, appointed by the President in consultation with Congress, will recommend ways to improve effectiveness and spend taxpayer dollars more wisely.

The commission will provide an important framework to facilitate the reform, restructuring, or possible elimination of those agencies or programs unable to demonstrate expected performance results during their scheduled review. It will also help to identify those programs that have achieved their intended purposes or outlived their usefulness.

A second key feature of this important measure is the creation of individual results commissions targeted at specific programs or policy areas where duplication and overlapping jurisdiction hinder reform. Again, these seven-member bipartisan commissions, appointed by the President in consultation with Congress, will consider administration proposals to improve the performance of various programs and agencies by restructuring and consolidation. This will reduce unnecessary costs and waste paid for by the American taxpayer.

We need to continue to evaluate the way the Federal Government operates and look for ways to make it more cost effective for the long term. I believe this legislation presents a good step toward dealing with the large number of Federal programs out there, many of which are, frankly, wasteful and unnecessary. Many also duplicate other Federal, State and private efforts. S. 1399 provides a commonsense framework for reorganization and review of Federal programs, and provides for a way to abolish them if determined unnecessary.

S. 1399 is a good government measure. It is about efficiency, accountability to the American taxpayer, and identifying potential savings. It is a fiscally responsible measure that will provide a way for the Federal Government to save even as it meets its spending obligations in the future. I invite my colleagues to take a serious look at this proposal and to join me in advancing this effort.

AUGUST 2005 CODEL TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, from August 14 to the 22, I traveled to Latin America to investigate first hand important issues relating to national security, immigration and the war on drugs. I would like to share the details of this trip and some of the insights I gained with my colleagues.

On Sunday, August 14, we flew to Havana, Cuba. Upon our arrival we drove

to the U.S. Mission where we met with James Cason, our chief of mission, and members of his staff. I started off the meeting by asking my hosts if Cuba could help the U.S. combat the smuggling of illegal drugs into our country. Mr. Rod Rojas of the U.S. Coast Guard, who currently serves as the U.S. Drug Interdiction Specialist based in Havana, noted that there is a good working relationship between the Coast Guard and the Cuban Border Guard on drug issues. It primarily takes the form of the Cubans sharing information with the United States as to suspicious ships passing through its territorial waters. The United States then interdicts these ships when they cross into U.S. waters. While the number of such reports has fallen in recent years, Mr. Rojas believes that this is a testament to the success of Cuban efforts: now that they know they will be reported, drug smugglers seem to be avoiding Cuban waters.

These reports confirm my long-held view that we should be working more closely with Cuba on drug interdiction efforts. This is why since 2001 I have sought to include language in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill to fund joint drug interdiction efforts between our two countries. This language is in the Senate version of the fiscal year 2006 bill, and I intend to press to secure its retention in the bill through conference.

From this positive report on the drug interdiction situation, our conversation turned to a troubling report on the current human rights situation in Cuba. Mr. Cason told us that there has been a deterioration of human rights in Cuba in recent years as Castro has cracked down on political dissidents. In 2003, Castro jailed 75 dissidents and has thus far released fewer than 20 from this group. These arrests were followed by others including the arrest of over 30 dissidents earlier this year. In addition to arrests, Castro has begun to employ other atrocious practices including having dissidents assaulted on the streets and generating demonstrations at the homes of dissidents to prevent them from stepping outside.

This repression has spread to the economic realm as well. In the late 1990s, Castro had opened a very limited window to free enterprise in Cuba by issuing licenses for private businesses. Had this trend continued, Cuba could have followed the path of China and Vietnam towards a limited market economy and higher living standards. Instead, Castro has abandoned this liberalization and cut back the number of licenses for private business. Both politically and economically, there are signs that Cuba is going backwards.

Finally, our conversation turned to the issue of immigration. In an effort to provide a legal outlet for immigration and avoid the massive boatlifts of the past, the United States allows 20,000 Cubans to legally immigrate every year. This number includes family reunifications, visas given out by

lottery, and approximately 5,000 visas granted to individuals accorded refugee status because they are found to face persecution if they remain in Cuba. Yet this legal outlet is still overwhelmed by the desire to leave Castro's Cuba: every year thousands of Cubans who cannot secure these visas still come to the U.S. by sea and, increasingly, overland via Mexico.

On Monday, August 15, we returned to the airport in the morning and flew an hour and a half from Havana down to our military base at Guantanamo Bay. Upon arrival we were met by White House Counsel Harriet Miers, Department of Defense General Counsel Jim Haynes, and a contingent of my Judiciary Committee staff. The base commander, MG Jay Hood, greeted us all and loaded us into a boat for the trip across the inlet from the airstrip to the operational center of the base.

Our visit began with a briefing by General Hood and members of his staff about many of the individuals being held and interrogated at Guantanamo and what they were learning from them. The briefing also reviewed the many cases on record of individuals we released from Guantanamo who immediately returned to the ranks of the terrorists once free. This briefing was an important reminder of the difficult balance that must be struck in our handling of these detainees. While we must strive for fair processes, we must remember that the individuals we are dealing with are often our most vicious enemies.

After our briefing, we drove to a mess hall for lunch where I had the opportunity to meet a number of Pennsylvanians who are serving with distinction at the base. We then visited one of the buildings used for interrogation and met with a group of interrogators who have been assigned to work with the Saudi prisoners. The interrogators informed us that their progress was slow. I asked these interrogators about the tactics they used. They were adamant that they did not use coercive tactics. They added that such tactics do not work. On the contrary, they told us that they have found the most effective method of interrogation to be developing a relationship with a detainee, treating him with respect, and winning him over through positive reinforcement.

On August 1, the New York Times ran a front page story detailing the allegations of two senior prosecutors at Guantanamo that the trial system for detainees had "been secretly arranged to improve the chances of conviction and to deprive defendants of material that could prove their innocence." After our tour of the base, I questioned General Hood, DoD General Counsel Jim Haynes, and Brigadier General Thomas Hemingway of the DoD Office of Military Commissions about these allegations and other complaints about the military justice system. White House Counsel Miers was present. Since our conversation was classified, I

will not comment in this forum on what was said. After this meeting we returned to Havana.

On Tuesday, August 16, we returned to the U.S. Mission to meet with two brave Cuban dissidents: Vladimiro Roca and Martha Roque. Mr. Roca is the President of the Social Democratic Party of Cuba. Knowing that I would meet with President Castro later in my trip, I felt it important to meet with the dissidents so that I would hear from both sides. I learned after my visit that the Governor of Nebraska, who was in town at the same time I was, also met with Castro but declined to meet with the dissidents.

Since political parties are banned in Cuba, Mr. Roca's "party" has only 35 members. Mr. Roca was jailed by Castro for 5 years from 1997 to 2002 for criticizing his government. Yet Mr. Roca continues to speak out and to criticize the regime. Although free, Mr. Roca has been the subject of intimidation and demonstrations designed to keep him from leaving his home.

Like Mr. Roca, Ms. Roque has also been jailed for expressing her strong anti-Castro views. She spent 3 years in jail from 1997 to 2000. Upon her release from prison she immediately returned to her activism. In 2003, she was arrested for a second time while attending an anti-Castro demonstration and sentenced to twenty years in jail. One year and five months into her term, Ms. Roque suffered a heart attack and was released.

While both Mr. Roca and Ms. Roque had trials, neither process sounds as if it was worthy of the name. According to Mr. Roca, he was told prior to his trial what the verdict and sentence would be. Mr. Roca and Ms. Roque are not alone. They inform me that there are still 81 prisoners of conscience languishing in Cuban jails for doing nothing more than exercising a right to free speech that their government refuses to recognize.

Following this meeting we drove to a luncheon meeting with President Fidel Castro. I had met with Castro during two prior visits to Cuba in 1999 and 2002 and found the experience to be worthwhile. As before, I found Castro to be an engaging host. He has an easy wit and enjoys a good-natured exchange. Yet beneath the joking was a serious undercurrent. Having just come from a meeting with dissidents, I pressed Castro to release the political prisoners in his jails. Castro tried to shift the topic of conversation from his prisoners by bringing up the case of five Cubans convicted of spying in the U.S. whose convictions were recently overturned by the 11th Circuit. I suggested to Castro that far from being an example of American wrongdoing, this kind of fair process is exactly the type of justice he should be offering to his own people. I also pressed Castro to open his country to democracy and dissent. He listened, but my exhortations obviously had no effect.

Much of Castro's conversation focused on his efforts to provide health

care to third world countries. Castro discussed this topic at length, and it quickly became clear that he believes this effort will be his central legacy. Cuba, a country of 11 million, has 70,000 doctors due to Castro's early emphasis on providing medical care to his own people. Castro has in recent years started sending thousands of these doctors abroad to help serve the underprivileged. Venezuela is the leading recipient of this medical largesse and hosts the majority of Cuba's overseas medical corps. According to Castro, Cuban doctors in Venezuela live and work in the slums and provide crucial medical care to those who would otherwise go without. For example, Castro told us that 6,000 Cuban eye doctors will perform 100,000 eye operations on poor Venezuelans this year. In addition to providing care, Castro told us that his doctors also provide an education, teaching Venezuelans to be doctors both in Venezuela and in Cuba. Castro then read off to us a list of the many countries in which Cuban doctors are living and serving from East Timor to Haiti and including many African and Latin American countries.

It must be noted that Castro's motives are not entirely altruistic. Our Embassy in Caracas informed me that in exchange for these medical services he is given a generous supply of free oil and his doctors are paid a subsidy which is remitted back to the state. Yet it is doubtful that Castro's arrangements with poorer countries such as Haiti bring similar financial rewards. While there is much to criticize about Castro and his regime, this humanitarian effort is to be respected. To underscore the personal importance of this effort to him, Castro ended his discourse by stating that "history will vindicate us."

When we left Castro we proceeded to the airport and flew to Caracas, Venezuela. On Wednesday, August 17, we had breakfast with our Ambassador in Caracas, William Brownfield. Mr. Brownfield is a career diplomat with an obvious passion for his work and a deep knowledge of his subject. Ambassador Brownfield sets forth a pragmatic approach to Venezuela. While fundamental differences exist between our two countries, he argues, we can and must cooperate on those issues where we share an agenda, namely oil and drugs.

On oil, Venezuela lacks the infrastructure to refine more than one-fourth of the oil it produces. Venezuelan oil is heavier than most and needs special refineries, and these refineries are located in the United States. In addition, Venezuela is relatively close to the United States when compared to other United States suppliers and other Venezuelan markets. Thus continued cooperation on oil is imperative for both nations.

Secondly, both nations share an interest in combating drugs. There have been some recent conflicts over the specifics of fighting drugs. Only a week

before our trip, President Chavez announced that he was suspending all cooperation with our DEA. The United States, in turn, suspended the visas of three high ranking Venezuelan law enforcement officials. Yet beneath the conflict, the shared interests and goals remain and can serve as a motivation to overcome these differences and proceed with the important work of drug interdiction.

The Venezuelan President, Hugo Chavez, has been criticized for governing in an anti-democratic fashion. While in Caracas, I wanted to hear directly from those who held this view and arranged a meeting with an activist named Alejandro Plaz and one of his associates. Mr. Plaz is the President of Sumate, a Venezuelan non-governmental organization dedicated to electoral observation and what he calls "democratic observation"—i.e. monitoring the leading indicators of a healthy democracy such as human rights and freedom of speech. These activities have stirred the ire of President Chavez's regime. Mr. Plaz has been charged with conspiracy to destroy the Republican system in Venezuela and if convicted would face 8 to 16 years in prison. The core element of the allegation of "conspiracy" is that Mr. Plaz accepted a \$31,000 grant from the National Endowment for Democracy. The Venezuelan Government argues that since teaching about democracy is a political activity, and since political activities cannot be funded from abroad, Mr. Plaz has violated the law. By all accounts, however, including an analysis conducted by the American Bar Association, this is a political trial aimed to intimidate a man perceived to be a political opponent.

Mr. Plaz also detailed how Chavez loyalists in the legislature used a simple majority vote to change the rule requiring a supermajority to amend certain basic laws of the nation. Having thus lowered the threshold, the legislature has used simple majorities to expand the number of seats on the Supreme Court and pack these seats with Chavez loyalist as well as to fill the election boards with Chavez loyalists.

We next drove to the Venezuelan foreign ministry where we met with Venezuelan Foreign Minister Ali Rodriguez Araque and the Venezuelan Minister of Interior and Justice Jesse Chacon. Foreign Minister Araque started things on a positive note by stating that despite the differences which the United States and Venezuela may have in the political sphere, our two nations have many shared interests in oil and drug interdiction and must emphasize our commonalities. Interior Minister Chacon picked up on the theme of drug interdiction and went on at some length about Venezuela's efforts to fight the use of its territory as a transit point for Columbian drugs. According to the Minister, Venezuelan authorities seized 57 tons of cocaine and heroin in 2004 and 42 tons in 2003. He then spent some time discussing the recent controversy

between our DEA agents in Venezuela and the Venezuelan government. He set forth his government's side of the story, and focused on alleged inappropriate actions by our DEA agents including the use of "controlled deliveries" to ship illegal drugs out of Venezuela in contravention of Venezuelan law.

Immediately following this meeting, we drove to Miraflores Palace where I met with Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez. We were joined by the two Ministers with whom I had previously met as well as U.S. Ambassador Brownfield. President Chavez began the meeting with an extended discussion about the importance of drug interdiction to both of our countries. He noted that drugs are a destabilizing force in the countries victimized by them. He then spoke about the deteriorating relations between the United States and Venezuela. He expressed concern in particular about statements coming from the U.S. government that he is trying to destabilize Latin America. He also said he is concerned about his U.S. ambassador's lack of access to the White House and high ranking executive branch officials.

Chavez commented about having met President Clinton on three occasions, one of which was at the United Nations. President Chavez believed that his relations with President Clinton were good and would like to see similar relations with President Bush. President Chavez also spoke about Venezuela's oil resources and his plans for billions of dollars of investments to increase oil production.

After the President's extensive opening statement, I responded that good relations between the United States and Venezuela are very important to both countries. I told the President that we appreciate his help in stopping the flow of drugs from Columbia and South America. I also noted the importance of Venezuelan oil to the United States and the world. I expressed my view that United States companies would be willing to invest substantial sums to improve Venezuelan oil production and help them produce oil for the world and help Venezuela generate revenue money to fight poverty. I then took up the dispute between Venezuelan narcotics officers and the DEA and suggested that all facts should be put on the table to determine exactly what occurred so that both parties are then in a position to decide what steps could be taken to resolve the dispute. President Chavez said that this was a good idea and that consideration ought to be given to having a new agreement on drug interdiction.

President Chavez later spoke at some length about President Castro and his efforts to provide extensive medical personnel to Venezuela. Chavez commented that Castro had discussed my meetings with Castro and thought that they were productive. Chavez then returned to the topic of oil and pointed out that a Venezuelan company, pre-

sumably Citgo, had 13,000 gas stations and 8 refineries in the United States. He then reiterated his concern about statements from the U.S. regarding Venezuela destabilizing Latin America. Chavez said that public opinion in Venezuela was running against the United States because of these statements.

At the conclusion of our meeting, President Chavez agreed that it would be useful for his Foreign Minister and Minister of the Interior to meet with our Ambassador the following week to try to resolve United States/Venezuela differences on drug enforcement. Previously, all of our Ambassador's efforts to arrange such a meeting had been rejected.

On Thursday, August 18 we flew to Liberia, Costa Rica. Our first meeting that afternoon focused on the drug issue. We sat down with Paul Knierim, our top DEA agent in Costa Rica, and his Costa Rican counterpart, Allen Solano, who is the Director of the Costa Rican Drug Control Police. Although no drugs are grown or processed in Costa Rica, the nation and the rest of Central America serve as a crucial transit route for smugglers bringing South American drugs to the markets in North America and Europe.

Drugs are transported overland on Costa Rica's roads, by sea through both its Pacific and Caribbean territorial waters, as well as over Costa Rica's airspace in private planes and on passenger jets. These operations are often sophisticated. In one smuggling ring that was uncovered, re-fueling ships met the smuggling boats at fixed points along the Costa Rican coast so that the boats would not have to risk detection by coming ashore.

The region faces its own set of issues. The Trans American Highway, an important overland route for drugs, passes through this region and has been the site of increased drug traffic in recent years. Also, the Daniel Oduber international airport outside of Liberia has seen growing passenger traffic in recent years, especially to and from the United States, as the local tourist industry and real estate markets have developed. This increased traffic provides an opportunity for smugglers to blend into the crowd. Thus authorities have found that drug traffickers are sending more smugglers on the planes to transport drugs northward. These "mules" typically transport the drugs by placing them in latex and swallowing them, a practice which can prove fatal if the latex bags break.

I was pleased to learn that in Costa Rica cooperation between our DEA and the local authorities is excellent. We have five of our agents stationed in country where they work with the Costa Ricans to investigate and interdict drug shipments. Success is difficult. Mr. Knierim of our DEA told me that they know they are having an impact, since their actions force the smugglers to change their tactics. But he also realizes that they have not been able to defeat the smugglers. The battle continues.

Later in my visit, I met with Dr. Rolando Herrero, a leading cancer researcher who has been a pioneer in the exploration of the connection between viral infections and cancer. In particular, in a series of studies conducted in the 1980s and early 1990s, Dr. Herrero demonstrated a connection between the Human Papilloma Virus, HPV, a sexually transmitted disease, and cervical cancer. Having proven this connection, Dr. Herrero is now conducting a trial of an HPV vaccine that could prevent the spread of the virus and thus significantly lower the incidence of cervical cancer. This vaccine trial received \$5 million in NIH funding through the National Cancer Institute this year. Given the prevalence of the HPV virus among sexually active young Americans, and the enormous expense of pap smears and treatments, this trial has obvious importance for the protection of women's health in the U.S.

Dr. Herrero has conducted his studies, including the current vaccine trial, in the Guanacaste Province in northwest Costa Rica. He explained that because of the relative stability of the local female population aged 18–25, this region allows for the extensive yearly follow up that would not be possible in the more mobile societies of America and Europe. As a result of his extensive prior work in the region, Dr. Herrero also has an impressive infrastructure in place to allow for effective follow-up studies by a highly professional team of 150 scientists and health care workers who know the local population and its habits well.

Finally, we drove to the offices of Mr. Bernardo Rojas, the Director of Ecodesarollo, a private company which has been given a concession from the Costa Rican government to develop an area known as the Papagayo Peninsula on the Pacific Coast of northern Costa Rica. The work being done by Mr. Rojas and this innovative public/private partnership can serve as a model for other countries wishing to develop their tourism industry while preserving the environment and respecting local populations.

Specifically, the Ecodesarollo Company has been given the rights to develop and manage an 840 hectare peninsula for a period of 49 years, with a right to renew the concession for another 49 years. In return, however, the company must meet a series of significant requirements. First, it must build 9 hotels and 3 golf courses in this area within a 28-year period which began in 1999. To date, two hotels and one golf course have been built to very impressive standards and have begun attracting tourists from around the world.

While conducting extensive construction, the developers are required to preserve the environment. They must preserve 70 percent of the green areas and set aside two conservation zones. They have also put into place extensive water treatment and recycling and a project to repopulate the local forests

with local species of plants. The developers have focused on the prevention of forest fires with great success. Before the project began, there were 18 consecutive years of forest fires during the dry season. Since development began, there have been six dry seasons without any fires.

Finally, they must assist the local population. The company is required to build 2,000 residential units in the region. It must also provide additional funding and programs to the local schools and colleges.

While in Costa Rica I learned that the day after my meeting with Venezuela's President Chavez, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld made some critical comments about the Venezuelan leader during a visit to Peru. I was concerned that Mr. Rumsfeld's rhetoric had the potential to erode the progress we had made with President Chavez during our visit. Accordingly, I wrote to Secretary Rumsfeld and informed him of my meeting with Chavez and my belief that a window of opportunity had been opened to resolve our disagreement with Venezuela over drug interdiction policy. I suggested that, at least for the time being, we should have a moratorium on adverse comments about Venezuela.

Our next and final destination was Mexico City, Mexico. Given our long common border, Mexico presents the greatest challenges and opportunities in the war on drugs and terror and on the immigration issue. Good relations with Mexico are crucial to both of our nations, and I was very glad for the opportunity to learn about these issues first hand.

On my first morning in Mexico we were met at our hotel by our Ambassador, Antonio Garza. Prior to his assignment to Mexico, Ambassador Garza was elected Railroad Commissioner of Texas and appointed by then Governor Bush to be Texas's Secretary of State. Ambassador Garza has a detailed knowledge of the issues facing our two countries, and I believe he is serving us very well in Mexico.

From the hotel we drove to the Mexican Foreign Ministry for a breakfast with a group of Mexican government officials to discuss the two most important issues before us: drugs and immigration. The group included Geronimo Gutierrez, Mexico's Under Secretary of Foreign Relations for North America, and Eduardo Medina Mora, the Director of Mexico's Center for National Security Investigations, Mexico's equivalent of the CIA.

I began our breakfast by asking my hosts about the problem of the drug cartels and the recent violence in Nuevo Laredo, a town just south of the border with Texas, where rival cartels have been fighting each other in the streets with machine guns and rocket launchers. Mr. Mora informed us that the Mexican authorities have successfully prosecuted the leaders of some of the country's largest drug cartels, including a major cartel in Baja, Cali-

fornia and the Gulf Cartel operating south of Texas. I was also informed that the U.S. has been providing crucial assistance in this effort. We have helped to train, equip and fund a new, professional Federal police force to replace its corrupt and inefficient predecessor. The new force currently stands at 7,000 members. According to Mr. Mora, the next big challenge facing the Mexicans in the war on drugs is to replicate at the state and local level what they have accomplished at the Federal level by replacing ineffective and/or bribed police forces with professional police forces capable of winning the fight against the cartels. I was informed that the U.S. can be helpful in this effort much as we were in building the Federal police by providing money, equipment and training.

Extradition of drug lords to the U.S. is a key component in this fight against the drug cartels. Mexican prisons fail to deter the drug lords, and there are stories of many who, through bribes, have been able to get everything they need to manage their empires from behind bars. I have been told repeatedly, however, that Mexican drug lords are terrified by the prospect of being jailed in U.S. prisons where they serve hard time.

Unfortunately, the Mexican courts have created a serious impediment to extradition to the U.S. Like many European countries, Mexico is opposed to the death penalty and will not extradite an individual to the U.S. if that individual may face the death penalty upon conviction. Yet the Mexican courts have extended this policy in a unique way. Three years ago the Mexican Supreme Court held that life imprisonment without the possibility of parole is the equivalent of the death penalty since the prisoner will die in jail, and therefore a prisoner who would face a life sentence in the U.S. cannot be extradited. Other Mexican courts have gone so far as to declare that a 20-year sentence is the equivalent of the death penalty when imposed on a 60-year old convict, since someone of that age will likely die in prison.

My Mexican hosts expressed displeasure with these court decisions and tell me they will seek their review. Still, despite these setbacks, extraditions are at their highest level ever, exceeding thirty a year in recent years. I suggested to my Mexican counterparts that we in the Judiciary Committee can work with our Department of Justice and local prosecutors to encourage them to file charges in a way that will facilitate extradition. U.S. prosecutors have secured the extradition of murderers from Europe by taking the death penalty off the table, and we can take similar steps to alleviate the concerns of the Mexicans. For example, Mexican law allows for a sentence as long as sixty years in the case of "aggravated homicide." Thus if U.S. prosecutors agree not to seek a penalty greater than 60-years imprisonment, or to seek life imprisonment but with the

possibility of parole, it may well facilitate the extradition while still providing a serious sentence for the offenders.

On the immigration front my hosts assured me that Mexico is making a serious effort to reduce the traffic of illegal immigrants from Mexico into the United States. These efforts are largely focused on limiting the flow of illegals from third countries as opposed to the flow of Mexicans themselves. Before they seek to illegally enter the United States, hundreds of thousands of would-be immigrants from South and Central American must first illegally enter Mexico. But Mexico is cracking down on these illegals and is deporting them back to their home countries in large numbers. I was informed that last year the Mexicans deported over 200,000 such illegals. The Mexicans are also requiring visas for visitors from countries such as Brazil and Ecuador who did not previously need them.

The Mexicans have also agreed to permit the U.S. to implement an interior repatriation program. Typically, when we catch an illegal immigrant, we deposit them on the other side of our border with Mexico where they are tantalizingly close to the United States and likely to try again to enter. Under the interior repatriation program, we fly those illegals who wish it all the way back to their home towns and villages. Once home, far away from the border, they are far less likely to try again. So far, this program has returned 13,000 illegal immigrants to their homes in Mexico.

From the Mexican Foreign Ministry we drove to the United States Embassy, where I was greeted by over 30 representatives of the Embassy and other U.S. agencies for a briefing on our drug and counter-terror efforts. This briefing largely confirmed what I had learned earlier in the day from the Mexican officials. Larry Holifield, the regional director of the DEA for Mexico and Central America, described the great cooperation between our DEA and their Mexican counterparts, including permission to conduct wiretaps and joint operations where vetted Mexican police units act on U.S. intelligence tips to take down members of the drug cartels. He and others spoke about the help we have provided to the Mexicans in building their police force and how effective this has been.

Greg Stephens of the Department of Justice confirmed that the Mexicans are getting better on extradition. As of 6 years ago the Mexicans had never extradited a Mexican citizen to the United States. Last year the Mexicans extradited 34 people to the United States and are on track to extradite a similar number this year. Renee Harris of U.S. Customs and Border Control spoke about the internal repatriation program and agreed that it was working, although she would like to see more help from the Mexican government in publicizing the program to its citizens. In response to my question

about what more we can do to stem the flow of illegal immigrants, Ms. Harris responded with a familiar refrain: we can provide more technology, equipment and training.

Following this meeting, we drove to the offices of the Mexican President, Vicente Fox. Before our meeting with the President began, I had the opportunity to sit down with Mexican Attorney General Daniel Francisco Cabeza de Vaca. I asked Attorney General Cabeza de Vaca about the extradition issue and if it would help if we agreed not to seek a sentence of longer than 60 years for anyone extradited to the United States from Mexico. The Attorney General thought this would help, and told me that he had discussed this topic directly with Attorney General Gonzales. He also believed that the problematic Supreme Court decision would be reviewed.

I asked the attorney General about the situation in Nuevo Laredo, and he expressed confidence that the situation was improving. He told me that the Federal Government had sent over 1,500 police to the city and that some important arrests were made just last week. He praised the sharing of intelligence with the United States which has helped them to identify and detain targets. He said there were two phases to combating the violence in Nuevo Laredo. The first phase was to ensure the permanent presence of the Federal police and the army in the City. This has already been accomplished. The second phase was to improve local law enforcement and create a new and professional local police force which was not owned by the cartels. He expected to see a reduction in the level of violence very soon. The Attorney General also asked for my assistance in the matter. He told me that the warring cartels were using very high powered weapons, including 50 caliber machine guns and rocket launchers, and that these weapons were coming from the United States. I agreed to contact the ATF to see what could be done to stem the flow of such illegal weapons to Mexico.

Next I was received by President Vicente Fox. Fox started off our meeting by telling me that it is vital for the United States, Canada and Mexico to work together on a variety of problems including immigration, counter narcotics, and terrorism. He noted that our three nations were losing jobs to Asia and needed to work jointly to bolster our economies.

On the issue of violence in Nuevo Laredo and elsewhere, the President told me that Mexico has both a short term and a long-term approach. In the short term, Mexico has jailed 40,000 members of the drug cartels in a 4-year period. Among those in prison are six of the country's major drug lords. The President complained, however, that even while in jail some drug lords have been able to continue to run their syndicates by bribing prison guards for access to telephones and other means of communication. Fox then spoke in

more general terms about the problem of police corruption at the local level. He noted that police earn a salary of \$600 a month but are offered bribes in the thousands. In Nuevo Laredo alone, 1,100 policemen were fired from their jobs last month for corruption. The Federal Government has moved 1,000 policemen into the area to stem the violence.

In the long term, President Fox told us that he is trying to foster greater cooperation between the Mexican Federal Government and the Mexican states. To do so would require passage of legislation that has long been pending in the Mexican Congress. President Fox's party controls neither house of Congress and so far this legislation has not been enacted. To emphasize the importance of better cooperation from local police, President Fox pointed out that there are approximately 400,000 local police and only 10,000 Federal police. He also noted that approximately 95 percent of all crime consists of violation of state and local laws, while only 5 percent is Federal.

On the issue of extradition, President Fox told me that he would like to extradite more criminals to the United States but is limited by what his Supreme Court has done. While he would like to see this opinion overruled, he is sensitive not to take any action which would be counter productive. But he is working hard in the fight against drugs. He told me that earlier that day he spent 2 hours with his counter narcotics experts. He plans to meet with the governors of Arizona and New Mexico to discuss the states of emergency that they have declared in response to the influx of illegal drugs and immigrants.

On the violence in Nuevo Laredo, President Fox stated that the cause was the fight between rival drug cartels for control of the city. He is using his military in Nuevo Laredo. I told President Fox that I was not optimistic that the war over the drug cartels could be won having observed the problems in Colombia since the early 1980s and having now seen the problems in Venezuela and Costa Rica. I asked the President if he felt that war was winnable. President Fox replied that it would be very difficult to win the war on drugs as long as the demand for drugs remains strong. But he believes that the fight must continue.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING RALPH CURTIS

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to recognize one of my constituents, Mr. Ralph Curtis. Mr. Curtis has served as manager of the Rio Grande Water Conservation District for 25 years. He took over the managerial position when the organization was very small, consisting of just Ralph and one other employee. The time and energy that Ralph has given

to the Rio Grande Water Conservation District has made this organization the well respected entity that it is within the San Luis Valley and Colorado.

Because he grew up on—and later managed—his family's ranch in Saguache, Ralph has long been aware of the importance of water to the San Luis Valley. Under his direction, the district took a leadership role in fighting against the American Water Development Inc. water grab, in water conservation education and in pro-active efforts on behalf of endangered species such as the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher.

Ralph's community contributions have not gone unmarked either. He has been honored with numerous awards such as: the Wayne Aspinall Water Leader of the Year, San Luis Valley Wetlands Stewardship Award, Friend of 4-H, Distinguished Service Award for Conservation of Natural Resources, Support of Colorado Association of Soil Conservations Districts, and he was inducted into the Honorable Order of the Water Buffalo.

Ralph has always looked ahead to the next challenge, has always looked forward to the next hill, in order to see where the road will lead him. I would like to wish Ralph and his wife Gloria the very best as they walk down that new road together looking for new challenges.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO JAY DAVIDSON

● Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I pay tribute and congratulate Jay Davidson on his reception of an America Honors Recovery Award given to him by the Johnson Institute, a nationally recognized organization dedicated to helping people overcome alcohol and substance addiction.

Mr. Davidson has dedicated his life to the cause of fighting addiction. He does this by serving as the president and CEO of The Healing Place, based in Louisville, KY. Under Mr. Davidson, this center has achieved a success rate of 65 percent, which is five times the national average. The efforts of The Healing Place have been so successful that this year Governor Ernie Fletcher has announced that it will serve as a model to 10 other shelter and recovery centers throughout Kentucky. In fact, this model has been effective enough that other branches of The Healing Place have been opened in Lexington, KY, Raleigh, NC, and Richmond, VA.

The citizens of Kentucky are fortunate to have the leadership of Jay Davidson. His example of dedication, hard work and compassion should be an inspiration to all throughout the Commonwealth.

He has my most sincere appreciation for this work and I look forward to his continued service to Kentucky.●

TRIBUTE TO PATRICIA M. DIXON

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the outstanding serv-

ice and dedication in the field of economic development of Mrs. Patricia M. Dixon, this on the occasion of her retirement from the Economic Development Administration, United States Department of Commerce effective today, September 28, 2005.

Mrs. Dixon has served honorably at the Economic Development Administration for 33 years, most recently and prominently as the Economic Development Representative to the State of South Carolina. Her contributions to economic development in South Carolina are numerous and have greatly contributed to the economic progress of the most distressed areas of the State. Her work has been widely recognized most notably by the South Carolina Association of Regional Councils, which awarded her their highest honor, the Outstanding Staff Award in 1991.

Mrs. Dixon has demonstrated her work in disaster recovery and base closures, saving jobs, solving solid waste problems, expanding job opportunities and rebuilding tax bases. Her innovative approaches to economic development problems and issues have been replicated in other communities. She also served as the first Federal cochair of the South Carolina Rural Development Council under the President's Initiative for Rural Development. Mrs. Dixon continues to serve on the executive committees of both the North and South Carolina rural development councils. In addition, she was instrumental in the original establishment of revolving loan funds for economic development districts in South Carolina.

Mrs. Dixon has garnered the personal and professional respect and admiration of her friends and colleagues at the Economic Development Administration and elsewhere. She represents the finest of qualities in a public servant and has been an incomparable asset to the greater effort of improving quality of life for the people of South Carolina. In conclusion, the retirement of Mrs. Patricia M. Dixon will be a great loss to the EDA and the State of South Carolina, but I wish her great success and happiness in her future.●

HONORING IOWA COMMUNITY LEADERS

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, every year the Iowa Council for International Understanding honors immigrants and refugees in Iowa who have, in the words of the council, "achieved, belonged and contributed to our community in a significant way."

The ICIU began in 1938 when a group of volunteers joined forces to aid immigrants fleeing the war in Europe. Since their founding, the ICIU has continued to provide cultural services to both the immigrant community and to native-born Iowans. The United States has always been a beacon of hope for many around the world seeking refuge from oppressive regimes, and it is my belief that each generation of immigrants has enriched our Nation both cul-

turally and economically. My mother was an immigrant from Slovenia, and I am proud to be a first generation American.

I take this opportunity to join in honoring the recipients of this year's ICIU awards and to thank and congratulate them for all they have achieved and contributed to Iowa's communities.

Joe Gonzalez was born in Mexico and immigrated to Des Moines in 1957. In 1971, he joined the Des Moines Police Department. He was one of the first Hispanic officers in the department and has garnered numerous awards, on both the State and national level, over his 33-year tenure. Among other things, Officer Gonzalez has been particularly active in aiding crime victims and victims of sexual and domestic abuse. After the September 11 attacks, he worked at Ground Zero.

Sonia Parras Konrad immigrated to the United States 9 years ago from Granada, Spain. She was trained as a lawyer and is most recently a graduate of Drake University Law School. Today she practices law in Iowa. Ms. Konrad is being honored today for her passionate dedication to helping victims of domestic and sexual violence, particularly within Spanish speaking communities. Among the programs she has founded is LUNA, Latinas Unidas por un Nuevo Amanecer—Latinas United for a New Dawn—designed to prevent and deal with the effects of domestic and sexual violence. This program has aided countless Iowans and has been used as a model in other states.

Juliet Cunningham emigrated from Kirkuk, Iraq, to the United States in 1979 to pursue advanced educational opportunities. She is actively involved with many Iowa institutions, including the Iowa State University Engineering and Research Complex, Des Moines Science Center, Society of Women Engineers and the West Des Moines United Methodist Church. In 1994 Mrs. Cunningham cofounded TEAM Services Inc., a soil, environmental, and construction materials consulting firm with her husband. Of particular note is her role in helping get a TEAM Services laboratory in central Iowa accredited for the testing of construction materials, making it the first laboratory in Iowa with these capabilities.

Dr. Liansuo Xie was born in 1958 and grew up in China's Hebei Province. He worked as a mechanic in a paper manufacturing plant there before studying to receive a B.S. from the Beijing Agricultural Engineering University in 1982. Shortly thereafter, he married and came to the U.S. to study further at Iowa State University where he eventually earned a Ph.D. and was honored with a Research Excellence award. He is widely considered to be one of the best engineers at the Townsend Engineering Company in Des Moines, where he has worked since 1990, for his work on project design and design productivity. Finally, Dr. Liansuo is a long-standing contributor to his community, serving as a founding member of

the Iowa Chinese Language School, the Sister States of Iowa, Hebei Committee, and acting as a tour guide for Chinese delegations to Iowa and the United States.

B.J. Do arrived in Iowa in 1975 at the age of 13. He arrived wearing only shorts and speaking very limited English, having fled Vietnam at the end of the Vietnam War. Despite his humble beginning, he went on to earn both B.S. and M.S. degrees in electrical and computer engineering from the University of Iowa. From there the sky was the limit, as Mr. Do went on to work on, design for, and manage projects for major international companies all over the United States. He has since returned to Iowa where he is the co-founder and CEO of ABC Virtual Communications, a software product and services company based in west Des Moines. He has received recognitions for his accomplishments from myriad institutions, including the University of Iowa and the State of Iowa, along with receiving the Ernst and Young Entrepreneur of the Year Award in 1999.

We are proud of their achievements and are pleased they are members of our communities. I am sure that ICIU would agree that for every story told here today, countless others remain untold.●

TRIBUTE TO THE SOUTHEAST MISSOURIAN

● Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a historically significant anniversary for one of Southeast Missouri's most widely recognized and respected institutions. For the past year, the Southeast Missourian, located in Cape Girardeau, MO, has been celebrating its grand centennial.

Its first issue rolled off the presses on October 3, 1904, with George and Fred Naeter at the helm. The brothers had purchased the small business with hopes of one day transforming it into the thriving company thousands of faithful readers are familiar with today. After a number changes, the Southeast Missourian was formally dedicated on September 11, 1925, at 301 Broadway.

Over the past several decades, the Southeast Missourian has provided timely reporting of the important changes in the region. Much of the area surrounding Cape Girardeau is rural. The Southeast Missourian has been a primary source of information to those readers. They depend on the Southeast Missourian for local, statewide, national and world news.

From the reports on flooding along the banks of the Mississippi River, to the birth announcements in the Sunday edition, the Southeast Missourian has a unique appeal that is difficult to match. They have set a precedent for excellence in print journalism with the underlying theme of community and public service. It's been a personal privilege over the years to be covered

by the paper's news department and to discuss ideas with its editorial board.

The Southeast Missourian has been instrumental in collaborating with its host city of Cape Girardeau to strengthen the community through local enterprise. And year after year the newspaper continues to give back countless charitable donations and sponsorships to the community.

I express my sincerest gratitude to the entire staff, past and present, for their contribution and dedication in making the Southeast Missourian the publication it is today. I extend warm congratulations to the Rust family, which has continued to raise the bar year after year in achieving excellence for fair and objective journalism. Joe Sullivan, the editor of the paper, in particular deserves credit for his hard work and professionalism. I hope for the next 100 years, the Southeast Missourian will continue to make a difference for the good in Southeast Missouri.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a treaty which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 9:34 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2385. An act to extend by 10 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

H.R. 3784. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

At 1:54 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 West Street in Newville, Pennsylvania, as the "Randall D. Shughart Post Office Building".

H.R. 3703. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8501 Philatelic Drive in Spring Hill, Florida, as the "Staff Sergeant Michael Schafer Post Office Building".

H.R. 3863. An act to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for the reallocation rules in the Campus-Based Aid programs, and to extend the deadline by which funds have to be reallocated to institutions of higher education due to a natural disaster.

H.R. 3864. An act to assist individuals with disabilities affected by Hurricane Katrina or Rita through vocational rehabilitation services.

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Lights On After-school!", a national celebration of after-school programs.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Domestic Violence Awareness Month and expressing the sense of Congress that Congress should raise awareness of domestic violence in the United States and its devastating effects on families.

The message further announced that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 3200, an act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2360 making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following Members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BERRY, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. OBEY.

At 3:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Croatt, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 2132. An act to extend the waiver authority of the Secretary of Education with respect to student financial assistance during a war or other military operation or national emergency.

H.R. 3200. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3667. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 South Barrington Street in Los Angeles, California, as the "Karl Malden Station".

H.R. 3767. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 2600 Oak Street in St. Charles, Illinois, as the "Jacob L. Frazier Post Office Building".

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 57 West Street in Newville, Pennsylvania, as the "Randall D. Shughart Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3703. An act to provide assistance to families affected by Hurricane Katrina, through the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families. A bill to provide the Secretary of Education with waiver authority for students who are eligible for Federal student grant assistance who are adversely affected by a major disaster. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8501 Philatelic Drive in Spring Hill, Florida, as the "Staff Sergeant Michael Schafer Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3736. An act to protect volunteers assisting the victims of Hurricane Katrina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Lights On After-school!", a national celebration of after-school programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following measure was discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

S. 1219. A bill to authorize certain tribes in the State of Montana to enter into a lease or other temporary conveyance of water rights to meet the water needs of the Dry Prairie Rural Water Association, Inc; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1783. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the pension funding rules, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4013. A communication from the Director, Division for Strategic Human Resources Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Employees' Retirement System; Death Benefits and Employee Refunds" (RIN3206-AK57) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4014. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, a report

of draft legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, at the request of a participating State to convey to the State, by quitclaim deed, without consideration, any land or interests in land acquired within the State under the Forest Legacy Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry.

EC-4015. A communication from the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Biomass Research and Development Initiative for Fiscal Year 2004"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4016. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Preferred Stock" (RIN3052-AC21) received on September 21, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4017. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Investment, Liquidity and Divestiture" (RIN3052-AC22) received on September 21, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4018. A communication from the Chief, Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Collection of State Commodity Assessments" (RIN0560-AH35) received on September 21, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4019. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amicarbazone; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 7736-3) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4020. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bacillus Thuringiensis Cry34Ab1 and Cry35Ab1 Proteins and the Genetic Material Necessary for Their Production in Corn; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 7735-4) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4021. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL No. 7737-9) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4022. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inert Ingredients; Revocation of 34 Pesticide Tolerance Exemptions for 31 Chemicals" (FRL No. 7737-3) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4023. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Iprovalicarb; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 7736-2) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4024. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office

of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lindane; Tolerance Actions" (FRL No. 7734-3) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4025. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reynoutria Sachalinensis Extract; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 7730-3) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4026. A communication from the Acting Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's National Environmental Education Advisory Council Report on the Status of Environmental Education in the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4027. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, a report entitled "Interim Guidance on Control of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) in Ozone State Implementation Plans" (FRL No. 7965-4) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4028. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Arizona; Correction of Redesignation of Phoenix to Attainment for the Carbon Monoxide Standard" (FRL No. 7960-8) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4029. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 7953-9) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4030. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "American Samoa State Implementation Plan, Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 7955-6) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4031. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa" (FRL No. 7967-5) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4032. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Final Determination to Stay and/or Defer Sanctions, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 7966-5) received on September 7, 2005; to the

Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4033. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "New York SIP, Onondaga County Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan" (FRL No. 7959-1) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4034. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to the Definition of Volatile Organic Compounds—Removal of VOC Exemptions for California's Aerosol Coatings Reactivity-based Regulation" (FRL No. 7966-2) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4035. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Maryland Control of Emissions from Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration (CISWI) Units" (FRL No. 7966-7) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4036. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 7966-4) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4037. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Designation" (FRL No. 7967-7) received on September 7, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4038. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Announcement of the Delegation of Partial Administrative Authority for Implementation of Federal Implementation Plan for the Nez Perce Reservation to the Nez Perce Tribe" (FRL No. 7970-2) received on September 18, 2005; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2863. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1779. A bill to amend the Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter Act of 1958 to ensure the humane slaughter of nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SMITH, Mr. INOUE, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. BUNNING):

S. 1780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, to improve the public disclosure of activities of exempt organizations, and to enhance the ability of low-income Americans to gain financial security by building assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow full expensing for the cost of qualified refinery property in the year in which the property is placed in service, and to classify petroleum refining property as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWNBACK:

S. 1782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that qualified personal service corporations may continue to use the cash method of accounting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 1783. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the pension funding rules, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 1784. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote a culture of safety within the health care system through the establishment of a National Medical Error Disclosure and Compensation Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1785. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 17, United States Code (relating to the vessel hull design protection), to clarify the distinction between a hull and a deck, to provide factors for the determination of the protectability of a revised design, to provide guidance for assessments of substantial similarity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. VITTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. BURNS):

S. 1786. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make emergency airport improvement project grants-in-aid under title 49, United States Code, for repairs and costs related to damage from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita; considered and passed.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 1787. A bill to provide bankruptcy relief for victims of natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 1788. A bill to amend section 524(g)(1) of title 11, United States Code, to predicate the discharge of debts in bankruptcy by any vermiculite mining company meeting certain criteria on the establishment of a health care trust fund for certain individuals suffering from an asbestos related disease; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution authorizing special awards to World War I and World War

II veterans of the United States Navy Armed Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. Res. 254. A resolution marking the dedication of the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 255. A resolution recognizing the achievements of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Waterfowl Population Survey; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 256. A resolution honoring the life of Sandra Feldman; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR):

S. Res. 257. A resolution recognizing the spirit of Jacob Mock Doub and many young people who have contributed to encouraging youth to be physically active and fit, and expressing support for "National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. Res. 258. A resolution to commend Timothy Scott Wineman; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. Res. 259. A resolution commending the efforts of the Department of Veterans Affairs in responding to Hurricane Katrina; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Con. Res. 54. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a commemorative postage stamp honoring Jasper Francis Cropsey, the famous Staten Island-born 19th Century Hudson River Painter; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 258

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance research, training, and health information dissemination with respect to urologic diseases, and for other purposes.

S. 347

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 347, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act and title III of the Public Health Service Act to improve access to information about individuals' health care operations and legal rights for care near the end of life, to promote advance care planning and decision-making so that individuals' wishes are known should they become unable to

speak for themselves, to engage health care providers in disseminating information about and assisting in the preparation of advance directives, which include living wills and durable powers of attorney for health care, and for other purposes.

S. 440

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 440, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to include podiatrists as physicians for purposes of covering physicians services under the medicaid program.

S. 537

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 537, a bill to increase the number of well-trained mental health service professionals (including those based in schools) providing clinical mental health care to children and adolescents, and for other purposes.

S. 627

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) were added as cosponsors of S. 627, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit, to increase the rates of the alternative incremental credit, and to provide an alternative simplified credit for qualified research expenses.

S. 663

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 663, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow self-employed individuals to deduct health insurance costs in computing self-employment taxes.

S. 713

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants.

S. 755

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 755, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to nonprofit tax-exempt organizations for the purchase of ultrasound equipment to provide free examinations to women needing such services, and for other purposes.

S. 911

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 911, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for reimbursement of certified midwife services and to provide for more equitable reimbursement rates for certified nurse-midwife services.

S. 1007

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1007, a bill to prevent a severe reduction in the Federal medical assistance percentage determined for a State for fiscal year 2006.

S. 1046

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1046, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of Federal courts over certain cases and controversies involving the Pledge of Allegiance.

S. 1060

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1060, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to provide for programs to increase the awareness and knowledge of women and health care providers with respect to gynecologic cancers.

S. 1197

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1197, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

S. 1217

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1217, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to phase out the 24-month waiting period for disabled individuals to become eligible for medicare benefits, to eliminate the waiting period for individuals with life-threatening conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1309

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1309, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend the trade adjustment assistance program to the services sector, and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1358, a bill to protect scientific integrity in Federal research and policymaking.

S. 1402

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1402, a bill to amend section 42 of title 18, United States Code, to pro-

hibit the importation and shipment of certain species of carp.

S. 1405

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1405, a bill to extend the 50 percent compliance threshold used to determine whether a hospital or unit of a hospital is an inpatient rehabilitation facility and to establish the National Advisory Council on Medical Rehabilitation.

S. 1411

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1411, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a pilot program to provide regulatory compliance assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 1479

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1479, a bill to provide for the expansion of Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. 1489

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with regard to research on asthma, and for other purposes.

S. 1573

At the request of Mrs. DOLE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1573, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the funding of collectively bargained retiree health benefits.

S. 1575

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1575, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a demonstration program to increase the number of doctorally prepared nurse faculty.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1589, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for reductions in the medicare part B premium through elimination of certain overpayments to Medicare Advantage organizations.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr.

REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a temporary windfall profit tax on crude oil and to rebate the tax collected back to the American consumer, and for other purposes.

S. 1700

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1700, a bill to establish an Office of the Hurricane Katrina Recovery Chief Financial Officer, and for other purposes.

S. 1735

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1735, a bill to improve the Federal Trade Commission's ability to protect consumers from price-gouging during energy emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1761

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1761, a bill to clarify the liability of government contractors assisting in rescue, recovery, repair, and reconstruction work in the Gulf Coast region of the United States affected by Hurricane Katrina or other major disasters.

S. CON. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. TALENT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 25, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the application of Airbus for launch aid.

S. CON. RES. 53

At the request of Mr. OBAMA, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 53, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any effort to impose photo identification requirements for voting should be rejected.

S. RES. 236

At the request of Mr. COLEMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 236, a resolution recognizing the need to pursue research into the causes, a treatment, and an eventual cure for idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis, supporting the goals and ideals of National Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Week, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 1779. A bill to amend the Humane Methods of Livestock Slaughter Act of 1958 to ensure the humane slaughter of nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Downed Animal

Protection Act, legislation intended to protect people from the unnecessary spread of disease. This bill would prohibit the use of nonambulatory animals for human consumption.

Nonambulatory animals, also known as downed animals, are livestock such as cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, or other equines that are too sick to stand or walk unassisted. Many of these animals are dying from infectious diseases and present a significant pathway for the spread of disease.

The safety of our Nation's food supply is of the utmost importance. With the presence of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), also known as mad-cow disease, and other strains of transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSE), which are related animal diseases found not only in nearby countries but also in the United States, it is important that we take all measures necessary to ensure that our food is safe.

Currently, before slaughter, the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) diverts downer livestock only if they exhibit clinical signs associated with BSE. Routinely, BSE is not correctly distinguished from many other diseases and conditions that show similar symptoms. The ante-mortem inspection that is currently used in the United States is very similar to the inspection process in Europe, which has proved to be inadequate for detecting BSE. Consequently, if BSE were present in a U.S. downed animal, it could currently be offered for slaughter. If the animal showed no clinical signs of the disease, the animal would then pass an ante-mortem inspection, making the diseased animal available for human consumption. The BSE agent could then cross-contaminate the normally safe muscle tissue during slaughter and processing. The disposal of downer livestock would ensure that the BSE agent would not be recycled to contaminate otherwise safe meat.

There are other TSE diseases already known to us such as scrapie that affects sheep and goats, chronic wasting disease in deer and elk, and classic Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease in humans, all of which are present in the United States. Because our knowledge of such diseases are limited, the inclusion of horses, mules, swine, and other equine in this act are a necessary precaution. This precautionary measure is needed in order to ensure that the human population is not affected by diseased livestock. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has already created regulations that prevent imports of all live cattle and other ruminants and certain ruminant products from countries where BSE is known to exist. In 1997, the FDA placed a prohibition on the use of all mammalian protein, with a few exceptions, in animal feeds given to cattle and other ruminants. These regulations are a good start in protecting us from the possible spread of

BSE, however, they do not go far enough. Because they still allow the processing of downer cattle.

According to a study performed by the Harvard School of the Public Health in conjunction with the USDA and surveillance data from European countries, downer cattle are among the highest risk population for BSE. According to the Harvard Study, the removal of nonambulatory cattle from the population intended for slaughter would reduce the probability of spreading BSE by 82 percent. The USDA and the FDA have acknowledged that downed animals serve as a potential pathway for the spread of BSE. While both have entertained the idea of prohibiting the rendering of downed cattle, they have taken no formal action. It is imperative that we, Congress, ensure that downer livestock does not enter our food chain, and the best way to accomplish this task is to codify the prohibition of downer livestock from entering our food supply.

The Downed Animal Protection Act fills a gap in the current USDA and FDA regulations. The bill calls for the humane euthanization of nonambulatory livestock, both for interstate and foreign commerce. The euthanization of nonambulatory livestock would remove this high risk population from the portion of livestock reserved for our consumption. Due to the presence of other TSE diseases found throughout other species of livestock, all animals that fit under the definition of livestock will be included in this bill.

The benefits of my bill are numerous, for both the public and the industry. On the face of it, the bill will prevent needless suffering by humanely euthanizing nonambulatory animals. The removal of downed animals from our products will insure that they are safer and of better quality. The reduction in the likelihood of the spread of diseases would result in safer working conditions for persons handling livestock. This added protection against disease would help the flow of livestock and livestock products in interstate and foreign commerce, making commerce in livestock more easily attainable.

Some individuals fear that this bill would place an excessive financial burden on the livestock industry. I want to remind my colleagues that one single downed cow in Canada diagnosed with BSE in 2003 shut down the world's third largest beef exporter. It is estimated that the Canadian beef industry lost more than \$1 billion when more than 30 countries banned Canadian cattle and beef upon the discovery of BSE. As the Canadian cattle industry continues to recover from its economic loss, it is prudent for the United States to be proactive in preventing BSE and other animal diseases from entering our food chain.

Today, the USDA has increased its efforts to test approximately ten percent of downed cattle per year for BSE.

However, it is my understanding that the USDA is looking to revisit this issue. I do not believe that now is the time to lower our defenses. We must protect our livestock industry and human health from diseases such as BSE. This bill reduces the threat of passing diseases from downed livestock to our food supply. It ensures downed animals will not be used for human consumption. It also requires higher standards for food safety and protects the human population from diseases and the livestock industry from economic distress.

American consumers should be able to rely on the Federal Government to ensure that meat and meat by-products are safe for human consumption. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1779

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Downed Animal Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the humane euthanization of nonambulatory livestock in interstate and foreign commerce—

- (1) prevents needless suffering;
- (2) results in safer and better working conditions for persons handling livestock;
- (3) brings about improvement of products and reduces the likelihood of the spread of diseases that have a great and deleterious impact on interstate and foreign commerce in livestock; and
- (4) produces other benefits for producers, processors, and consumers that tend to expedite an orderly flow of livestock and livestock products in interstate foreign commerce.

(b) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States that all nonambulatory livestock in interstate and foreign commerce shall be immediately and humanely euthanized when such livestock become nonambulatory.

SEC. 3. UNLAWFUL SLAUGHTER PRACTICES INVOLVING NONAMBULATORY LIVESTOCK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Public Law 85-765 (commonly known as the "Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1958") (7 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2 (7 U.S.C. 1902) the following:

"SEC. 3. NONAMBULATORY LIVESTOCK.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

- "(1) COVERED ENTITY.—The term 'covered entity' means—
- "(A) a stockyard;
 - "(B) a market agency;
 - "(C) a dealer;
 - "(D) a packer;
 - "(E) a slaughter facility; or
 - "(F) an establishment.

"(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—The term 'establishment' means an establishment that is covered by the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

"(3) HUMANELY EUTHANIZE.—The term 'humanely euthanize' means to immediately render an animal unconscious by mechanical, chemical, or other means, with this state remaining until the death of the animal.

"(4) NONAMBULATORY LIVESTOCK.—The term 'nonambulatory livestock' means any cattle, sheep, swine, goats, or horses, mules, or other equines, that will not stand and walk unassisted.

"(5) SECRETARY.—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) HUMANE TREATMENT, HANDLING, AND DISPOSITION.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to provide for the humane treatment, handling, and disposition of all nonambulatory livestock by covered entities, including a requirement that nonambulatory livestock be humanely euthanized.

"(c) HUMANE EUTHANASIA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), when an animal becomes nonambulatory, a covered entity shall immediately humanely euthanize the nonambulatory livestock.

"(2) DISEASE TESTING.—Paragraph (1) shall not limit the ability of the Secretary to test nonambulatory livestock for a disease, such as Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy.

"(d) MOVEMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered entity shall not move nonambulatory livestock while the nonambulatory livestock are conscious.

"(2) UNCONSCIOUSNESS.—In the case of any nonambulatory livestock that are moved, the covered entity shall ensure that the nonambulatory livestock remain unconscious until death.

"(e) INSPECTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for an inspector at an establishment to pass through inspection any nonambulatory livestock or carcass (including parts of a carcass) of nonambulatory livestock.

"(2) LABELING.—An inspector or other employee of an establishment shall label, mark, stamp, or tag as 'inspected and condemned' any material described in paragraph (1)."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendment made by subsection (a) takes effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate final regulations to implement the amendment made by subsection (a).

Mr. SANTORUM (for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SMITH, Mr. INOUE, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. BUNNING):

S. 1780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, to improve the public disclosure of activities of exempt organizations, and to enhance the ability of low-income Americans to gain financial security by building assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the CARE Act of 2005 along with Senator LIEBERMAN, a bill we have been trying to push through Congress since 2000. However, at no point in the past five years has the passage of this bill been so timely.

At a time where America appears divided on a War on Terror, Supreme Court nominations, and the relief effort in the gulf region, Americans are unified in their support of charitable organizations. In a recent Zogby poll, 86 percent of those polled rated private charities' response to Hurricane

Katrina as excellent or good. By contrast, 32 percent described the government's response as excellent or good, and 67 percent said fair or poor.

The work of charitable organizations and their volunteers have been inspirational at a time when many feel hopeless. I recently held a hearing in the Finance Subcommittee of Social Security and Family Policy to hear from charitable organizations about their efforts around the gulf coast. Though the hearing was scheduled before the events of Hurricane Katrina, the amazing work being done by these organizations highlighted the need for charitable incentives to continue and expand the generosity we are seeing.

In response to Hurricane Katrina, we have seen organizations such as America's Second Harvest and the Florida Boulevard Baptist Church feed the hungry. We have seen that within 48 hours of Katrina, the Nation's fraternal benefit societies were feeding, housing, and providing supplies, clothes, toiletries, cash and beds to those in need in shelters both in Houston and in New Orleans. During the first week of this effort, fraternals had already expended upwards of \$14 million on hurricane relief, a sum which is expected to increase as these efforts broaden. We see community foundations, such as the Baton Rouge Area Foundation, literally saving people's lives by helping Louisiana State University open a field hospital for 1,000 people in an old Kmart. And we see national organizations such as the YMCA of the USA providing program services such as emergency child care, recreation, and grief counseling. The YMCA has provided showers and other physical comforts and opened up their facilities as staging areas for relief, recovery and clean-up efforts. And the list goes on and on and on—not even considering the response of these same organizations and many others to Hurricane Rita.

The CARE Act is a bipartisan bill that received strong bipartisan support as it passed the Senate in the 108th Congress by a vote of 95-5. The House of Representatives passed companion legislation, the Charitable Giving Act, by a vote of 408-13. Sadly, this bill was blocked this bill from going to conference despite overwhelming support from both Houses and the general public.

The CARE Act of 2005 provides commonsense provisions to induce charitable giving. Among these include the above-the-line deduction for non-itemizers. More than two-thirds of Americans do not itemize on their tax returns, yet this group is estimated to contribute \$36 billion to charities. Research indicates that lower and moderate-income individuals are more likely not to itemize on their tax returns, and that they give a greater percentage of their incomes to charity than higher income individuals. It is only fair that they benefit for their generosity. As Major Hood from the Salvation Army

so eloquently wrote in his testimony at my hearing, “[t]he provision allowing non-itemizers to deduct charitable contributions can only encourage those Americans with smaller incomes—including young professionals who might otherwise be inclined to begin a lifetime of annual giving—to contribute to worthy causes. We do not discriminate among those in need, and we ask Congress not to discriminate in providing tax incentives for charitable giving.”

Additionally, the CARE Act calls for tax-free IRA charitable distributions for individuals aged 70½ and over. My home State of Pennsylvania has the second highest percentage of seniors in the country. Many of these older Americans want to experience the joy of making a difference by giving, and this provision provides them that opportunity. Certainly, these individuals should not be penalized for contributing portions of their life’s savings to a worthy cause.

Organizations have been generous during this crisis by donating food to those who need it. The CARE Act provides expanded incentives that will yield an estimated \$2 billion worth of food donations from farmers, restaurants, and corporations to help those in need. America’s Second Harvest estimates that this is the equivalent of 878 million meals for hungry Americans over 10 years. Last year, the North American Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention helped provide 3 million meals to hungry people. At the time of my hearing they were feeding hurricane victims 250,000 meals each day. By allowing businesses to recoup production costs this provision will incentivize food donations and help our action fight hunger. For the first time, farmers, ranchers, small business and restaurant owners will benefit from the same tax incentives afforded major corporate donors for the donation of food to the needy.

The CARE Act also provides asset building initiatives for low-income individuals. Low-income Americans face a huge hurdle when trying to save. Individual Development Accounts, IDAs, provide them with a way to work toward building assets while instilling the practice of saving into their everyday lives. IDAs are one of the most promising tools that enable low-income and low-wealth American families to save, build assets, and enter the financial mainstream. Based on the idea that all Americans should have access, through the tax code or through direct expenditures, to the structures that subsidize homeownership and retirement savings of wealthier families, IDAs encourage savings efforts among the poor by offering them a one-to-one match for their own deposits. IDAs reward the monthly savings of working-poor families who are trying to buy their first home, pay for post-secondary education, or start a small business. These matched savings accounts are similar to 401(k) plans and other matched savings accounts, but can serve a broad range of purposes.

We have also seen the philanthropy of corporations such as Home Depot and Coca-Cola Company. The Home Depot Foundation has donated nearly \$4 million to assist in the relief efforts. Coca-Cola Company donated \$5 million and water and other beverages to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for its relief efforts. This is an appropriate time to gradually raise the caps on corporate contributions from 10 to 20 percent to encourage corporations to continue their social responsibility. We must also level the playing field for all corporate donations by expanding charitable incentives for S corporations to increase charitable giving.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, I have worked closely with the Pennsylvania Association of Nonprofit Organizations. I have heard from many of the nonprofits in my State about the pressing need for the charitable incentives we have in the CARE Act.

The time is now to expand charitable giving, both in my home State and throughout the Nation. One certainty we have seen is in every disaster that occurs in the United States and around the world is the desire of fellow Americans to help those that are in need. We should commend that generosity by passing this legislation.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow full expensing for the cost of qualified refinery property in the year in which the property is placed in service, and to classify petroleum refining property as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, just this past May, I stood at a gas station in Salt Lake City and announced the introduction of S. 1039, the Gas Price Reduction Through Increased Refining Capacity Act of 2005.

By standing near a gas pump charging \$2.25 per gallon, I thought I was making a strong statement about the high price of gas and the need for greater refining capacity in our country.

That was only a few months ago, but hurricanes Katrina and Rita have since exposed the vulnerability of our Nation’s refining infrastructure, and the gas prices in May now seem like the good old days.

I am pleased that the energy bill signed by President Bush this summer included the principal concept of S. 1039—that of providing a strong tax incentive to expand refinery capacity by allowing the cost to be written off immediately. Unfortunately, because of budget restrictions, my legislation had to be cut.

I have long been concerned that our shrinking number of refineries and their proximity to our Nation’s coasts pose an unacceptable risk to our economic and strategic security. I thought cutting S. 1039 was a mistake at the time, and now I am hoping Congress will remedy that mistake.

Today, I rise to reintroduce those portions of my refining capacity legislation that were left out of the energy bill and call upon my colleagues to help me finish what was begun with my original bill.

My new legislation, the Refinery Investment Tax Assistance Act, would enhance the incentives made in the energy bill by increasing the short-term incentive to add new and expanded refining facilities and by removing the obstacle of long tax depreciation schedules that refineries face.

For those refiners able to commit to installing new refining equipment before 2008 and to have that added capacity built by 2012, my original bill would have allowed a complete write-off for investments in new refining equipment in the first year. As passed by Congress, though, this provision was cut for budgetary reasons to allow for expensing of only 50 percent of the costs in the first year. The legislation I am introducing today would enhance that to allow for the full 100 percent expensing in the first year. Now, more than ever, we need to use every possible means to increase the security of our fuel supply.

This bill would also restore another very important provision of S. 1039 that was dropped out of the energy bill as a cost savings. This provision would help to remove some of the disparity the refining industry faces in our current tax system. Most manufacturers in our country are able to depreciate the cost of their new equipment over five years. Refineries, on the other hand, are strapped with a full 10-year depreciation period. This unfair treatment of our refining industry acts as a long-term obstacle to new investment in increased capacity. The current 10-year depreciation schedule for refiners is unwarranted, and it is past time that we level the playing field on depreciation for this critically important sector of our energy industry.

On September 6, in the aftermath of Katrina, Mr. Bob Slaughter of the National Petrochemical & Refiners Association testified before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. He said that an important solution to our energy crisis would be to “[e]xpand the refining tax incentive provision in the Energy Act. Reduce the depreciation period for refining investments from 10 to seven or five years in order to remove a current disincentive for refining investment. Allow expensing under the current language to take place as the investment is made rather than when the equipment is actually placed in service. Or the percentage expensed could be increased as per the original legislation introduced by Senator HATCH.”

I think it is important to recognize that, over time, this legislation will not cost the U.S. Treasury one dime. It would allow refineries to change the timing of the depreciation of their equipment, but not the amount. And, we should keep in mind that when this

bill leads to more refineries and increased capacity, we will have also increased the tax base.

I want to throw my full support behind the proposals recently announced by House Energy and Commerce Chairman BARTON and House Resource Committee Chairman POMBO, which would take other approaches to increase the number of refineries in our Nation. From both a national security and an energy security perspective, I especially endorse a proposal by Chairman POMBO to locate more refineries on public lands near oil resource deposits. Such a move will make our Nation more secure from attacks from terrorists and from Mother Nature. I understand that Senate Energy and Natural Resource Committee Chairman Pete Domenici is promoting similar proposals on the Senate side. And I applaud these men for their leadership.

We have learned that when it comes to our Nation's energy security, refining is where we are the most vulnerable. It is not the time for half measures, but bold immediate action to establish a secure and independent refining program in this country. I hope my colleagues will join me in my efforts to achieve this goal. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1781

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Refinery Investment Tax Assistance Act of 2005".

SEC. 2. FULL EXPENSING FOR QUALIFIED REFINERY PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 179C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section 1323 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, is amended by striking "50 percent of".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in section 1323 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

SEC. 3. PETROLEUM REFINING PROPERTY TREATED AS 5-YEAR PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 168(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to 5-year property) is amended by striking "and" at the end of clause (v), by striking the period at the end of clause (vi) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(vii) any petroleum refining property."

(b) PETROLEUM REFINING PROPERTY.—Section 168(i) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(18) PETROLEUM REFINING PROPERTY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'petroleum refining property' means any asset for petroleum refining, including assets used for the distillation, fractionation, and catalytic cracking of crude petroleum into gasoline and its other components.

"(B) ASSET MUST MEET ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—Such term shall not include any property which does not meet all applicable environmental laws in effect on the date such property was placed in service. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a waiver under the Clean Air Act shall not be taken

into account in determining whether the applicable environmental laws have been met.

"(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS.—Such term shall not include any property with respect to which a deduction was taken under subsection (e)(3)(B) by any other taxpayer in any preceding year."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any property with respect to which the taxpayer has entered into a binding contract for the construction thereof on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 1784. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote a culture of safety within the health care system through the establishment of a National Medical Error Disclosure and Compensation Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am pleased today to introduce legislation that will improve patient safety while helping to provide some relief to health care providers dealing with escalating medical liability costs.

We are dealing with a medical malpractice problem in this country that is jeopardizing patient safety and hurting our health care system. As I visit with doctors and hospitals in New York and around the Nation, I hear about the pressures and problems of escalating medical malpractice insurance premiums.

These high premiums are forcing many physicians to alter their practice of medicine and leaving some patients without access to necessary medical care. In my State of New York, an unacceptable 40 percent of our counties have less than 5 practicing obstetricians.

At the same time, we have all heard the terrifying statistic from the landmark 1999 IOM report stating that as many as 98,000 deaths every year are the result of medical errors. But, far fewer people know that the IOM suggests that 90 percent of medical errors are the result of failed systems and procedures, not the negligence of physicians.

We must do better. If properly designed, these systems and procedures could go a long way towards seriously reducing medical errors.

But, understanding the root causes of errors requires their disclosure and analysis. And that's the fundamental tension between the medical liability system and our common goal of providing high quality care and improving patient safety in the health care system.

Studies have consistently shown that health care providers are reticent to engage in patient safety activities and be open about errors because they believe they are being asked to do so without appropriate assurances of legal protection.

That's where this legislation comes in. We build on the patient safety bill that was signed into law earlier this summer by creating a voluntary program to encourage disclosure of errors, an opportunity to enter negotiations and early settlement, while, at the same time, protecting patients' rights and providing liability protection for health care providers who participate in the program.

Our bill is designed to bridge the gap between the medical liability and patient safety systems for the benefit of patients and providers.

The truly unfortunate result of the current congressional stalemate over caps is that patients and physicians are left waiting for someone to break the logjam and work to find bipartisan solutions that have an opportunity to mitigate this problem. I believe it's critical that we find a way around this stalemate and that Congress work in good faith to find solutions that can garner enough support to find their way to the President's desk.

I believe that this is an exciting and innovative program that will improve patient-physician communication, reduce the rates of preventable patient injury, reduce the liability insurance premiums that physicians are facing, and insure that patients have access to fair compensation for medical injury: Four fundamental goals that I believe are necessary components of any solution we consider.

There are a number of successful programs across the country that are consistent with the provisions of our legislation, including one at the University of Michigan, and even one initiated by a medical malpractice insurance provider in Colorado. I am excited about the results these programs are producing—fewer numbers of suits being filed, more patients being compensated for injuries, greater patient trust and satisfaction, and significantly reduced administrative and legal defense costs for providers, insurers, and hospitals where these programs are in place.

I am hopeful that our legislation will provide an opportunity for more hospitals and physicians to use this program and see for themselves the benefits they—and their patients—will reap.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to join Senator CLINTON to introduce legislation that will help us all find common ground on the debate over patient safety and medical malpractice claims.

Today, medical error is the eighth leading cause of death in the United States. Every year, these tragic mistakes cost the lives of up to 98,000 Americans. This is unacceptable in America, and we must do more to ensure that every patient gets the right care, at the right time, in the right way.

The debate in Washington over this issue has been centered on caps and lawsuits. But across America, hospitals and medical providers are proving that

there's a better way to protect patients and doctors, all while raising the quality of our care and lowering its cost.

From the Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota to the VA hospital in Lexington, Kentucky, doctors and administrators aren't trying to cover up medical errors—They're trying to admit them. Instead of closing ranks and keeping the patient in the dark, they're investigating potential errors, apologizing if mistakes have been made, and offering a reasonable settlement that keeps the case out of court.

This program is often known as "Sorry Works," and it's led to some amazing results. When patients are treated with respect and told the truth, they sue less. More are actually compensated for their injuries, but medical providers pay less because the reward is the result of a settlement, not an expensive lawsuit. Malpractice costs for doctors go down, and health care professionals actually learn from their mistakes so they're not repeated and lives are saved.

At the VA hospital in Lexington, Kentucky, this program has reduced the average settlement to \$16,000, compared with \$98,000 nationwide. This ranked in the lowest quartile of all VA facilities for malpractice payouts. At the University of Michigan's hospital system, this program helped them cut their lawsuits in half and save up to \$2 million in defense litigation.

The bill we're introducing today builds on these hopeful results and incorporates them into a national program. The National Medical Error Disclosure and Compensation Act, or MEDiC Act, will help reduce medical error rates and medical malpractice costs by opening the lines of communication between doctors and patients—encouraging honesty and accountability in the process.

The bill will also set up a National Patient Safety Database, which will be used to determine best practices in preventing medical errors, improving patient safety, and increasing accountability in the healthcare system.

We expect participants to see a cost savings, and we will require them to reinvest a portion of these savings into patient quality measures that will reduce medical errors. This bill also requires that some of these savings are passed along to providers in the form of lower malpractice insurance premiums.

Certainly, these are lofty goals. But what Senator CLINTON and I hope to do with this legislation is promote the type of creative thinking that will be required if this country is going to overcome some of the gridlock in the healthcare debate. The MEDiC Act of 2005 brings together some of the best ideas currently out there, and I hope my colleagues in the Senate will work with Senator CLINTON and me to put these ideas in action.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1785. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 17, United States Code (relating to the vessel hull design protection), to clarify the distinction between a hull and a deck, to provide factors for the determination of the protectability of a revised design, to provide guidance for assessments of substantial similarity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise today along with the Senior Senator from Vermont in introducing the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments of 2005. This is the third recent piece of legislation on which I have teamed with Senator LEAHY—first working together on important reforms to the Freedom of Information Act and then joining to introduce significant counterfeiting prevention legislation. I am glad to continue our work by introducing this legislation which, though seemingly technical and minor, offers very important clarifications about the scope of protections available to boat designs.

Boat designs, like any technical designs, are complex and are the result of a great deal of hard work and contribution of intellectual property. Accordingly, Congress enacted the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act in 1998 to provide necessary protections that were not present among copyright statutes prior to that time. The Act has been instrumental for the continued development and protection of boat designs but unfortunately recently has encountered a few hurdles.

A recent court decision raised questions about the scope of protections available to various boat designs. Justifiably or not, this interpretation under the VHDPA unfortunately has led many in the boat manufacturing industry to conclude that the Act's provisions are not effective at protecting vessel designs. Intellectual property protection of those designs is critical to these manufacturers in order to encourage innovative design and clarification is needed.

The legislation we offer will clarify that the protections accorded to a vessel design can be used to separately protect a vessel's hull and/or deck as well as a plug or mold of either the hull or deck. The proposed amendments would make clear that it remains possible for boat designers to seek protection for both the hull and the deck, and plug or mold of both, of a single vessel, and many designers no doubt will continue to do so. However, these amendments are intended to clarify that protection under the VHDPA for these vessel elements may be analyzed separately.

This bipartisan legislation provides the necessary assurance to boat manufacturers that the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act will remain a vital intellectual property protection statute. The bill offers very important clarifications about the scope of protections available to boat designs and will be welcome news to boat makers across

the Nation and in Texas. The thousands of miles of coastline in Texas, and all the lakes and rivers in between, provide significant opportunities for recreational and commercial boating throughout the State. This legislation will ensure that there will be continued innovation in the design and manufacture of boats for many years to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1785

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Vessel Hull Design Protection Amendments of 2005".

SEC. 2. DESIGNS PROTECTED.

Section 1301(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) VESSEL FEATURES.—The design of a vessel hull or deck, including a plug or mold, is subject to protection under this chapter, notwithstanding section 1302(4)."

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1301(b) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "vessel hull, including a plug or mold," and inserting "vessel hull or deck, including a plug or mold,";

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

"(4) A 'hull' is the exterior frame or body of a vessel, exclusive of the deck, superstructure, masts, sails, yards, rigging, hardware, fixtures, and other attachments."; and
(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(7) A 'deck' is the horizontal surface of a vessel that covers the hull, including exterior cabin and cockpit surfaces, and exclusive of masts, sails, yards, rigging, hardware, fixtures, and other attachments.".

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Senator CORNYN and I have already worked together on significant Freedom of Information Act legislation and on counterfeiting legislation during the first session of this Congress. Today, we are introducing another bill and taking our partnership to the high seas, or at least to our Nation's boat manufacturing industry, with the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments of 2005.

Designs of boat vessel hulls are often the result of a great deal of time, effort, and financial investment. They are afforded intellectual property protection under the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act that Congress passed in 1998. This law exists for the same reason that other works enjoy intellectual property rights: to encourage continued innovation, to protect the works that emerge from the creative process, and to reward the creators. Recent courtroom experience has made it clear that the protections Congress passed seven years ago need some statutory refinement to ensure they meet the purposes we envisioned. The Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments shore up the law, making an important clarification about the scope of

the protections available to boat designs.

We continue to be fascinated with, and in so many ways dependent on, bodies of water, both for recreation and commerce. More than fifty percent of Americans live on or near the coastline in this country. We seem always to be drawn to the water, whether it is the beautiful Lake Champlain in my home State of Vermont or the world's large oceans. And as anyone who has visited our seaports can attest, much of our commerce involves sea travel. I would like to thank Senators KOHL and HATCH for cosponsoring this legislation. Protecting boat designs and encouraging innovation in those designs are worthy aims, and I hope we can move quickly to pass this bipartisan legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 254—MARKING THE DEDICATION OF THE GAYLORD NELSON WILDERNESS WITHIN THE APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 254

Whereas the Honorable Gaylord Nelson, a State Senator, Governor, and United States Senator from Wisconsin, devoted his life to protecting the environment by championing issues of land protection, wildlife habitat, environmental health, and increased environmental awareness, including founding Earth Day;

Whereas the Honorable Gaylord Nelson authored the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore Act, which led to the protection of one of the most beautiful areas in Wisconsin and recognized the rich assemblage of natural resources, cultural heritage, and scenic features on Wisconsin's north coast and 21 islands of the 22-island archipelago;

Whereas the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore was designated a National Park on September 26, 1970;

Whereas, on December 8, 2004, approximately 80 percent of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore was designated the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness;

Whereas the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore provides a refuge for many species of birds, including threatened bald eagles and endangered piping plovers, herring-billed gulls, double-crested cormorants, and great blue herons, and is a safe haven for a variety of amphibians, such as blue-spotted salamanders, red-backed salamanders, gray treefrogs, and mink frogs, and is a sanctuary for several mammals, including river otters, black bears, snowshoe hares, and fishers;

Whereas the official dedication of the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness occurred on August 8, 2005, 36 days after the Honorable Gaylord Nelson's passing; and

Whereas the Honorable Gaylord Nelson changed the consciousness of our Nation and embodied the principle that 1 person can change the world, and the creation of the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness is a small, but fitting, recognition of his efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the Honorable Gaylord Nelson's environmental legacy;

(2) celebrates the dedication of the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore; and

(3) requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of the Senator.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, December 8, 2004, approximately 80 percent of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin was designated the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness. Although we did not formally celebrate the new wilderness area until August 8, 2005, we have been delighting in the designation ever since December of last year.

The designation of the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore on August 8, 2005 was a tremendous occasion for both Wisconsin and the country. I was deeply honored to participate in the ceremony marking the creation of the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness. I knew Gaylord, and am proud to occupy his Senate seat. Like all of those in attendance at the dedication ceremony, including Tia Nelson, Governor Doyle, Congressman OBEY, local officials, tribal chairs, and many others, I was deeply saddened that Gaylord wasn't able to be sitting among us, having passed away on July 3, 2005.

However, I do believe that, because the area, the magnificent Apostles, and the wilderness designation we were celebrating were such a part of Gaylord, he was in fact there with us that day, urging us to mark the achievement and to continue his life's work of building a national conservation ethic. As we all know, while his record of achievements is long and impressive, it is Senator Nelson's passion and commitment to protecting our environment that will remain the centerpiece of his legacy. For this reason, Senator KOHL and I have submitted a resolution to bring recognition to Gaylord's unwavering efforts on behalf of the environment and to celebrate the dedication of a wilderness area rightly named in his honor.

Gaylord so believed in his responsibility to the environment that he started a revolution that has inspired millions of people from across the globe. The day he created in 1970—Earth Day—has become a cause for celebration, education, and reflection for all. Simply stated, Gaylord Nelson changed the consciousness of a Nation, and quite possibly the world. He was a distinguished Governor and Senator, a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and a personal hero of mine. Most importantly, he was the embodiment of the principle that one person can change the world.

August 8, 2005 marked the beginning of a new period for the Apostle Islands and I could not be more proud of this. In 1998, Representative OBEY and I asked for a wilderness survey. Seven years later, we finally gathered to salute the awe-inspiring resource as well

as the man who dedicated himself to protecting our environment, particularly those places where we humans are but humble visitors—wilderness areas. Let us not forget, however, that before we could talk about having a wilderness area within the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, we had to have a National Lakeshore. I am sure it will come as no surprise that Gaylord was essential in the effort to recognize the Apostle Islands as a national treasure.

The wild and primitive nature of the Apostles and now the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness has always been an attraction, not only for Wisconsin residents but for people from across the globe. At the Apostles you can find pristine old growth forests; wetlands that are home to an astounding ecological diversity; birds that travel long distances and use the islands for respite; and amphibians, which can act as indicators of the Park's environmental health.

It is a truly amazing place.

And people know it. In fact, just recently, the Apostles was rated the #1 National Park in the U.S. by National Geographic Traveler. The rating was based on a variety of factors, most notably environmental and ecological quality, social and cultural integrity, and the outlook for the future.

We have it all in the Park—ecological and cultural resources intertwined with one another. The history of the islands is a history of people living off, and very much in balance with, the land and water surrounding them. A visit to the Apostles and the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness can be, if we let go of the trappings of modern society, an enlightening voyage that challenges us to think about those who came before us, those who will follow us, and the connections between us and the natural resources we depend on for our survival.

The Ojibwae, who Wisconsinites know were the original inhabitants of the Apostles, had great respect for the resources. They believed in taking something only if they were giving something in return. The Ojibwae people understood their dependence on the environment long before many others began contemplating such a relationship. Unfortunately, as a society, we have not always heeded their example. We must be better stewards of our land, our air, and our water. Gaylord pushed us toward that goal every day of his life. And, what better way to mark the dedication of the Wilderness Area named in his honor than for each of us to dedicate ourselves to actively carrying his legacy forward. That is Gaylord's challenge for all of us.

So many people supported the creation of the Lakeshore and the Wilderness area. The support has taken many forms—all of which have added to the success of our Park and the wilderness designation. I am especially grateful for the families who have donated their properties, many of which are filled with childhood and other cherished family memories, for the betterment of

the whole Apostle Islands and now the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness. Future generations whom none of us will ever know will benefit deeply from their commitment to one of Wisconsin's most treasured places.

Every time I visit the Apostles and pieces of what are now the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness, I depart with a sense of inner peace and clarity. A New York Times journalist wrote about the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in 1972, saying he encountered a "silence so intense you can hear it." I believe that what all those who visit the Gaylord Nelson Wilderness are bound to hear through that "intense silence" is Gaylord himself calling them to action.

SENATE RESOLUTION 255—RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE AND THE WATERFOWL POPULATION SURVEY

Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 255

Whereas every spring and summer teams of United States Fish and Wildlife Service pilot-biologists take to the skies to survey North America's waterfowl breeding grounds flying more than 80,000 miles a year, crisscrossing the country just above the treetops and open fields, they and observers on the ground record the number of ducks, geese, and swans and assess the quality and quantity of water-fowl breeding habitats.

Whereas the pilot biologists operate from the wide open bays and wetlands of the eastern shores of North America to some of the most remote regions of Canada and Alaska, and are documenting an important part of our wildlife heritage;

Whereas the Waterfowl Population Survey, operated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is celebrating its 50th anniversary in 2005, is featured on the 2005–2006 Duck Stamp, and has been recognized by the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation for its contribution to waterfowl hunting;

Whereas the Waterfowl Population Survey Program has evolved into the largest and most reliable wildlife survey effort in the world;

Whereas for more than 50 years cooperative waterfowl surveys have been performed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Canadian Wildlife Service, State and provincial biologists, and nongovernmental partners; and

Whereas survey results determine the status of North America's waterfowl populations, play an important role in setting annual waterfowl hunting regulations, and help guide the decisions of waterfowl managers throughout North America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the achievements and contributions of the Waterfowl Population Survey Program;

(2) expresses strong support for the continued success of the Waterfowl Population Survey Program;

(3) encourages the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in its efforts to broaden understanding and public participation in the

Waterfowl Population Survey Program by increasing partnerships to continue growth and development of the Survey; and

(4) reaffirms its commitment to the Waterfowl Population Survey Program and the conservation of the rich natural heritage of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—HONORING THE LIFE OF SANDRA FELDMAN

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 256

Whereas Sandra Feldman was born Sandra Abramowitz in October, 1939, to blue-collar parents living in a tenement in Coney Island, New York;

Whereas Sandra Feldman, while at James Madison High School, Brooklyn College, and New York University, began a life-long dedication to education both in the United States and abroad;

Whereas Sandra Feldman began her career by teaching fourth grade at Public School 34 on the Lower East Side of New York City;

Whereas during her service as union leader at Public School 34, Sandra Feldman became employed by the United Federation of Teachers in New York City, and was elected president in 1986, after 20 years of service;

Whereas Sandra Feldman's tenure as president of the United Federation of Teachers was distinguished by her devotion to better working conditions for the teachers she represented;

Whereas in 1997, the American Federation of Teachers elected Sandra Feldman to serve as their president, until she retired 7 years later;

Whereas Sandra Feldman effectively represented the educators, healthcare professionals, public employees, and retirees who made up the membership of the American Federation of Teachers;

Whereas Sandra Feldman was a tireless advocate for public education, working with President George W. Bush on the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 to improve accountability standards and provide increased resources to schools to help increasing professional development to better equip teachers to instruct students, and using research-driven methods to redesign school programs;

Whereas Sandra Feldman was equally devoted to fighting against discrimination, raising the nursing shortage into national public awareness, advocating for smaller class sizes and patient-to-nurse ratios promoting increased benefits and compensation for workers, and spreading her message beyond her own membership by advocating for workers overseas as well;

Whereas Sandra Feldman lent her expertise to both the national and international labor movements in her capacities as a member of the AFL-CIO executive council and a vice president of Education International; and

Whereas Sandra Feldman succumbed on September 18, 2005, to a difficult struggle against breast cancer at the age of 65: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the loss of Sandra Feldman, a vibrant and dedicated public servant;

(2) recognizes the contributions of Sandra Feldman to public education;

(3) expresses its deepest condolences to those who knew and loved Sandra Feldman; and

(4) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Sandra Feldman.

SENATE RESOLUTION 257—RECOGNIZING THE SPIRIT OF JACOB MOCK DOUB AND MANY YOUNG PEOPLE WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO ENCOURAGING YOUTH TO BE PHYSICALLY ACTIVE AND FIT, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR "NATIONAL TAKE A KID MOUNTAIN BIKING DAY"

Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. SALAZAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 257

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, obesity rates have nearly tripled in adolescents in the United States since 1980;

Whereas overweight adolescents have a 70 percent chance of becoming overweight or obese adults;

Whereas research conducted by the National Institutes of Health indicates that, while genetics do play a role in childhood obesity, the large increase in childhood obesity rates over the past few decades can be traced to overeating and lack of sufficient exercise;

Whereas the Surgeon General and the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports recommend regular physical activity, including bicycling, for the prevention of overweight and obesity;

Whereas Jacob Mock "Jack" Doub, born July 11, 1985, was actively involved in encouraging others, especially children, to ride bicycles and was an active youth who was introduced to mountain biking at the age of 11 near Grandfather Mountain, North Carolina, and quickly became a talented cyclist;

Whereas Jack Doub died unexpectedly from complications related to a bicycling injury on October 21, 2002;

Whereas Jack Doub's family and friends have joined, in association with the International Mountain Bicycling Association, to honor Jack Doub's spirit and love of bicycling by establishing the Jack Doub Memorial Fund to promote and encourage children of all ages to learn to ride and lead a physically active lifestyle;

Whereas the International Mountain Bicycling Association's worldwide network, which is based in Boulder, Colorado, includes 32,000 individual members, more than 450 bicycle clubs, 140 corporate partners, and 240 bicycle retailer members, who coordinate more than 1,000,000 volunteer trail work hours each year and have built more than 5,000 miles of new trails;

Whereas the International Mountain Bicycling Association has encouraged low-impact riding and volunteer trail work participation since 1988; and

Whereas "National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day" was established in honor of Jack Doub in 2004 by the International Mountain Bicycling Association, and is celebrated on the first Saturday in October of each year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the health risks associated with childhood obesity;

(B) the spirit of Jacob Mock "Jack" Doub and so many others who have been actively promoting physical activity to combat childhood obesity; and

(C) Jack Doub's contribution to encouraging youth of all ages to be physically active and fit, especially through bicycling;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of “National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day”, which was established in honor of Jack Doub in 2004 by the International Mountain Bicycling Association, and is celebrated on the first Saturday in October of each year; and

(3) encourages parents, schools, civic organizations, and students to support the International Mountain Bicycling Association’s “National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day” to promote increased physical activity among youth in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 258—TO COMMEND TIMOTHY SCOTT WINEMAN

Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mr. BENNETT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 258

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman became an employee of the United States Senate on October 19, 1970, and since that date has ably and faithfully upheld the high standards and traditions of the staff of the United States Senate for a period that included 19 Congresses;

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman has served in the senior management of the Disbursing Office for more than 25 years, first as the Assistant Financial Clerk of the United States Senate from August 1, 1980 to April 30, 1998, and finally as Financial Clerk of the United States Senate from May 1, 1998 to October 14, 2005;

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman has faithfully discharged the difficult duties and responsibilities of his position as Financial Clerk of the United States Senate with great pride, energy, efficiency, dedication, integrity, and professionalism;

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman has earned the respect, affection, and esteem of the United States Senate; and

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman will retire from the United States Senate on October 14, 2005, with 35 years of service with the United States Senate all with the Disbursing Office: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate commends Timothy S. Wineman for his exemplary service to the United States Senate and the Nation, and wishes to express its deep appreciation and gratitude for his long, faithful, and outstanding service.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Timothy S. Wineman.

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—COMMENDING THE EFFORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS IN RESPONDING TO HURRICANE KATRINA

Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs:

S. RES. 259

Whereas Hurricane Katrina physically devastated many areas in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs operates 11 medical centers, 18 community-based outpatient clinics, 3 regional offices, and 8 national cemeteries in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs evacuated over 1,000 patients, employees, and their families from facilities in the affected areas without any loss of life due to the evacuations;

Whereas over 1,000 employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs are volunteering to assist veterans and their families affected by Hurricane Katrina throughout the United States;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs is providing shelter to over 550 staff and their families who have been displaced as a result of Hurricane Katrina;

Whereas patients and employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Texas provided extraordinary support and medical assistance to veterans, staff, and families affected by Hurricane Katrina and coordinated numerous medical efforts as part of the overall Federal Government response and recovery efforts in the Gulf Region; and

Whereas heroic actions and efforts on the part of numerous employees and volunteers of the Department of Veterans Affairs saved countless lives and provided immeasurable comfort to the victims of Hurricane Katrina: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the employees and volunteers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, who risked life and limb to assist veterans, staff, and their respective families who were affected by Hurricane Katrina.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution that honors the extraordinary heroics exhibited by employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs in the response to the catastrophic conditions caused by Hurricane Katrina.

The Department of Veterans Affairs operates 11 medical centers, 18 community-based outpatient clinics, three regional offices, and eight national cemeteries in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Throughout this tragedy, VA moved employees, their families, equipment, and even patients from many of these places. Incredibly with over 1,000 people evacuated in total, not one life was lost.

While it is impossible for me to recognize every act of bravery and courage exhibited, I would be remiss if I did not highlight the incredible story of two VA nurses and their efforts to ensure continued patient care during the aftermath of Katrina. These two nurses not only braved the danger of the storm, but they risked their own lives to ensure that their patients could survive. These two women fed their own water supply to their patients, and, even more incredibly, they then administered intravenous fluids to one another to stay hydrated so that they could continue to deliver care. Clearly, this was going far above and beyond the call of duty. The example set by these two courageous women must be recognized.

I also want to note that VA’s success in responding to this storm was largely due to the extensive preparation by VA workers before Katrina hit the Gulf Region. This preparation ensured the successful administration of continued medical care to veterans upon relocation as well as the safe evacuation of all staff and their families.

Before the storm hit, VA workers oversaw the evacuation of 166 patients in Mississippi and Louisiana. In addition, VA workers had the foresight to transfer copies of electronic medical

records from the New Orleans VA Medical Center to the VA facility in Houston so that those records would be available on a national level. The bottom line is that this careful preparation before the storm hit saved lives.

The examples of sacrifice and heroics are countless. But, I don’t want to forget those who simply stayed put in the right place and did their job—sometimes for days on end. I am speaking most specifically of the valiant efforts of the employees in the VA facilities throughout Texas. These dedicated doctors, nurses, and supporting staff worked countless hours providing medical assistance, shelter and comfort to the evacuated VA patients, employees, and their families.

As Chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, it is my distinct honor to commend the heroic efforts of VA workers throughout the country in this resolution. I am also pleased to note that Ranking Member AKAKA has joined with me in expressing our sincere appreciation. The devastation of Hurricane Katrina is something with which we are all familiar. It gives me great pleasure to highlight the dedication, sacrifice, and courage of VA workers in light of the terrible devastation caused by what many have called the worst natural disaster in our Nation’s history.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 54—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING JASPER FRANCIS CROPSEY, THE FAMOUS STATEN ISLAND-BORN 19TH CENTURY HUDSON RIVER PAINTER

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 54

Whereas Jasper Francis Cropsey was born on February 18, 1823, in Rossville, Staten Island, New York to Jacob Cropsey and Elizabeth Hilyer Cortelyou;

Whereas Jasper Francis Cropsey was a famous second generation 19th Century Hudson River Valley Painter, and became known as America’s “Painter of Autumn” after his vibrant depiction of Autumn on the Hudson River was unveiled in London in 1860;

Whereas Jasper Francis Cropsey contributed greatly to the Hudson River Valley, Staten Island, and the United States through his artistic and architectural talent by producing, throughout his lifetime, more than 1,300 oil paintings, 400 water colors, and numerous architectural drawings; and

Whereas Jasper Francis Cropsey admired the work of Thomas Cole and other American landscape painters and he believed in the natural unspoiled beauty of the United States, depicting serene landscapes of man’s peaceful coexistence with nature and harmonious American naturalism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring Jasper Francis Cropsey, the famous Staten Island-born 19th Century Hudson River Painter; and

(2) the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1875. Mr. GRAHAM (for Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. NELSON, of Florida)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1281, to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for science, aeronautics, exploration, exploration capabilities, and the Inspector General, and for other purposes, for fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010.

SA 1876. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1877. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1878. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1879. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1880. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 147, to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1881. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1875. Mr. GRAHAM (for Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. NELSON of Florida)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1281, to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for science, aeronautics, exploration, exploration capabilities, and the Inspector General, and for other purposes, for fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010; as follows:

On page 2, after line 8, beginning with the item relating to section 137 strike through the item relating to section 152 on page 3 and insert the following:

Sec. 137. Lessons learned and best practices.
Sec. 138. Safety management.
Sec. 139. Creation of a budget structure that aids effective oversight and management.

Sec. 140. Earth observing system.

Sec. 141. NASA healthcare program.

Sec. 142. Assessment of extension of data collection from Ulysses and Voyager spacecraft.

Sec. 143. Program to expand distance learning in rural underserved areas.

Sec. 144. Institutions in NASA'S minority institutions program.

Sec. 145. Aviation safety program.

Sec. 146. Atmospheric, geophysical, and rocket research authorization.

Sec. 147. Orbital debris.

Sec. 148. Continuation of certain educational programs.

Sec. 149. Establishment of the Charles "Pete" Conrad Astronomy Awards Program.

Sec. 150. GAO assessment of feasibility of Moon and Mars exploration missions.

Sec. 151. Workforce.

Sec. 152. Major research equipment and facilities.

Sec. 153. Data on specific fields of study.

On page 3, before line 1, strike the second item relating to section 161 and insert the following:

Sec. 162. Facilities management.

On page 3, before line 1, after the item relating to section 304 insert the following:

Sec. 305. Power and propulsion reporting.

Sec. 306. Utilization of NASA field centers and workforce.

On page 3, before line 1, beginning with the item relating to section 402 strike through the item relating to section 507 and insert the following:

Sec. 402. Commercial technology transfer program.

Sec. 403. Authority for competitive prize program to encourage development of advanced space and aeronautical technologies.

Sec. 404. Commercial goods and services.

TITLE V—AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 501. Governmental interest in aeronautics.

Sec. 502. National policy for aeronautics research and development.

Sec. 503. High priority aeronautics research and development programs.

Sec. 504. Test facilities.

Sec. 505. Miscellaneous provisions.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENTS.

Sec. 601. Extension of indemnification authority.

Sec. 602. Intellectual property provisions.

Sec. 603. Retrocession of jurisdiction.

Sec. 604. Recovery and disposition authority.

Sec. 605. Requirement for independent cost analysis.

Sec. 606. Electronic access to business opportunities.

Sec. 607. Reports elimination.

Sec. 608. Small business contracting.

Sec. 609. Government accountability office review and report.

On page 4, strike lines 16 through 22, and insert the following:

(4) The exploration, development, and permanent habitation of the Moon will inspire the Nation, spur commerce, imagination, and excitement around the world, and open the possibility of further exploration of Mars. NASA should return to the Moon within the next decade.

On page 10, line 7, strike "schedules;" and insert "schedules, and may place a greater emphasis on science, including the programs described in this paragraph, throughout the fiscal years for which funds are authorized

by this Act (and for this purpose, of the funds authorized by section 101(1) of this Act, no less than \$5,341,200,000 shall be for science, and of the funds authorized by section 102(1) of this Act, no less than \$5,960,300,000 shall be for science);".

On page 14, line 12, strike "and".

On page 14, line 17, strike "orbit." and insert "orbit;".

On page 14, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(5) conduct a program to assure the health and safety of astronauts during extended space exploration missions which include more effective countermeasures to mitigate deleterious effects of such missions, and the means to provide in-space exploration medical care delivery to crews with little or no real-time support from Earth, relevant issues such as radiation exposure, exercise countermeasures, cardiac health, diagnostic and monitoring devices, and medical imaging;

(6) utilize advanced power and propulsion technologies, including nuclear and electric technologies, to enable or enhance robotic and human exploration missions when feasible; and

(7) develop a robust technology development program to provide surface power for use on the Moon and other locations relevant to NASA space exploration goals which, to the extent feasible, address needs for modular, scalable power sources for a range of applications on the Moon including human and vehicular uses.

On page 16, beginning with line 8, strike through line 12 on page 18.

On page 18, line 13, strike "SEC 139." and insert "SEC. 137.".

On page 19, line 9, strike "SEC. 140." and insert "SEC. 138.".

On page 20, line 20, strike "SEC. 141." and insert "SEC. 139.".

On page 21, line 17, strike "SEC. 142." and insert "SEC. 140.".

On page 23, line 9, strike "SEC. 143." and insert "SEC. 141.".

On page 23, line 17, strike "SEC. 144." and insert "SEC. 142.".

On page 24, line 8, strike "SEC. 145." and insert "SEC. 143.".

On page 25, line 4, strike "SEC. 146." and insert "SEC. 144.".

On page 25, line 23, strike "SEC. 147." and insert "SEC. 145.".

On page 26, line 6, strike "SEC. 148." and insert "SEC. 146.".

On page 26, line 13, strike "SEC. 149." and insert "SEC. 147.".

On page 26, line 18, strike "SEC. 150." and insert "SEC. 148.".

On page 27, line 1, strike "SEC. 151." and insert "SEC. 149.".

On page 28, line 3, strike "SEC. 152." and insert "SEC. 150.".

On page 28, line 12, after "schedules." insert "The Comptroller General shall include in this assessment the short- and long-term impact of the exploration program on other NASA program areas, including aeronautics, space science, earth science and NASA's overall research and technology development budget.".

On page 28, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 151. WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall develop a human capital strategy to ensure that NASA has a workforce of the appropriate size and with the appropriate skills to carry out the programs of NASA, consistent with the policies and plans developed pursuant to this section. The strategy shall ensure that current personnel are utilized, to the maximum extent feasible, in implementing the vision for space exploration and NASA's

other programs. The strategy shall cover the period through fiscal year 2011.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The strategy shall describe, at a minimum—

(1) any categories of employees NASA intends to reduce, the expected size and timing of those reductions, the methods NASA intends to use to make the reductions, and the reasons NASA no longer needs those employees;

(2) any categories of employees NASA intends to increase, the expected size and timing of those increases, the methods NASA intends to use to recruit the additional employees, and the reasons NASA needs those employees;

(3) the steps NASA will use to retain needed employees; and

(4) the budget assumptions of the strategy, which for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 shall be consistent with the authorizations provided in subtitle A, and any expected additional costs or savings from the strategy by fiscal year.

(c) **SCHEDULE.**—The Administrator shall transmit the strategy developed under this section to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and House of Representatives Committee on Science not later than the date on which the President submits the proposed budget for the Federal Government for fiscal year 2007 to the Congress. At least 60 days before transmitting the strategy, NASA shall provide a draft of the strategy to its Federal Employee Unions for a 30-day consultation period after which NASA shall respond in writing to any written concerns provided by the Unions.

(d) **LIMITATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—NASA may not initiate any buyout offer after the date of enactment of this Act until 60 days after the strategy required by this subsection has been transmitted to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and House of Representatives Committee on Science in accordance with subsection (c). NASA may not implement any reduction-in-force or other involuntary separations (except for cause) prior to June 1, 2007, except as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(A) **SPECIFIC BUY-OUTS.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), NASA may make exceptions can be made for specific buy-outs on a case-by-case basis, if NASA provides information to the Committees that justifies those specific buy-outs, including why the relevant employees could not be utilized to fulfill other NASA missions.

(B) **EMERGENCY REDUCTIONS-IN-FORCE.**—NASA may also request an exception for an emergency reduction-in-force of management personnel by transmitting to the Committees—

(i) a detailed rationale for the proposed reduction-in-force;

(ii) an explanation of why the proposed reduction-in-force cannot wait until after the workforce strategy has been transmitted to the Committees in accordance with the requirements of this section; and

(iii) an explanation of why the relevant employees could not be utilized to fulfill other NASA missions.

SEC. 152. MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Science Foundation may use funds in the major research equipment and facilities construction account for the design and development of projects that—

(1) have been given a very high rating by relevant scientific peer review panels in the relevant discipline;

(2) have substantial cost-sharing with non-Foundation entities; and

(3) have passed a critical design review.

(b) **NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD APPROVAL.**—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to eliminate the need for approval by the National Science Board before such equipment and facilities are eligible for acquisition, construction, commissioning, or upgrading.

SEC. 153. DATA ON SPECIFIC FIELDS OF STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The National Science Foundation shall collect statistically reliable data through the American Community Survey on the field of degree of college-educated individuals.

(b) **ADDITIONAL CENSUS QUESTION.**—In order to facilitate the implementation of subsection (a), the Secretary of Commerce shall expand the American Community Survey to include a question to elicit information concerning the field of study in which college-educated individuals received their degrees. The Director of the Bureau of the Census shall consult with the Director of the National Science Foundation concerning the wording of the question or questions to be added to the Survey.

On page 28, beginning with line 21, strike through line 5 on page 30 and insert the following:

NASA shall develop a facilities investment plan through fiscal year 2015 that takes into account uniqueness, mission dependency, and other studies required by this Act.

On page 33, line 2, strike “and”.

On page 33, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(4) consider the need for a life sciences centrifuge and any associated holding facilities; and

On page 33, line 3, strike “(4)” and insert “(5)”.

On page 38, beginning with line 24, strike through line 9 on page 39 and insert the following:

(a) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of the United States to possess the capability for assured human access to space. The Administrator shall act to ensure that the United States retains that capacity on a continuous basis. The Administrator shall conduct the transition from the Space Shuttle orbiter to a replacement capacity in a manner that efficiently uses the personnel, capabilities, and infrastructure that are currently available to the extent feasible.

(b) **PROGRESS REPORT.**—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science on the progress and the estimated amount of time before the next generation human-rated NASA spacecraft will demonstrate crewed, orbital spaceflight.

(c) **POLICY COMPLIANCE REPORT.**—If, 1 year before the final flight of the Space Shuttle orbiter, the United States has not demonstrated a replacement human space flight system, the Administrator shall certify that the United States cannot uphold the policy outlined in subsection (a) and shall provide a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science describing—

(1) United States strategic risks associated with the hiatus or gap;

(2) the estimated length of time during which the United States will not have independent human access to space;

(3) what steps will be taken to shorten that length of time; and

(4) what other means will be used to allow human access to space during that time.

On page 39, line 10, strike “(b) REPORT.” and insert “(d) TRANSITION PLAN REPORT.”.

On page 39, line 19, strike “(c)” and insert “(e)”.

On page 40, line 7, strike “In” and insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—In”.

On page 40, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(b) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—The Administrator shall initiate a feasibility study for establishing a National Free Flyer Launch Center as a means of consolidating and integrating secondary launch capabilities, launch opportunities, and payloads.

(c) **ASSESSMENT.**—The feasibility study required in this section shall include an assessment of the potential utilization of existing launch and launch support facilities and capabilities in the states of Montana and New Mexico and their respective contiguous states, and the state of Alaska, and shall include an assessment of the feasibility of integrating the potential National Free Flyer Launch Center within the operations and facilities of an existing non-profit organization such as the Inland Northwest Space Alliance in Missoula, Montana, or similar entity.

SEC. 305. POWER AND PROPULSION REPORTING.

The Administrator shall, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, provide to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science, a full description of plans to develop and utilize nuclear power and nuclear propulsion capabilities to achieve agency goals and any requirements in this Act, and address how those plans meet the intent of the Vision for Space Exploration and the President’s Space Transportation Policy Directive.

SEC. 306. UTILIZATION OF NASA FIELD CENTERS AND WORKFORCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In budgeting for and carrying out elements of this title, the Administrator shall make the most effective use of existing research, development, testing, and space exploration expertise and facilities resident within NASA field centers.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIELD CENTERS.**—The Administrator shall take appropriate action to balance responsibilities between the field centers for leading the development of systems relevant to the Vision for Space Exploration, including systems identified in this title or any architecture studies performed by NASA.

On page 41, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 402. COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall execute a commercial technology transfer program with the goal of facilitating the exchange services, products, and intellectual property between NASA and the private sector. This program shall be maintained in a manner that provides measurable benefits for the agency, the domestic economy, and research communities.

(b) **PROGRAM STRUCTURE.**—In carrying out the program described in paragraph (a), the Administrator shall maintain the funding and program structure of NASA’s existing technology transfer and commercialization organizations through the end of fiscal year 2006.

On page 41, line 16, strike “SEC. 402.” and insert “SEC. 403.”.

On page 45, line 1, strike “SEC. 403.” and insert “SEC. 404.”.

On page 45, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

TITLE V—AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 501. GOVERNMENTAL INTEREST IN AERONAUTICS.

Congress reaffirms the national commitment to aeronautics research made in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

Aeronautical research and development remains a core mission of NASA. NASA is the lead agency for civil aeronautics research. NASA shall conduct a robust program of aeronautics research that includes fundamental basic research as well as research in the fields of vehicle systems and of safety and security.

SEC. 502. NATIONAL POLICY FOR AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall develop through NASA and other relevant entities, a national aeronautics policy to guide the aeronautics programs of the United States through the year 2020. The development of this policy shall utilize external studies that have been conducted on the state of United States aeronautics and aviation research and have suggested policies to ensure continued competitiveness.

(b) CONTENT.—At a minimum the national aeronautics policy shall describe—

(1) national goals for aeronautics research;

(2) the priority areas of research for aeronautics through fiscal year 2011;

(3) the basis of which and the process by which priorities for ensuing fiscal years will be selected; and

(4) respective roles and responsibilities of various Federal agencies in aeronautics research.

(c) NASA INPUT.—In providing input to and executing the National Aeronautics Policy, the Administrator, shall consider the following issues:

(1) The established governmental interest in conducting research and development programs for improvement of the usefulness, performance, speed, safety, and efficiency of aeronautical and vehicles, as described in section 102(c)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 and reaffirmed in section 501.

(2) The established governmental interest in conducting research and development programs that contribute to preservation of the role of the United States as a global leader in aeronautical technologies and in the application thereof in section 102(c)(5) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 and reaffirmed in section 501.

(3) The appropriate balance between long-term, high risk research and shorter, more incremental research, and the expected impact on the United States economy and public good.

(4) The appropriate balance between in-house research and procurement with industry and academia.

(5) The extent to which NASA should address military and commercial aviation needs.

(6) How NASA will coordinate its aeronautics program with other Federal agencies.

(7) Opportunities for partnerships with the private sector.

(d) SCHEDULE.—

(1) No later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit the national aeronautics policy to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the House Committee on Science, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(2) No later than 60 days after the transmittal of the policy, the Administrator shall submit NASA's response to the policy, to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the House Committee on Science, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

SEC. 503. HIGH PRIORITY AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In its role as lead agency for civil aeronautics research and develop-

ment, NASA shall develop programs and projects in accordance with the National Aeronautics Policy described in section 502, as well program areas listed in subsection (b). These programs must be driven by scientific merit.

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—In executing an aeronautics research and development program, the Administrator shall, at a minimum, within the budgetary and programmatic resources provided, conduct programs in the following areas:

(1) FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH.—The Administrator shall establish a program of long-term fundamental research in aeronautical sciences and technologies that is not tied to specific development projects. The Administrator shall set aside no less than 5 percent of the aeronautics budget for this program. As part of this program, the Administrator is encouraged to make merit-reviewed grants to institutions of higher learning, including such institutions located in states that participate in the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research.

(2) VEHICLE SYSTEMS RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY.—In order to maintain United States economic competitiveness and protect the environment, the Administrator shall establish programs in each of the following technology areas:

(A) ENVIRONMENTAL AIRCRAFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator shall establish an initiative with the objective of developing and demonstrating in a relevant environment, technologies to enable the following commercial aircraft performance characteristics:

(i) NOISE.—Noise levels on takeoff and on airport approach and landing that do not exceed ambient noise levels in the absence of flight operations in the vicinity of airports from which such commercial aircraft would normally operate;

(ii) ENERGY CONSUMPTION.—Twenty-five percent reduction in the energy required for medium to long range flights, compared to aircraft in commercial service as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(iii) EMISSIONS.—Nitrogen oxides on takeoff and landing that are significantly reduced, without adversely affecting hydrocarbons and smoke, relative to aircraft in commercial service as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator shall establish an initiative with the objective of developing and demonstrating in a relevant environment within airframe and propulsion technologies to enable efficient, economical overland flight of supersonic civil transport aircraft with no significant impact on the environment.

(C) ROTORCRAFT AND OTHER RUNWAY-INDEPENDENT AIR VEHICLES.—The Administrator shall establish a rotorcraft and other runway-independent air vehicles initiative with the objective of developing and demonstrating improved safety, noise, and environmental impact in a relevant environment.

(D) HYPERSONICS RESEARCH.—The Administrator shall establish a hypersonics research program whose objective shall be to explore the science and technology of hypersonic flight using air-breathing propulsion concepts, through a mix of theoretical work, basic and applied research, and development of flight research demonstration vehicles. Emphasis in the program shall be given to advancing and demonstrating turbine engine technology in the transition to hypersonic range Mach 3 to Mach 5.

(E) REVOLUTIONARY AERONAUTICAL CONCEPTS.—The Administrator shall establish a research program which covers a unique range of subsonic, fixed wing vehicles and

propulsion concepts. This research is intended to push technology barriers beyond current subsonic technology. Propulsion concepts include advanced materials, morphing engines, hybrid engines, and fuel cells.

(F) MORE ELECTRIC AIRCRAFT INITIATIVE.—The Administrator shall establish a program for innovative and focused research and development such as fuel cell technologies.

(3) AIRSPACE SYSTEMS RESEARCH.—The Airspace Systems Research program shall pursue research and development to enable revolutionary improvements to and modernization of the National Airspace system, as well as to enable the introduction of new systems for vehicles that can take advantage of an improved, modern air transportation system. In pursuing research and development in this area, the Administrator shall align the projects of the Airspace Systems Research program so that they directly support the objectives of the Joint Planning and Development Office's Next Generation air Transportation System Integrated Plan.

(4) AVIATION SAFETY AND SECURITY RESEARCH.—The Aviation Safety and Security Research program shall pursue research and development activities that directly address the safety and security needs of the National Airspace System and the aircraft that fly in it.

SEC. 504. TEST FACILITIES.

(a) Prior to completion of the National Aeronautics Policy described in section 502 and transmittal of such policy pursuant to subsection (d) of that section, the Administrator may not close, suspend, or terminate contracts for the operation of major aeronautical test facilities, including wind tunnels, unless the Administrator—

(1) certifies in writing that such closure will not have an adverse impact on NASA's ability to execute the National Policy and achieve the goals described in that Policy; and

(2) provides notification to and receives concurrence from the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the House Committee on Science, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation 60 days in advance of such action.

SEC. 505. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator shall encourage the development of a skilled and diverse aeronautics research workforce using appropriate available tools such as grants, scholarships for service, and fellowships.

(b) ALIGNMENT OF PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Administrator shall align NASA's aeronautics program with priorities established by the Joint Planning and Development Office and by the National Aeronautics Policy described in section 502 of this Act.

On page 45, line 8, strike "**TITLE V**" and insert "**TITLE VI**".

On page 45, line 11, strike "**SEC. 501**" and insert "**SEC. 601**".

On page 45, line 17, strike "**SEC. 502**" and insert "**SEC. 602**".

On page 49, line 1, strike "**SEC. 503**" and insert "**SEC. 603**".

On page 49, line 3, strike "502" and insert "602".

On page 49, line 16, strike "**SEC. 504**" and insert "**SEC. 604**".

On page 51, line 1, strike "**SEC. 505**" and insert "**SEC. 605**".

On page 52, line 1, strike "**SEC. 506**" and insert "**SEC. 606**".

On page 57, line 7, strike "**SEC. 507**" and insert "**SEC. 607**".

On page 57, strike line 17 through line 19. On page 58, after line 5, add the following:

(3) Section 323 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2000 is amended by striking subsection (a).

SEC. 608. SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING.

(a) **PLAN.**—In consultation with the Small Business Administration, the Administrator shall develop a plan to maximize the number and amount of contracts awarded to small business concerns (within the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and to meet established contracting goals for such concerns.

(b) **PRIORITY.**—The Administrator shall establish, as a priority, meeting the contracting goals developed in conjunction with the Small Business Administration to maximize the amount of prime contracts, as measured in dollars, awarded in each fiscal year by NASA to small business concerns (within the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)).

SEC. 609. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW AND REPORT.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of NASA's policies, processes, and procedures in the planning and management of applications research and development implemented in calendar years 2001 to 2005 within the Applied Sciences Directorate and former Earth Science Applications Program. A formal and transparent peer review process that instills public and stakeholder confidence in NASA's sponsored applications research and development programs is important and the process by which this program defines requirements, scopes programs, selects peer reviewers, manages the research competition, and selects proposals is of concern. The review shall include—

(1) the program planning and analysis process used to formulate applied science research and development requirements, priorities, and solicitation schedules, including changes to the process within the period under review, and the effects of such planning on the quality and clarity of applied sciences research announcements;

(2) the peer review process including—

(A) membership selection, determination of qualifications and use of NASA and non-NASA reviewers;

(B) management of conflicts of interest, including reviewers funded by the program with a significant consulting or contractual relationship with NASA, and individuals who both review proposals and participate in the submission of proposals under the same solicitation announcement;

(C) compensation of non-NASA proposal reviewers;

(3) the process for assigning or allocating applied research to NASA researchers and to non-NASA researchers; and

(4) alternative models for NASA planning and management of applied science and applications research, including an evaluation of—

(A) the National Institutes of Health's intramural and extramural research program structure, peer review process, management of conflicts of interests, compensation of reviewers, and the effects of compensation on reviewer efficiency and quality;

(B) the Department of Agriculture's research programs and structure, peer review process, management of conflicts of interest, compensation of reviewers, and the effects of compensation on reviewer efficiency and quality; and

(C) the "best practices" of both in the planning, selection, and management of applied sciences research and development.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science describing the results of the review conducted

under subsection (a), including recommendations for NASA best practices.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Not later than 90 days after receipt of the report, NASA shall provide the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science a plan describing the implementation of those recommendations.

SA 1876. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 371, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 2887. TRANSFER TO REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES WITHOUT CONSIDERATION OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED OR REALIGNED UNDER 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.

Section 2905(b)(4)(B) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) by striking "shall seek" and all that follows through "with respect to the installation" and inserting the following: "may not obtain consideration in connection with any transfer under this paragraph of property located at the installation. The redevelopment authority to which such property is transferred shall";

(2) in clause (i), by striking "agrees" and inserting "agree"; and

(3) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking "executes" and inserting "execute"; and

(B) by striking "accepts" and inserting "accept".

SA 1877. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 371, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 2887. ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED UNDER 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.

Section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) **SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED UNDER 2005 ROUND OF BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.**—

"(1) **AGREEMENT REQUIRED.**—With respect to each military installation approved for closure under this part after January 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall enter into an agreement with the chief executive officer of the State in which such military installation is located regarding the environmental re-

mediation of property and facilities at such installation.

"(2) **CONTENT OF AGREEMENT.**—Each agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) a description of the remediation to be performed by the Department of Defense, including the level of remediation necessary for the redevelopment of such property and facilities; and

"(B) a schedule for such remediation.".

SA 1878. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 371, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 2887. LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF UNITS UNDER THE 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT PENDING READINESS OF RECEIVING LOCATIONS.

The Secretary of Defense may not transfer any unit from a military installation closed or realigned as part of the 2005 round of defense base closure and realignment under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) until the Secretary certifies that all facilities and infrastructure necessary to support such unit at the military installation to which the unit will be transferred are ready for use by such unit.

SA 1879. Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title III, add the following:

SEC. 330. NAVY HUMAN RESOURCES BENEFIT CALL CENTER.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(2) for operation and maintenance for the Navy, \$1,500,000 may be available for Civilian Manpower and Personnel for a Human Resources Benefit Call Center in Machias, Maine.

SA 1880. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 147, to express the policy of the United States regarding the United States relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. . . . RESOLUTION OF APOLOGY TO THE NATIVE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the ancestors of today's Native Peoples inhabited the land of the present-day United States since time immemorial and for thousands of years before the arrival of people of European descent;

(2) the Native Peoples have for millennia honored, protected, and stewarded this land we cherish;

(3) the Native Peoples are spiritual peoples with a deep and abiding belief in the Creator, and for millennia their people have maintained a powerful spiritual connection to this land, as is evidenced by their customs and legends;

(4) the arrival of Europeans in North America opened a new chapter in the histories of the Native Peoples;

(5) while establishment of permanent European settlements in North America did stir conflict with nearby Indian tribes, peaceful and mutually beneficial interactions also took place;

(6) the foundational English settlements in Jamestown, Virginia, and Plymouth, Massachusetts, owed their survival in large measure to the compassion and aid of the Native Peoples in their vicinities;

(7) in the infancy of the United States, the founders of the Republic expressed their desire for a just relationship with the Indian tribes, as evidenced by the Northwest Ordinance enacted by Congress in 1787, which begins with the phrase, "The utmost good faith shall always be observed toward the Indians";

(8) Indian tribes provided great assistance to the fledgling Republic as it strengthened and grew, including invaluable help to Meriwether Lewis and William Clark on their epic journey from St. Louis, Missouri, to the Pacific Coast;

(9) Native Peoples and non-Native settlers engaged in numerous armed conflicts;

(10) the United States Government violated many of the treaties ratified by Congress and other diplomatic agreements with Indian tribes;

(11) this Nation should address the broken treaties and many of the more ill-conceived Federal policies that followed, such as extermination, termination, forced removal and relocation, the outlawing of traditional religions, and the destruction of sacred places;

(12) the United States forced Indian tribes and their citizens to move away from their traditional homelands and onto federally established and controlled reservations, in accordance with such Acts as the Act of May 28, 1830 (4 Stat. 411, chapter 148) (commonly known as the "Indian Removal Act");

(13) many Native Peoples suffered and perished—

(A) during the execution of the official United States Government policy of forced removal, including the infamous Trail of Tears and Long Walk;

(B) during bloody armed confrontations and massacres, such as the Sand Creek Massacre in 1864 and the Wounded Knee Massacre in 1890; and

(C) on numerous Indian reservations;

(14) the United States Government condemned the traditions, beliefs, and customs of the Native Peoples and endeavored to assimilate them by such policies as the redistribution of land under the Act of February 8, 1887 (25 U.S.C. 331; 24 Stat. 388, chapter 119) (also known as the "General Allotment Act"), and the forcible removal of Native children from their families to faraway boarding schools where their Native practices and languages were degraded and forbidden;

(15) officials of the United States Government and private United States citizens harmed Native Peoples by the unlawful acquisition of recognized tribal land and the

theft of tribal resources and assets from recognized tribal land;

(16) the policies of the United States Government toward Indian tribes and the breaking of covenants with Indian tribes have contributed to the severe social ills and economic troubles in many Native communities today;

(17) despite the wrongs committed against Native Peoples by the United States, the Native Peoples have remained committed to the protection of this great land, as evidenced by the fact that, on a per capita basis, more Native people have served in the United States Armed Forces and placed themselves in harm's way in defense of the United States in every major military conflict than any other ethnic group;

(18) Indian tribes have actively influenced the public life of the United States by continued cooperation with Congress and the Department of the Interior, through the involvement of Native individuals in official United States Government positions, and by leadership of their own sovereign Indian tribes;

(19) Indian tribes are resilient and determined to preserve, develop, and transmit to future generations their unique cultural identities;

(20) the National Museum of the American Indian was established in the Smithsonian Institution as a living memorial to the Native Peoples and their traditions; and

(21) Native Peoples are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

(b) ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND APOLOGY.—The United States, acting through Congress—

(1) recognizes the special legal and political relationship the Indian tribes have with the United States and the solemn covenant with the land we share;

(2) commends and honors the Native Peoples for the thousands of years that they have stewarded and protected this land;

(3) recognizes that there have been years of official depredations, ill-conceived policies, and the breaking of covenants by the United States Government regarding Indian tribes;

(4) apologizes on behalf of the people of the United States to all Native Peoples for the many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect inflicted on Native Peoples by citizens of the United States;

(5) expresses its regret for the ramifications of former wrongs and its commitment to build on the positive relationships of the past and present to move toward a brighter future where all the people of this land live reconciled as brothers and sisters, and harmoniously steward and protect this land together;

(6) urges the President to acknowledge the wrongs of the United States against Indian tribes in the history of the United States in order to bring healing to this land by providing a proper foundation for reconciliation between the United States and Indian tribes; and

(7) commends the State governments that have begun reconciliation efforts with recognized Indian tribes located in their boundaries and encourages all State governments similarly to work toward reconciling relationships with Indian tribes within their boundaries.

(c) DISCLAIMER.—Nothing in this section—

(1) authorizes or supports any claim against the United States; or

(2) serves as a settlement of any claim against the United States.

SA 1881. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1042, to authorize ap-

propriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 378, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

SEC. 3114. SMALL AND RENEWABLE POWER CONTRACTS.

Section 501(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) PUBLIC UTILITY CONTRACTS.—

"(i) TERM.—A contract for public utility services may be made for a period of not more than 20 years.

"(ii) DEFINITION OF PUBLIC UTILITY ELECTRIC SERVICES.—In this subparagraph, the term 'public utility services', with respect to electricity services, includes electricity supplies and services, including transmission, generation, distribution, and other services directly used in providing electricity."

NOTICES OF HEARINGS/MEETINGS

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on Indian Housing.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 224-2251.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Ms. Murkowski. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, October 6, 2005 at 3 p.m. in Room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1025, to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the construction of the Cheney division, Wichita Federal reclamation project, Kansas, and for other purposes" to authorize the Equus Beds Division of the Wichita Project; S. 1498, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution facilities to the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District; S. 1529, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the city of Yuma, Arizona; S. 1578, to reauthorize the Upper Colorado and San Juan River Basin endangered fish recovery implementation programs; and S. 1760, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Rogue River Valley Irrigation District or within the Medford Irrigation District, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those

wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Kellie Donnelly 202-224-9360 or Shannon Ewan at 202-224-7555.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, October 6, 2005 at 10 a.m. in Room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive an update on Hurricanes Katrina and Rita's effects on energy infrastructure and the status of recovery efforts in the Gulf Coast region.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

I would also like to announce that the hearing to evaluate and receive a status report on the Environmental Management programs of the Department of Energy which was previously scheduled before the Committee for this date and time has been postponed and will be rescheduled at a later date.

For further information, please contact Lisa Epifani 202-224-5269 or Shannon Ewan at 202-224-7555.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 10 a.m., on S. 1114—Professional Athletes Drug Testing bill and S. 1334—Professional Sports Integrity and Accountability Act, in Hart 216.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 28, at 11:30 a.m. to consider pending calendar business.

Agenda

Agenda Item 3: S. 166—To amend the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the

Deschutes River Conservancy, and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 4: S. 206—To designate the Ice Age Floods National Geologic Trail, and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 5: S. 213—To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Rio Arriba County, NM.

Agenda Item 6: S. 242—To establish four memorials to the Space Shuttle *Columbia* in the State of Texas.

Agenda Item 7: S. 251—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a water resource feasibility study for the Little Butte/Bear Creek Sub-basins in Oregon.

Agenda Item 8: S. 592—To extend the contract for the Glendo Unit of the Missouri River Basin Project in the State of Wyoming.

Agenda Item 9: S. 652—To provide financial assistance for the rehabilitation of the Benjamin Franklin National Memorial in Philadelphia, PA, and the development of an exhibit to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

Agenda Item 11: S. 761—To rename the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in the State of Idaho as the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area in honor of the late Morley Nelson, an international authority on birds of prey, who was instrumental in the establishment of this National Conservation Area, and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 12: S. 777—To designate Catoctin Mountain Park in the State of Maryland as the "Catoctin Mountain National Recreation Area," and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 13: S. 819—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reallocate costs of the Pactola Dam and Reservoir, SD, to reflect increased demands for municipal, industrial, and fish and wildlife purposes.

Agenda Item 14: S. 891—To extend the water service contract for the Ainsworth Unit, Sandhills Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, NE.

Agenda Item 15: S. 895—To direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a rural water supply program in the Reclamation States to provide a clean, safe, affordable, and reliable water supply to rural residents.

Agenda Item 16: S. 955—To direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of including in the National Park System certain sites in Williamson County, TN, relating to the Battle of Franklin.

Agenda Item 17: S. 958—To amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Star-Spangled Banner Trail in the States of Maryland and Virginia and the District of Columbia as a National Historic Trail.

Agenda Item 18: S. 1154—To extend the Acadia National Park Advisory Commission, to provide improved visitor services at the park, and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 19: S. 1170—To establish the Fort Stanton-Snowy River National Cave Conservation Area.

Agenda Item 20: S. 1238—To amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to provide for the conduct of projects that protect forests, and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 21: S. 1338—To require the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey, to conduct a study on groundwater resources in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 23: H.R. 126—To amend Public Law 89-366 to allow for an adjustment in the number of free roaming horses permitted in Cape Lookout National Seashore.

Agenda Item 24: H.R. 409—To provide for the exchange of land within the Sierra National Forest, CA, and for other purposes.

Agenda Item 26: H.R. 539—To designate certain National Forest System land in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Agenda Item 27: H.R. 584—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to recruit volunteers to assist with, or facilitate, the activities of various agencies and offices of the Department of the Interior.

Agenda Item 28: H.R. 606—To authorize appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for the restoration of the Angel Island Immigration Station in the State of California.

Agenda Item 29: H.R. 1101—To revoke a Public Land Order with respect to certain lands erroneously included in the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, CA.

Agenda Item 30: H.R. 2362—To reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

In addition, the Committee may turn to any other measures that are ready for consideration.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing to discuss the role of science in environmental policy making.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 10 a.m., to hear testimony on "Hurricane Katrina: Community Rebuilding Needs and Effectiveness of Past Proposals."

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on Darfur Revisited: The International Response.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing titled, "Recovering from Hurricane Katrina: Responding to the Immediate Needs of Its Victims."

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on Indian Housing.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on "Protecting Copyright and Innovation in a Post-Grokster World" on Wednesday, September 28, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. in the Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness List

Panel I: The Honorable Mary Beth Peters, U.S. Register of Copyrights, Copyright Office, Washington, DC; and the Honorable Debra Wong Yang, U.S. Attorney for the Central District of California and Chair of the Attorney General's Advisory Committee on Cyber/Intellectual Property Subcommittee, Los Angeles, CA.

Panel II: Marty Roe, Lead Singer, Diamond Rio, Nashville, TN; Cary Sherman, President, Recording Industry Association of America, Washington, DC; Gary Shapiro, President and Chief Executive Officer, Consumer Electronics Association, Arlington, VA; Mark Lemley, William H. Neukom, Professor of Law, Stanford University Law School and Director Stanford Program in Law, Science and Technology Stanford, CA; Ali Aydar, Chief Operating Officer, SNOCAP, San Francisco, CA; and Sam Yagan, President, MetaMachine, Inc. (developer of eDonkey and Overnet) New York, NY.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 28, at 2:30 p.m.

The purpose of the hearings is to review the Grazing programs of the Bureau of Land Management and the For-

est Service, including proposed changes to grazing regulations, and the status of grazing permit renewals, monitoring programs and allotment restocking plans.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Johanna Mihok, a legal intern on my Judiciary Committee staff, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of Judge John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States.

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

Mr. HARKIN. I ask unanimous consent Elizabeth Leef of my staff be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of today's session.

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

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Valerie Frias and Katherine Hutchinson, two Judiciary Committee staffers, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the debate on the nomination of John G. Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. First, I ask unanimous consent that Matt Reisetter of my staff be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the debate on the nomination of Judge Roberts.

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

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION AU-
THORIZATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 174, S. 1281.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1281) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for science, aeronautics, exploration, exploration capabilities, and the Inspector General, and for other purposes, for fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation with amendments.

(Strike the parts shown in black brackets and insert the parts shown in italic.)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Florida, in bringing before the Senate today, S. 1281, the NASA Authorization Bill of 2005. Our subcommittee and the full Commerce Committee have worked hard to prepare legislation that we believe is important and timely, because

it comes at a watershed moment in this Nation's civil space program.

That moment has come at no small cost. It grew out of a terrible tragedy that took place in the skies over Texas 2½ years ago, when the space shuttle *Columbia* and her brave crew were lost as they were returning home from an important and successful research mission.

In the aftermath of that accident, we were forced, as a nation, to once again confront the question of the value of space exploration in the face of the risks involved in sending our best and brightest—and those of other nations who are our partners in space exploration—into the hostile realm of space. The overwhelming and resounding answer, from the families of those who were lost to men, women and children across the country, and our elected leadership, was "yes." They gave the same answer that Lewis and Clark gave to Thomas Jefferson 200 years ago, when he charged them with the task of exploring what was then a great, largely unknown expanse.

Just as that difficult but inspiring voyage of discovery opened the way for this Nation to spread its wings from sea to sea, the voyages of discovery into the far reaches of space have begun—and will continue—to open vast opportunities for our Nation, and for the world.

While the vision that drove Lewis and Clark—the discovery of a northwest passage to the Pacific Ocean—was not the result they achieved, the understanding of the raw richness of our continent, and the insights into themselves and their fellow human beings provided a wealth of discovery more diverse and more valuable than any specific goal they had in mind as they began.

Among the many important findings of the investigation into the *Columbia* accident was the need for a renewed guiding vision for our human space exploration programs. On January 14, 2004, President George W. Bush provided the essence of that bold new vision for exploration, not only for NASA, but for the Nation. It extends far beyond his tenure in office—beyond the tenure of most of us serving in the Senate today. It reaches beyond many years and ultimately millions of miles into the solar system in which we live. It will require a long-standing commitment by this Nation, and it will not be an easy vision to accomplish. We will find unexpected obstacles and challenges along the way. If we didn't, it would not really be exploration. Our task as a nation, and in the company of international partners who will join us on this journey, will be to meet those challenges and turn them into opportunities.

The essential first step in the new Vision for Exploration was to return the space shuttle to flight. As we all know, the space shuttle *Discovery* launched into orbit and began this Nation's return to space flight on July 26th. Commander Eileen Collins and her crew,

the crew aboard the International Space Station, and the entire NASA team conducted an extremely successful first test flight to assess the progress made in the space shuttle program since the tragic *Columbia* accident. While the shedding of foam debris during liftoff—the direct cause of the damage to *Columbia*—was reduced to a level far below that previously experienced, it has not been eliminated and more work remains to understand and address that problem. Fortunately, among the major improvements in the Shuttle program is the vast increase in the ability to monitor and collect visual information on the health of the Orbiter both during launch and in orbit. That unprecedented level of information was combined with new on-orbit repair techniques to further enhance our confidence in the shuttle program's flight readiness. All of us, I'm sure, were thrilled to watch astronaut Steve Robison deftly pluck the small gap fillers from *Discovery's* underside, and the amazing never before seen images of the orbiter's thermal protection system. Our subcommittee will continue to monitor the application of the findings of this first test flight to the preparations for the launch of the second test flight next year, which continues this first step in the Vision for Exploration.

The legislation we bring before the Senate today supports the Vision of Exploration outlined by the President. It provides an opportunity for the Congress to fulfill its responsibility to help set the stage for the commencement of our new national journey of exploration. It has been 5 years since the Congress has enacted authorization legislation for NASA and its programs. Those 5 years have seen a great deal of change in the realm of space exploration. First and foremost, for nearly all of that time, humans have been living and working continuously on orbit 240 miles above the earth aboard the International Space Station. Despite the interruption of its assembly by the *Columbia* accident, the space station has already provided a great deal of important scientific information resulting from the research the expedition crews aboard the ISS have been able to accomplish. And most of its laboratory facilities are not yet on orbit. The space station represents an immensely valuable asset for this Nation and our international and scientific partners, and the legislation before the Senate today will serve to ensure it realizes the vast potential it has long promised.

The past 5 years have seen other changes.

As we have undergone the recovery from the *Columbia* accident, we have witnessed the most comprehensive review of the hardware, systems and processing for the space shuttle program since it began operational flights 24 years ago. While we may never be able to completely eliminate the risks of human spaceflight, the space shuttle system is safer today than it has ever

been, and we have learned valuable lessons that can be applied to the next generation of human space flight vehicle.

Last year we witnessed dramatic evidence of yet another major change in space exploration when pilot Mike Melville flew *SpaceShipOne*, built by the Scaled Deposits Corporation, over 100 kilometers high, to become the first person to fly a privately-built vehicle into the reaches of space on September 29, 2004. Five days later, on October 4 Brian Binnie at the controls, *SpaceShipOne* became the first private manned spacecraft to exceed an altitude of 328,000 feet twice within the span of a 14-day period. With that accomplishment, Scaled Deposits Corporation won the \$10 million Ansari X-Prize, funded entirely by private funds. A new era in private, commercial development of manned and unmanned spacecraft has begun, which offers exciting opportunities for the future.

For example, two space entrepreneurs are planning to join together in the launch early next year of the Falcon V launch vehicle, built by Elon Musk's Space-X Corporation, which will carry aloft a prototype one-third scale space module built by Robert Bigelow's Bigelow Aerospace Corporation. Other companies are developing designs and building prototype hardware that could be the precursors of commercially developed space station modules and the means of supplying and maintaining them with cargo and crews that could complement and expand the research opportunities provided by the International Space Station. S. 1281 includes language which both encourages and enables increased commercial involvement in space activities, including servicing the International Space Station, developing and conducting free-flying space research vehicles, and providing for increased use of competitive prizes and incentives to spur private investment and development. We would expect to see that private sector interest and involvement eventually extend beyond earth orbit to become an integral part of the nation's broader commitment to exploration of the Moon, Mars and destinations beyond.

I would like now to discuss some of the key provisions of the NASA reauthorization bill which I believe are especially important to the new beginning we are making as a nation within the Vision for Exploration.

There is an old saying that a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. It is also true that we must begin from where we find ourselves today. As I said earlier, the first step of the Vision was initiated this past summer with the launch of *Discovery*, and will continue with the subsequent flights of the space shuttle to complete the assembly of the International Space Station and fulfill our commitments to our international partners and—I must add—our commitments to our scientific partners.

Over the past 17 years, this Chamber has been the scene of vigorous discussion and debate on the International Space Station, long before the first module was launched in November of 1998. Through all that discussion, the central theme of those of us who supported the space station—and two-thirds of us consistently supported it in the votes following those debates—was that the ISS represents a unique laboratory in space, which holds the promise for scientific findings that can directly benefit us on Earth. I find it interesting to hear statements that the space station has not fulfilled that promise. Those who suggest that seem to have forgotten that it is not yet completed. In fact, only one of the three planned laboratories is on orbit now—the US *Destiny* laboratory—and it is not yet fully equipped. The remaining modules are completed, and are at the Kennedy Space Center, awaiting their launch and outfitting so that the long-standing plans for ISS research can finally begin. We and our international partners have invested far too much in building and preparing those facilities, and the on-orbit structure that will provide their home and supporting power and crew accommodations, to back away from that investment now. To do so would not only represent a wasteful, irresponsible and inexcusable breach of faith with the American taxpayers, but an unconscionable betrayal of scientists and researchers in a wide range of disciplines who have invested years of effort and resources preparing to conduct research that can only be done in the microgravity of space.

This bill acknowledges and reaffirms our commitment to fulfill the promise of the ISS. We recognize that NASA has limited total resources and has been given an enormous task to lead the Vision for Exploration. The demands of many valuable and important existing programs have forced NASA to make difficult choices in focusing those scarce resources in ways which support the goals of the Vision. We understand that reality, and have attempted in this 5-year reauthorization bill to provide a stable, consistent and moderately increasing level of funding to enable NASA to address those challenges.

At the same time, we have encouraged, as I noted earlier, the increased participation and involvement of commercial interests and capabilities, in a way that can relieve NASA of some of the basic burdens of space operations. With respect to space station research, we believe additional steps must be taken to enable NASA to conduct the research it must to support long-duration human spaceflight, and to return to the Moon, and move onward to Mars, while not sacrificing or undermining the investment we have made in the ISS.

To accomplish this, the legislation designates the U.S. segment of the

International Space Station as national laboratory facility. It further directs the NASA Administrator to develop a plan, within one year after enactment of the bill, to establish a ground-based national laboratory structure that will be responsible for maintaining and operating the research capabilities in the on-orbit laboratory facilities. The ISS national laboratory will be empowered to establish scientific—and funding—relationships with other governmental and non-governmental entities and to include international participation as well. The infusion of new participants and non-NASA resources will free NASA of much of the financial burden it would require to sustain broad-based research aboard ISS, and would thus enable it to focus its ISS research, as planned, on those disciplines and experiments which directly support the needs of the Vision for Exploration.

We believe this represents a creative and responsible approach to meeting our international commitments and fulfilling the long-standing research promise of the ISS, while not inhibiting NASA's pursuit of its exploration objectives.

In order to continue the Nation's exploration activities, both in continuing essential activities in low-Earth orbit and moving outward, back to the Moon, Mars, and beyond, we must have a new generation of launch and flight vehicles. The Vision for Exploration calls for the development of a new crew exploration vehicle and associated launch systems, to meet that objective.

As I have stated, this legislation supports the goals and objectives of Vision for Exploration. As the saying goes, however, sometimes "the devil is in the details." As those details have been revealed in the planning to implement the vision, I have expressed concerns about some of the early transitional steps to redirect NASA's emphasis from low-Earth orbit to exploration of the Moon and Mars. I have already addressed the question of ensuring the maximum use of the International Space Station. My other primary concern has to do with the transition from the Space Shuttle to the new crew exploration vehicle. The initial announcement of the Vision for Exploration called for the termination of Shuttle flights in 2010, and the first flight of the crew exploration vehicle in 2014. The resulting 4-year hiatus in this Nation's ability to launch humans into space was simply unacceptable to me. It would represent a serious degradation of our national and economic security, as the community of spacefaring nations expands with the advent of Chinese human spaceflight capability and the potential of even more nations developing such capability, potentially challenging U.S. leadership in this important strategic area and major engine of technological advancement.

S. 1281, as introduced, stated that uninterrupted U.S. spaceflight capability

is essential to our Nation, and required, in Section 202 of the bill, that the Space Shuttle Orbiter not be retired until a replacement crew-capable space vehicle be made operational. NASA's new Administrator, Dr. Michael Griffin, stated, in his confirmation hearing before the Commerce Committee, and again in a subsequent subcommittee hearing on the space shuttle, that he shared our concern about a lengthy hiatus period in U.S. spaceflight capability. Since assuming leadership of NASA, he has undertaken an effort to approach the development of the replacement vehicle in such a way as to close that gap as much as possible. In anticipation of the success of those efforts, Senator NELSON and I agreed to a modification of the language in the bill—included in the manager's amendment to the bill—which provides some flexibility in meeting the goal of uninterrupted U.S. spaceflight capability, but continues to state it as a policy objective. The Exploration Systems Architecture Study was recently completed and I am very pleased to say that the results track very closely to the provisions of S. 1281. The CEV development would be accelerated to 2012, with the possibility of moving its operational date to 2011. The key to CEV acceleration is largely a question of resources, and sufficient funding could enable an even earlier operational date, possibly closing the potential gap in spaceflight capability altogether.

In Dr. Griffin's appearance before the Science and Space Subcommittee during our hearing on the space shuttle program, he pointed out that the plan for space shuttle retirement involves the retirement of the Orbiters, not necessarily the additional components that make up what we call the space shuttle. Those additional components are the solid rocket boosters and the external fuel tank.

I remind my colleagues that the Orbiter is a vehicle that has two major spaceflight functions combined in a single vehicle: the delivery of crew to and from orbit, and the delivery of cargo, or payloads, to and from orbit. The future developments of U.S. human spaceflight capability are intended to separate those functions. That will enable the development of much more simplified—and arguably much safer, more efficient, and less costly—vehicles to serve each separate function. The provisions of S. 1281—coupled with the revised plans for vehicle development recently announced, will fulfill those objectives using major elements of our existing systems and adapting them to meet the requirements of both manned and unmanned launch systems.

Launch vehicles and spaceflight vehicles do not prepare and launch themselves into orbit or maintain themselves entirely independently while in space. They require ground-based support facilities, institutions and skilled personnel. The maintenance of those

capabilities are, in fact, the most labor and resource-intensive elements of a spaceflight program, over time. They must be maintained even when the vehicles themselves are not flying, and must be kept in a high state of readiness. For human spaceflight systems, especially, that expertise and readiness are fundamental elements of flight safety.

The non-orbiter elements of the space shuttle program, both in flight hardware and ground support, represent an enormous national asset and, with modifications and reengineering, can potentially be adapted to meet—in separate configurations—the requirements for human spaceflight and for the launch of large, heavy payloads. Those large payloads are beyond the reach of either evolved expendable launch vehicles or privately-developed launch vehicles—or the current or planned launch vehicles of any other nation, for that matter. For these reasons, and others, this legislation directs and encourages NASA to make the maximum possible utilization of the personnel, assets and capabilities of the space shuttle program in developing the next generation of crew and cargo vehicles. Again, the new NASA plans will do just that, as envisioned by this legislation.

Another important and historical NASA research activity is aeronautical research, a fundamental part of NASA's activities since its inception. Indeed, not only is "aeronautics" the first "a" in NASA, but NASA came into being as an expansion of the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, which was established in 1915. That heritage is an important NASA legacy and the continued health of the Nation's aerospace industry in a very competitive global market-place makes it essential that our Nation have solid aeronautical research capabilities. Equally important, in an environment of limited resources, is that decisions about priorities for funding and programs be guided by a clear statement of policy, based on a thorough understanding of both available assets and essential requirements. This legislation directs the development of a national policy to guide the Nation's aeronautical research—including that conducted by NASA. The policy is to be developed within one year after enactment of the legislation, in order to provide time for a thorough and complete assessment of every aspect of aeronautics research, and yet provide the earliest possible guidance for both the administration and the Congress in determining the appropriate funding levels for U.S. aeronautics research. We have chosen not to establish a specific level of funding for that research in the legislation, in order to provide the flexibility for the NASA Administrator to establish those levels using the national policy guidance we have required to be developed.

Finally, let me say something about the broad range of science activities

for which NASA has always been known. The remarkable feat of the Deep Impact asteroid interception mission and the extraordinary success of the Spirit and Opportunity Mars Rovers are, of course, only the most recent and dramatic examples of NASA Space Science expertise. Less spectacular, but equally significant, are the earth observation and earth sciences programs which help us understand—and better care for—the spaceship of which all of us are crew members—spaceship Earth. As with aeronautics research, we have not spelled out specific funding authorization levels for the full 5 years authorized among the various science disciplines, providing flexibility for the NASA Administrator to make the best judgments about resource allocations. However, we express clearly in this bill the need for maintaining a balanced science portfolio throughout all NASA programs. In addition, we require accountability and will maintain careful oversight over the plans and decisions made to implement that balance.

This legislation provides a comprehensive, forward-looking and responsible approach to the transition of our Nation's space exploration programs into a new era of discovery. I believe that, together with our colleagues in the other body, we will be able to craft a congressional consensus that will help ensure this Nation's leadership in space exploration and provide benefits beyond measure and beyond imagination to this Nation and the world.

I want to thank my friend and colleague from Florida, Senator NELSON, for the spirit of cooperation he and his staff have brought to the development and refinement of this legislation. It represents a truly bi-partisan—really a non-partisan—result, as is appropriate for the Nation's space exploration programs. I also want to express my appreciation to the staff of my Subcommittee staff and the full Commerce Committee staff who have worked to bring this measure before the Senate. And, of course, I want to acknowledge the leadership of Senators STEVENS and INOUE, who have supported our efforts to provide authorization and a strong policy foundation to our Nation's space exploration efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1281.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators HUTCHISON, STEVENS, INOUE, and LOTT today in sponsoring an amended NASA Authorization Act and managers package that provides policy guidance for keeping NASA on track to achieve their objectives; and to ensure that there is a good balance between the different activities that NASA performs.

Just a few days ago, NASA released their Exploration Systems Architecture Study. The study describes how NASA plans to implement the President's Vision for Space Exploration by returning to the Moon and preparing to go beyond.

Through this NASA bill, Congress can provide constructive support to the good work being done by Administrator Michael Griffin, as they begin to implement the President's vision and prepare NASA for the challenges of the future.

This is a 5-year bill, authorizing NASA from 2006 through 2010. It authorizes NASA appropriations in excess of the President's budget request.

For fiscal year 2006, the President requested \$16.456 billion, which is a 2.4 percent increase over the fiscal year 2005 NASA operating budget. Recently the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Subcommittee approved \$16.4 billion for NASA. This bill authorizes \$16.556 billion for fiscal year 2006, which is a 3 percent increase over the fiscal year 2005 NASA operating budget. This bill authorizes increases at a level of about 3 percent each year, consistently providing more funding than the President's budget projection.

Like many of our colleagues, Senator HUTCHISON and I believe that recent NASA budget requests have been below the levels required for NASA to perform its various missions effectively. Once this bill is enacted, we intend to work with the Appropriations Committee to ensure that adequate funds are provided for NASA to succeed.

This legislation authorizes NASA to return humans to the Moon, to explore it, and to maintain a human presence on the Moon. Consistent with the President's vision, it also requires using what we learn and develop on the Moon as a stepping stone to future exploration of Mars.

To carry out these missions, our bill requires NASA to develop an implementation plan for the transition from shuttle to crew exploration vehicle, CEV. The plan will help NASA to make a smooth transition from retirement of the space shuttle orbiters to the replacement spacecraft systems. The implementation plan will help make sure that we can keep the skills and the focus that are needed to assure that each space shuttle flight is safe through retirement of the orbiters, and to retain those personnel needed for the CEV and heavy-lift cargo spacecraft.

It is essential to our national security that we prevent any hiatus or gap in which the United States cannot send astronauts to space without relying on a foreign country. The Russians have been good partners in construction of the International Space Station, and the Soyuz spacecraft has been a reliable vehicle for our astronauts. But with all of the uncertainties in our relationship with Russia, we simply cannot allow ourselves the vulnerability of being totally dependent on the Soyuz. We need to maintain assured access to space by U.S. astronauts on a continuous basis. We therefore require in this legislation, that there not be a hiatus between the retirement of the space shuttle orbiters and the availability of the next generation U.S. human-rated spacecraft.

We have worked with NASA to address their concerns regarding the hiatus, and have crafted language that expresses our desire not to have a gap, and that NASA feels is suitable. We are aware of Dr. Griffin's efforts to reduce the potential for a gap and we appreciate the work that he is doing to accelerate the crew exploration vehicle.

Our bill directs NASA to plan for and consider a Hubble servicing mission after the two Space Shuttle Return to Flight missions have been completed.

Americans are inspired by the images that Hubble produces. The new instruments to be added during the SM-4 Hubble servicing mission will produce higher quality images; enable us to see further into space; and give scientists a better understanding of our universe's past, and perhaps of our future. The replacement gyroscopes and batteries that are planned for the mission will extend Hubble's life by 5 or more years.

This NASA authorization bill calls for utilization of the International Space Station for basic science as well as exploration science. It is important that we reap the benefits of our multi-billion dollar investment in the Space Station. The promise of some basic science research requires a micro-gravity or a space environment for us to better understand the problem that we are trying to solve. This bill ensures that NASA will maintain a focus on the importance of basic science.

In order to assure that we can meet our obligations with respect to the Space Station, the administration has requested that Congress modify the Iran Nonproliferation Act to ensure that we can continue to cooperate with the Russian Federation in this area. There may be periods when our only access to the Space Station will be on the Russian Soyuz spacecraft. But Russia's failure to cease all proliferation activities with respect to Iran has resulted in sanctions against Russia that would preclude such cooperation.

This bill directs NASA to improve its safety culture. According to the Columbia Accident Investigation Board, CAIB, report, the safety culture at NASA was as much a cause of the *Columbia* tragedy as the physical cause. Low- and mid-level personnel felt that you could not elevate safety concerns without reprisals, or being ignored. NASA has already taken significant steps to address these problems, but we need to assure that the safety culture improves as quickly as possible and that it continues to improve.

This legislation proposes that the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel monitor and measure NASA's improvements to their safety culture, including employees' fear of reprisals for voicing concerns about safety.

It also contains policy regarding NASA's need to consider and implement lessons learned, in order to avoid another preventable tragedy like the *Challenger* and *Columbia* disasters.

This authorization bill addresses NASA aeronautics and America's preeminence in aviation. The Europeans

have stated their intent to dominate the airplane market by 2020. It is not in our national interest to let that occur.

We are calling on NASA to develop and demonstrate aviation technologies for reducing commercial aircraft noise levels at airports, making aircraft more fuel efficient, improving aircraft safety and security, and continuing the pursuit of revolutionary concepts such as hypersonic flight. Aeronautics is a very important function of NASA and needs to be continued and further developed. This bill calls on NASA to assure that at least 5 percent of the aeronautics budget is allocated for fundamental aeronautical research.

NASA has a new direction, and they have outstanding leadership in Dr. Michael Griffin.

We have an opportunity to authorize NASA for: implementing the Vision for Space Exploration; renewing our commitment to U.S. aviation and NASA aeronautics research; retaining or resurrecting very important science activities at NASA; and assuring that America has continuous human access to space.

By passing this legislation, we will continue to advance our national security, strengthen our economy, inspire the next generation of explorers, and fulfill our destiny as explorers.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, passage of S. 1281, the NASA Authorization Act of 2005, is a milestone in our country's continued efforts to open and develop new frontiers.

One year after the Columbia space shuttle tragedy, President Bush gave us a bold, new vision for the future of space exploration. This legislation provides the framework we need to implement the President's vision.

The Moon is the strategic gateway to the rest of the solar system. It will ultimately be a critical point for many human endeavors. It will support economic growth, cutting-edge research and technology, and innovative partnerships.

This legislation also provides NASA with important guidance for its other missions. It outlines a national aeronautics policy, which will be developed by the administration. This policy will enable us to take into account emerging challenges in aeronautics research as we plan our investments going forward.

S. 1281 also calls for the implementation of a balanced space science program and highlights the need for better access to data which can meet local and national challenges.

This is a bipartisan bill which provides a solid foundation for our current and future space activities. I am pleased we are sustaining our long-standing commitment to space exploration.

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the Hutchison amendment at the desk be agreed to; the committee-reported amendments, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and

passed; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table; and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 1875) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1281), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1281

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Findings.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATIONS

- Sec. 101. Fiscal year 2006.
- Sec. 102. Fiscal year 2007.
- Sec. 103. Fiscal year 2008.
- Sec. 104. Fiscal year 2009.
- Sec. 105. Fiscal year 2010.
- Sec. 106. Evaluation criteria for budget request.

SUBTITLE B—GENERAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 131. Implementation of a science program that extends human knowledge and understanding of the Earth, sun, solar system, and the universe.
- Sec. 132. Biennial reports to Congress on science programs.
- Sec. 133. Status report on Hubble Space Telescope servicing mission.
- Sec. 134. Develop expanded permanent human presence beyond low-Earth orbit.
- Sec. 135. Ground-based analog capabilities.
- Sec. 136. Space launch and transportation transition, capabilities, and development.
- Sec. 137. National policy for aeronautics research and development.
- Sec. 138. Identification of unique NASA core aeronautics research.
- Sec. 139. Lessons learned and best practices.
- Sec. 140. Safety management.
- Sec. 141. Creation of a budget structure that aids effective oversight and management.
- Sec. 142. Earth observing system.
- Sec. 143. *NASA healthcare program.*
- Sec. 144. *Assessment of extension of data collection from Ulysses and Voyager spacecraft.*
- Sec. 145. *Program to expand distance learning in rural underserved areas.*
- Sec. 146. *Institutions in NASA'S minority institutions program.*
- Sec. 147. *Aviation safety program.*
- Sec. 148. *Atmospheric, geophysical, and rocket research authorization.*
- Sec. 149. *Orbital debris.*
- Sec. 150. *Continuation of certain educational programs.*
- Sec. 151. *Establishment of the Charles "Pete" Conrad Astronomy Awards Program.*
- Sec. 152. *GAO assessment of feasibility of Moon and Mars exploration missions.*

SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS AND SPECIAL AUTHORITY

- Sec. 161. Official representational fund.
- Sec. 161. Facilities management.

TITLE II—INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

- Sec. 201. International Space Station completion.
- Sec. 202. Research and support capabilities on international Space Station.
- Sec. 20d. National laboratory status for International Space Station.
- Sec. 204. Commercial support of International Space Station operations and utilization.
- Sec. 205. Use of the International Space Station and annual report.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION POLICY

- Sec. 301. United States human-rated launch capacity assessment.
- Sec. 302. Space Shuttle transition.
- Sec. 303. Commercial launch vehicles.
- Sec. 304. Secondary payload capability.

TITLE IV—ENABLING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY

- Sec. 401. Commercialization plan.
- Sec. 402. Authority for competitive prize program to encourage development of advanced space and aeronautical technologies.
- Sec. 403. Commercial goods and services.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENTS

- Sec. 501. Extension of indemnification authority.
- Sec. 502. Intellectual property provisions.
- Sec. 503. Retrocession of jurisdiction.
- Sec. 504. Recovery and disposition authority.
- Sec. 505. Requirement for independent cost analysis.
- Sec. 506. Electronic access to business opportunities.
- Sec. 507. Reports elimination.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) It is the policy of the United States to advance United States scientific, security, and economic interests through a healthy and active space exploration program.

(2) Basic and applied research in space science, Earth science, and aeronautics remain a significant part of the Nation's goals for the use and development of space. Basic research and development is an important component of NASA's program of exploration and discovery.

(3) Maintaining the capability to safely send humans into space is essential to United States national and economic security, United States preeminence in space, and inspiring the next generation of explorers. Thus, a gap in United States human space flight capability is harmful to the national interest.

(4) The exploration, development, and permanent habitation of the Moon will—

- (A) inspire the Nation;
- (B) spur commerce, imagination, and excitement around the world; and
- (C) open the possibility of further exploration of Mars.

(5) The establishment of the capability for consistent access to and stewardship of the region between the Moon and Earth is in the national security and commercial interests of the United States.

(6) Commercial development of space, including exploration and other lawful uses, is in the interest of the United States and the international community at large.

(7) Research and access to capabilities to support a national laboratory facility within the United States segment of the ISS in low-

Earth orbit are in the national policy interests of the United States, including maintenance and development of an active and healthy stream of research from ground to space in areas that can uniquely benefit from access to this facility.

(8) NASA should develop vehicles to replace the Shuttle orbiter's capabilities for transporting crew and heavy cargo while utilizing the current program's resources, including human capital, capabilities, and infrastructure. Using these resources can ease the transition to a new space transportation system, maintain an essential industrial base, and minimize technology and safety risks.

(9) The United States should remain the world leader in aeronautics and aviation. NASA should align its aerospace research to ensure United States leadership. A national effort is needed to assess NASA's aeronautics programs and infrastructure to allow a consolidated national approach that ensures efficiency and national preeminence in aeronautics and aviation.]

(9) *The United States must remain the leader in aeronautics and aviation. Any erosion of this preeminence is not in the Nation's economic or security interest. NASA should align its aerospace leadership to ensure United States leadership. A national effort is needed to ensure that NASA's aeronautics programs are leading contributors to the Nation's civil and military aviation needs, as well as to its exploration capabilities.*

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) ISS.—The term "ISS" means the International Space Station.

(3) NASA.—The term "NASA" means the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(4) SHUTTLE-DERIVED VEHICLE.—The term "shuttle-derived vehicle" means any new space transportation vehicle, piloted or unpiloted, that—

(A) is capable of supporting crew or cargo missions; and

(B) uses a major component of NASA's Space Transportation System, such as the solid rocket booster, external tank, engine, and orbiter.

(5) IN-SITU RESOURCE UTILIZATION.—The term "in-situ resource utilization" means the technology or systems that can convert indigenous or locally-situated substances into useful materials and products.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorizations

SEC. 101. FISCAL YEAR 2006.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for fiscal year 2006, \$16,556,400,000, as follows:

(1) For science, aeronautics and exploration, \$9,661,000,000 for the following programs (including amounts for construction of facilities).

(2) For exploration capabilities, \$6,863,000,000, (including amounts for construction of facilities), which shall be used for space operations, and out of which \$100,000,000 shall be used for the purposes of section 202 of this Act.

(3) For the Office of Inspector General, \$32,400,000.

SEC. 102. FISCAL YEAR 2007.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for fiscal year 2007, \$17,052,900,000, as follows:

(1) \$10,549,800,000 for science, aeronautics and exploration (including amounts for construction of facilities).

(2) For exploration capabilities, \$6,469,600,000, for the following programs (including amounts for construction of facilities), of which \$6,469,600,000 shall be for space operations.

(3) For the Office of Inspector General, \$33,500,000.

SEC. 103. FISCAL YEAR 2008.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for fiscal year 2008, \$17,470,900,000.

SEC. 104. FISCAL YEAR 2009.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for fiscal year 2009, \$17,995,000,000.

SEC. 105. FISCAL YEAR 2010.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for fiscal year 2010, \$18,534,900,000.

SEC. 106. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR BUDGET REQUEST.

It is the sense of the Congress that each budget of the United States submitted to the Congress after the date of enactment of this Act should be evaluated for compliance with the findings and priorities established by this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

Subtitle B—General Provisions

SEC. 131. IMPLEMENTATION OF A SCIENCE PROGRAM THAT EXTENDS HUMAN KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE EARTH, SUN, SOLAR SYSTEM, AND THE UNIVERSE.

The Administrator shall—

(1) conduct a rich and vigorous set of science activities aimed at better comprehension of the universe, solar system, and Earth, and ensure that the various areas within NASA's science portfolio are developed and maintained in a balanced and healthy [manner;] manner, and, as part of this balanced science research program, provide, to the maximum extent feasible, continued support and funding for the Magnetospheric Multiscale Mission, SIM-Planet Quest, and Future Explorers programs, including determining whether these delayed missions and planned missions can be expedited to meet previous schedules;

(2) plan projected Mars exploration activities in the context of planned lunar robotic precursor missions, ensuring the ability to conduct a broad set of scientific investigations and research around and on the Moon's surface;

(3) upon successful completion of the planned return-to-flight schedule of the Space Shuttle, determine the schedule for a Shuttle servicing mission to the Hubble Space Telescope, unless such a mission would compromise astronaut or safety or the integrity of NASA's other missions;

(4) ensure that, in implementing the provisions of this section, appropriate inter-agency and commercial collaboration opportunities are sought and utilized to the maximum feasible extent;

(5) seek opportunities to diversify the flight opportunities for scientific Earth science instruments and seek innovation in the development of instruments that would enable greater flight opportunities;

(6) develop a long term sustainable relationship with the United States commercial remote sensing industry, and, consistent with applicable policies and law, to the maximum practical extent, rely on their services;

(7) in conjunction with United States industry and universities, develop Earth science applications to enhance Federal, State, [local, regional, and tribal agencies] local, and tribal governments that use govern-

ment and commercial remote sensing capabilities and other sources of geospatial information to address their needs; [and]

(8) plan, develop, and implement a near-Earth object survey program to detect, track, catalogue, and characterize the physical characteristics of near-Earth asteroids and comets in order to assess the threat of such near-Earth objects in impacting the [Earth.] Earth; and

(9) ensure that, of the amount expended for aeronautics, a significant portion is directed toward the Vehicle System Program, as much of the basic, long-term, high-risk, and innovative research in aeronautical disciplines is performed within that program.

SEC. 132. BIENNIAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON SCIENCE PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 2 years thereafter, the Administrator shall transmit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science setting forth in detail—

(1) the findings and actions taken on NASA's assessment of the balance within its science portfolio and any efforts to adjust that balance among the major program areas, including the areas referred to in section 131;

(2) any activities undertaken by the Administration to conform with the Sun-Earth science and applications direction provided in section 131; and

(3) efforts to enhance near-Earth object detection and observation.

(b) EXTERNAL REVIEW FINDINGS.—The Administrator shall include in each report submitted under this section a summary of findings and recommendations from any external reviews of the Administration's science mission priorities and programs.

SEC. 133. STATUS REPORT ON HUBBLE SPACE TELESCOPE SERVICING MISSION.

Within 60 days after the landing of the second Space Shuttle mission for return-to-flight certification, the Administrator shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science a one-time status report on a Hubble Space Telescope servicing mission.

SEC. 134. DEVELOP EXPANDED PERMANENT HUMAN PRESENCE BEYOND LOW-EARTH ORBIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As part of the programs authorized under the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), the Administrator shall establish a program to develop a permanently sustained human presence on the Moon, in tandem with an extensive precursor program, to support security, commerce, and scientific pursuits, and as a stepping-stone to future exploration of Mars. The Administrator is further authorized to develop and conduct international collaborations in pursuit of these goals, as appropriate.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

(1) implement an effective exploration technology program that is focused around the key needs to support lunar human and robotic operations;

(2) as part of NASA's annual budget submission, submit to the Congress the detailed mission, schedule, and budget for key lunar mission-enabling technology areas, including areas for possible innovative governmental and commercial activities and partnerships;

(3) as part of NASA's annual budget submission, submit to the Congress a plan for NASA's lunar robotic precursor and technology programs, including current and planned technology investments and scientific research that support the lunar program; and

(4) conduct an intensive in-situ resource utilization technology program in order to develop the capability to use space resources to increase independence from Earth, and sustain exploration beyond low-Earth orbit.

SEC. 135. GROUND-BASED ANALOG CAPABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish a ground-based analog capability in remote United States locations in order to assist in the development of lunar operations, life support, and in-situ resource utilization experience and capabilities.

(b) LOCATIONS.—The Administrator shall select locations for subsection (a) in places that—

- (1) are regularly accessible;
- (2) have significant temperature extremes and range; and
- (3) have access to energy and natural resources (including geothermal, permafrost, volcanic, and other potential resources).

(c) INVOLVEMENT OF LOCAL POPULATIONS; PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall involve local populations, academia, and industrial partners as much as possible to ensure that ground-based benefits and applications are encouraged and developed.

SEC. 136. SPACE LAUNCH AND TRANSPORTATION TRANSITION, CAPABILITIES, AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) POST-ORBITER TRANSITION.—The Administrator shall develop an implementation plan for the transition to a new crew exploration vehicle and heavy-lift launch vehicle that uses the personnel, capabilities, assets, and infrastructure of the Space Shuttle to the fullest extent possible and addresses how NASA will accommodate the docking of the crew exploration vehicle to the ISS.

(b) AUTOMATED RENDEZVOUS AND DOCKING.—The Administrator is directed to pursue aggressively automated rendezvous and docking capabilities that can support ISS and other mission requirements and include these activities, progress reports, and plans in the implementation plan.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL SUBMISSION.—Within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act the Administrator shall submit a copy of the implementation plan to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science.

SEC. 137. NATIONAL POLICY FOR AERONAUTICS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, through the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall develop, in consultation with NASA and other relevant Federal agencies, a national aeronautics policy to guide the aeronautics programs of the United States through the year 2020. *The development of this policy shall utilize external studies that have been conducted on the state of United States aeronautics and aviation research and have suggested policies to ensure continued competitiveness.*

(b) CONTENT.—At a minimum the national aeronautics policy shall describe—

- (1) national goals for aeronautics research;
- (2) the priority areas of research for aeronautics through fiscal year 2011;
- (3) the basis of which and the process by which priorities for ensuing fiscal years will be selected; and
- (4) respective roles and responsibilities of various Federal agencies in aeronautics research.

(c) NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF AERONAUTICS INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPABILITIES.—In developing the national aeronautics policy, the President, through the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall conduct a national study of government-owned aeronautics research infrastructure to assess—

[(1) uniqueness, mission dependency, and industry need; and

[(2) the development or initiation of a consolidated national aviation research, development, and support organization.

[(d)] (c) SCHEDULE.—No later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the President's Science Advisor and the Administrator shall submit the national aeronautics policy to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the House Committee on Science, and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SEC. 138. IDENTIFICATION OF UNIQUE NASA CORE AERONAUTICS RESEARCH.

Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science that assesses the aeronautics research program for its current and potential application to new aeronautics and space vehicles and the unique aeronautical research and associated capabilities that must be retained and supported by NASA to further space exploration and support United States economic competitiveness.

SEC. 139. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide an implementation plan describing NASA's approach for obtaining, implementing, and sharing lessons learned and best practices for its major programs and projects within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The implementation plan shall be updated and maintained to assure that it is current and consistent with the burgeoning culture of learning and safety that is emerging at NASA.

(b) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The implementation plan shall contain as a minimum the lessons learned and best practices requirements for NASA, the organizations or positions responsible for enforcement of the requirements, the reporting structure, and the objective performance measures indicating the effectiveness of the activity.

(c) INCENTIVES.—The Administrator shall provide incentives to encourage sharing and implementation of lessons learned and best practices by employees, projects, and programs; as well as penalties for programs and projects that are determined not to have demonstrated use of those resources.

SEC. 140. SAFETY MANAGEMENT.

Section 6 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 2477) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "There";

(2) by striking "to it" and inserting "to it, including evaluating NASA's compliance with the return-to-flight and continue-to-fly recommendations of the Columbia Accident Investigation Board,";

(3) by inserting "and the Congress" after "advise the Administrator";

(4) by striking "and with respect to the adequacy of proposed or existing safety standards and shall" and inserting "with respect to the adequacy of proposed or existing safety standards, and with respect to management and culture. The Panel shall also"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Panel shall submit an annual report to the Administrator and to the Congress. In the first annual report submitted after the date of enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005, the Panel shall include an evaluation of NASA's safety management culture.

"(c) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Administrator should—

"(1) ensure that NASA employees can raise safety concerns without fear of reprisal;

"(2) continue to follow the recommendations of the Columbia Accident Investigation Board for safely returning and continuing to fly; and

"(3) continue to inform the Congress from time to time of NASA's progress in meeting those recommendations."

SEC. 141. CREATION OF A BUDGET STRUCTURE THAT AIDS EFFECTIVE OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT.

In developing NASA's budget request for inclusion in the Budget of the United States for fiscal year 2007 and thereafter, the Administrator shall—

- (1) include line items for—
 - (A) science, aeronautics, and exploration;
 - (B) exploration capabilities; and
 - (C) the Office of the Inspector General;
- (2) enumerate separately, within the science, aeronautics, and exploration account, the requests for—
 - (A) space science;
 - (B) Earth science; and
 - (C) aeronautics;
- (3) include, within the exploration capabilities account, the requests for—
 - (A) the Space Shuttle; and
 - (B) the ISS; and
 - (4) enumerate separately the specific request for the independent technical authority within the appropriate account.

SEC. 142. EARTH OBSERVING SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall submit a plan to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science to ensure the long-term vitality of the earth observing system at NASA.

(b) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—The plan shall—

- (1) address such issues as—
 - (A) out-year budgetary projections;
 - (B) technical requirements for the system;
- and

(C) integration into the Global Earth Observing System of Systems; and

(2) evaluate—

- (A) the need to proceed with any NASA missions that have been delayed or canceled;
- (B) plans for transferring needed capabilities from some canceled or de-scoped missions to the National Polar-orbiting Environmental Satellite System;
- (C) the technical base for exploratory earth observing [systems;] *systems, including new satellite architectures and instruments that enable global coverage, all-weather, day and night imaging of the Earth's surface features;*
- (D) the need to strengthen research and analysis programs; and
- (E) the need to strengthen the approach to obtaining important climate observations and data records.

(c) EARTH OBSERVING SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "earth observing system" means the series of satellites, a science component, and a data system for long-term global observations of the land surface, biosphere, solid Earth, atmosphere, and oceans.

(d) THE need to strengthen the approach to obtaining important climate observations and data records.

(e) THE need to strengthen the approach to obtaining important climate observations and data records.

(c) EARTH OBSERVING SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "earth observing system" means the series of satellites, a science component, and a data system for long-term global observations of the land surface, biosphere, solid Earth, atmosphere, and oceans.

SEC. 143. NASA HEALTHCARE PROGRAM.

The Administrator shall develop policies, procedures, and plans necessary for—

(1) the establishment of a lifetime healthcare program for NASA astronauts and their families; and

(2) the study and analysis of the healthcare data obtained in order to understand the longitudinal health effects of space flight on humans better.

SEC. 144. ASSESSMENT OF EXTENSION OF DATA COLLECTION FROM ULYSSES AND VOYAGER SPACECRAFT.

(a) **ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall carry out an assessment of the costs and benefits of extending, to such date as the Administrator considers appropriate for purposes of the assessment, the date of the termination of data collection from the Ulysses spacecraft and the Voyager spacecraft.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after completing the assessment required by subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit a report on the assessment to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science.

SEC. 145. PROGRAM TO EXPAND DISTANCE LEARNING IN RURAL UNDERSERVED AREAS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall develop or expand programs to extend science and space educational outreach to rural communities and schools through video conferencing, interpretive exhibits, teacher education, classroom presentations, and student field trips.

(b) **PRIORITIES.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Administrator shall give priority to existing programs, including Challenger Learning Centers—

(1) that utilize community-based partnerships in the field;

(2) that build and maintain video conference and exhibit capacity;

(3) that travel directly to rural communities and serve low-income populations; and

(4) with a special emphasis on increasing the number of women and minorities in the science and engineering professions.

SEC. 146. INSTITUTIONS IN NASA'S MINORITY INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM.

The matter appearing under the heading "SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS" in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and House and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2473b; 103 Stat. 863) is amended by striking "Historically Black Colleges and Universities and" and inserting "Historically Black Colleges and Universities that are part B institutions (as defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2))), Hispanic-serving institutions (as defined in section 502(a)(5) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5)), Tribal Colleges or Universities (as defined in section 316(b)(3) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)(3)), Alaskan Native-serving institutions (as defined in section 317(b)(2) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)(2)), Native Hawaiian-serving institutions (as defined in section 317(b)(4) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1059d(b)(4)), and".

SEC. 147. AVIATION SAFETY PROGRAM.

The Administrator shall make available upon request satellite imagery of remote terrain to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, or the Director of the Five Star Medalion Program, for aviation safety and aerial photography programs to assist and train pilots in navigating challenging topographical features of such terrain.

SEC. 148. ATMOSPHERIC, GEOPHYSICAL, AND ROCKET RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator for atmospheric, geophysical, or rocket research at the Poker Flat Research Range and the Kodiak Launch Complex, not more than \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2010.

SEC. 149. ORBITAL DEBRIS.

The Administrator, in conjunction with the heads of other Federal agencies, shall take steps to develop or acquire technologies that will enable NASA to decrease the risks associated with orbital debris.

SEC. 150. CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.

From amounts appropriated to NASA for educational programs, the Administrator shall ensure continuation of the Space Grant Program, the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, and the NASA Explorer School to motivate and develop the next generation of explorers.

SEC. 151. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHARLES "PETE" CONRAD ASTRONOMY AWARDS PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish a program to be known as the Charles "Pete" Conrad Astronomy Awards Program.

(b) **AWARDS.**—The Administrator shall make an annual award under the program of—

(1) \$3,000 to the amateur astronomer or group of amateur astronomers who in the preceding calendar year discovered the intrinsically brightest near-Earth asteroid among the near-Earth asteroids that were discovered during that year by amateur astronomers or groups of amateur astronomers; and

(2) \$3,000 to the amateur astronomer or group of amateur astronomers who made the greatest contribution to the Minor Planet Center's mission of cataloging near-Earth asteroids during the preceding year.

(c) **QUALIFICATION FOR AWARD.**—

(1) **RECOMMENDATION.**—These awards shall be made based on the recommendation of the Minor Planet Center of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory.

(2) **LIMITATION.**—No individual who is not a citizen or permanent resident of the United States at the time of that individual's discovery or contribution may receive an award under this program.

SEC. 152. GAO ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY OF MOON AND MARS EXPLORATION MISSIONS.

Within 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science an assessment of the feasibility of NASA's planning for exploration of the Moon and Mars, giving special consideration to the long-term cost implications of program architecture and schedules.

Subtitle C—Limitations and Special Authority**SEC. 161. OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIONAL FUND.**

Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 101 may be used, but not to exceed \$70,000, for official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 162. FACILITIES MANAGEMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may convey, by sale, lease, exchange, or otherwise, including through leaseback arrangements, real and related personal property under the custody and control of the Administration, or interests therein, and retain the net proceeds of such dispositions in an account within NASA's working capital fund to be used for NASA's real property capital needs. All net proceeds realized under this section shall be obligated or expended only as authorized by appropriations Acts. To aid in the use of this authority, NASA shall develop a facilities investment plan that takes into account uniqueness, mission dependency, and other studies required by this Act.

(b) **APPLICATION OF OTHER LAW.**—Sales transactions under this section are subject to section 501 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411).

(c) **NOTICE OF REPROGRAMMING.**—If any funds authorized by this Act are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, notice of such action shall concurrently be provided to the House of Rep-

resentatives Committee on Science and the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **NET PROCEEDS.**—The term "net proceeds" means the rental and other sums received less the costs of the disposition.

(2) **REAL PROPERTY CAPITAL NEEDS.**—The term "real property capital needs" means any expenses necessary and incident to the agency's real property capital acquisitions, improvements, and dispositions.

TITLE II—INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION**SEC. 201. INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION COMPLETION.**

(a) **ELEMENTS, CAPABILITIES, AND CONFIGURATION CRITERIA.**—The Administrator shall ensure that the ISS will be able to—

(1) fulfill international partner agreements and provide a diverse range of research capacity, including a high rate of human biomedical research protocols, countermeasures, applied bio-technologies, technology and exploration research, and other priority areas;

(2) have an ability to support crew size of at least 6 persons;

(3) support crew exploration vehicle docking and automated docking of cargo vehicles or modules launched by either heavy-lift or commercially-developed launch vehicles; and

(4) be operated at an appropriate risk level.

(b) **CONTINGENCY PLAN.**—The transportation plan to support ISS shall include contingency options to ensure sufficient logistics and on-orbit capabilities to support any potential hiatus between Space Shuttle availability and follow-on crew and cargo systems, and provide sufficient pre-positioning of spares and other supplies needed to accommodate any such hiatus.

(c) **CERTIFICATION.**—Within [180] 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and before making any change in the ISS assembly sequence in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall certify in writing to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science NASA's plan to meet the requirements of subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **COST LIMITATION FOR THE ISS.**—Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress information pertaining to the impact of the Columbia accident and the implementation of full cost accounting on the development costs of the International Space Station. The Administrator shall also identify any statutory changes needed to section 202 of the NASA Authorization Act of 2000 to address those impacts.

SEC. 202. RESEARCH AND SUPPORT CAPABILITIES ON INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall—

(1) within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, provide an assessment of biomedical and life science research planned for implementation aboard the ISS that includes the identification of research which can be performed in ground-based facilities and then, if appropriate, validated in space to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science;

(2) ensure the capacity to support ground-based research leading to spaceflight of scientific research in a variety of disciplines with potential direct national benefits and applications that can advance significantly from the uniqueness of micro-gravity;

(3) restore and protect such potential ISS research activities as molecular crystal growth, animal research, basic fluid physics,

combustion research, cellular biotechnology, low temperature physics, and cellular research at a level which will sustain the existing scientific expertise and research capabilities until such time as additional funding or resources from sources other than NASA can be identified to support these activities within the framework of the National Laboratory provided for in section 203 of this Act; and

(4) within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, develop a research plan that will demonstrate the process by which NASA will evolve the ISS research portfolio in a manner consistent with the planned growth and evolution of ISS on-orbit and transportation capabilities.

(b) MAINTENANCE OF ON-ORBIT ANALYTICAL CAPABILITIES.—The Administrator shall ensure that on-orbit analytical capabilities to support diagnostic human research, as well as on-orbit characterization of molecular crystal growth, cellular research, and other research products and results are developed and maintained, as an alternative to Earth-based analysis requiring the capability of returning research products to Earth.

(c) ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL SCIENTIFIC USES.—The Administrator shall assess further potential possible scientific uses of the ISS for other applications, such as technology development, development of manufacturing processes, Earth observation and characterization, and astronomical observations.

(d) TRANSITION TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE RESEARCH OPERATIONS.—By no later than the date on which the assembly of the ISS is complete (as determined by the Administrator), the Administrator shall initiate steps to transition research operations on the ISS to a greater private-public operating relationship pursuant to section 203 of this Act.

SEC. 203. NATIONAL LABORATORY STATUS FOR INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to accomplish the objectives listed in section 202, the United States segment of the ISS is hereby designated a national laboratory facility. The Administrator, after consultation with the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall develop the national laboratory facility to oversee scientific utilization of an ISS national laboratory within the organizational structure of NASA.

(b) NATIONAL LABORATORY FUNCTIONS.—The Administrator shall seek to use the national laboratory to increase the utilization of the ISS by other national and commercial users and to maximize available NASA funding for research through partnerships, cost-sharing agreements, and arrangements with non-NASA entities.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—Within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall provide an implementation plan to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science for establishment of the ISS national laboratory facility which, at a minimum, shall include—

- (1) proposed on-orbit laboratory functions;
- (2) proposed ground-based laboratory facilities;
- (3) detailed laboratory management structure, concept of operations, and operational feasibility;
- (4) detailed plans for integration and conduct of ground and space-based research operations;
- (5) description of funding and workforce resource requirements necessary to establish and operate the laboratory;
- (6) plans for accommodation of existing international partner research obligations and commitments; and

(7) detailed outline of actions and timeline necessary to implement and initiate operations of the laboratory.

(d) U.S. SEGMENT DEFINED.—In this section the term “United States Segment of the ISS” means those elements of the ISS manufactured—

- (1) by the United States; or
- (2) for the United States by other nations in exchange for funds or launch services.

SEC. 204. COMMERCIAL SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION OPERATIONS AND UTILIZATION.

The Administrator shall purchase commercial services for support of the ISS for cargo and other [needs] *needs, and for enhancement of the capabilities of the ISS*, to the maximum extent possible, in accordance with Federal procurement law.

SEC. 205. USE OF THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION AND ANNUAL REPORT.

(a) POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States—

- (1) to ensure diverse and growing utilization of benefits from the ISS; and
- (2) to increase commercial operations in low-Earth orbit and beyond that are supported by national and commercial space transportation capabilities.

(b) USE OF INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.—The Administrator shall conduct broadly focused scientific and exploration research and development activities using the ISS in a manner consistent with the provisions of this title, and advance the Nation’s exploration of the Moon and beyond, using the ISS as a test-bed and outpost for operations, engineering, and scientific research.

(c) REPORTS.—No later than March 31 of each year the Administrator shall submit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science on the use of the ISS for these purposes, with implementation milestones and associated results.

TITLE III—NATIONAL SPACE TRANSPORTATION POLICY

SEC. 301. UNITED STATES HUMAN-RATED LAUNCH CAPACITY ASSESSMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, provide to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science, a full description of the transportation requirements needed to support the space launch and transportation transition implementation plan required by section 136 of this Act, as well as for the ISS, including—

- (1) the manner in which the capabilities of any proposed human-rated crew and launch vehicles meet the requirements of the implementation plan under section 136 of this Act;
- (2) a retention plan of skilled personnel from the legacy Shuttle program which will sustain the level of safety for that program through the final flight and transition plan that will ensure that any NASA programs can utilize the human capital resources of the Shuttle program, to the maximum extent practicable;
- (3) the implications for and impact on the Nation’s aerospace industrial base;
- (4) the manner in which the proposed vehicles contribute to a national mixed fleet launch and flight capacity;
- (5) the nature and timing of the transition from the Space Shuttle to the workforce, the proposed vehicles, and any related infrastructure;
- (6) support for ISS crew transportation, ISS utilization, and lunar exploration architecture;
- (7) for any human rated vehicle, a crew escape system, as well as substantial protec-

tion against orbital debris strikes that offers a high level of safety;

- (8) development risk areas;
- (9) the schedule and cost;
- (10) the relationship between crew and cargo capabilities; and
- (11) the ability to reduce risk through the use of currently qualified hardware.

SEC. 302. SPACE SHUTTLE TRANSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure continuous human access to space, the Administrator may not retire the Space Shuttle orbiter until a replacement human-rated spacecraft system has demonstrated that it can take humans into Earth orbit and return them safely, except as may be provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act. The Administrator shall conduct the transition from the Space Shuttle orbiter to a replacement capability in a manner that uses the personnel, capabilities, assets, and infrastructure of the current Space Shuttle program to the maximum extent feasible.

(b) REPORT.—After providing the information required by section 301 to the Committees, the Administrator shall transmit a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science containing a detailed and comprehensive Space Shuttle transition plan that includes any necessary recertification, including requirements, assumptions, and milestones, in order to utilize the Space Shuttle orbiter beyond calendar year 2010.

(c) CONTRACT TERMINATIONS; VENDOR REPLACEMENTS.—The Administrator may not terminate any contracts nor replace any vendors associated with the Space Shuttle until the Administrator transmits the report required by subsection (b) to the Committees.

SEC. 303. COMMERCIAL LAUNCH VEHICLES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Administrator should use current and emerging commercial launch vehicles to fulfill appropriate mission needs, including the support of low-Earth orbit and lunar exploration operations.

SEC. 304. SECONDARY PAYLOAD CAPABILITY.

In order to help develop a cadre of experienced engineers and to provide more routine and affordable access to space, the Administrator shall provide the capabilities to support secondary payloads on United States launch vehicles, including free flyers, for satellites or scientific payloads weighing less than 500 kilograms.

TITLE IV—ENABLING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY

SEC. 401. COMMERCIALIZATION PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Associate Administrator for Space Transportation of the Federal Aviation Administration, the Director of the Office of Space Commercialization of the Department of Commerce, and any other relevant agencies, shall develop a commercialization plan to support the human missions to the Moon and Mars, to support Low-Earth Orbit activities and Earth science mission and applications, and to transfer science research and technology to society. The plan shall identify opportunities for the private sector to participate in the future missions and activities, including opportunities for partnership between NASA and the private sector in the development of technologies and [services.] *services, shall emphasize the utilization by NASA of advancements made by the private sector in space launch and orbital hardware, and shall include opportunities for innovative collaborations between NASA and the private sector under existing authorities of NASA for reimbursable and non-reimbursable*

agreements under the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.).

(b) REPORT.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit a copy of the plan to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House of Representatives Committee on Science.

SEC. 402. AUTHORITY FOR COMPETITIVE PRIZE PROGRAM TO ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF ADVANCED SPACE AND AERONAUTICAL TECHNOLOGIES.

Title III of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 316. PROGRAM ON COMPETITIVE AWARD OF PRIZES TO ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF ADVANCED SPACE AND AERONAUTICAL TECHNOLOGIES.

“(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may carry out a program to award prizes to stimulate innovation in basic and applied research, technology development, and prototype demonstration that have the potential for application to the performance of the space and aeronautical activities of the Administration.

“(2) USE OF PRIZE AUTHORITY.—In carrying out the program, the Administrator shall seek to develop and support technologies and areas identified in section 134 of this Act or other areas that the Administrator determines to be providing impetus to NASA’s overall exploration and science architecture and plans, such as private efforts to detect near Earth objects and, where practicable, utilize the prize winner’s technologies in fulfilling NASA’s missions. The Administrator shall widely advertise any competitions conducted under the program and must include advertising to research universities.

“(3) COORDINATION.—The program shall be implemented in compliance with section 138 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005.

“(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—Recipients of prizes under the program under this section shall be selected through one or more competitions conducted by the Administrator.

“(2) ADVERTISING.—The Administrator shall widely advertise any competitions conducted under the program.

“(c) REGISTRATION; ASSUMPTION OF RISK.—

“(1) REGISTRATION.—Each potential recipient of a prize in a competition under the program under this section shall register for the competition.

“(2) ASSUMPTION OF RISK.—In registering for a competition under paragraph (1), a potential recipient of a prize shall assume any and all risks, and waive claims against the United States Government and its related entities, for any injury, death, damage, or loss of property, revenue, or profits, whether direct, indirect, or consequential, arising from participation in the competition, whether such injury, death, damage, or loss arises through negligence or otherwise, except in the case of willful misconduct.

“(3) RELATED ENTITY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘related entity’ includes a contractor or subcontractor at any tier, a supplier, user, customer, cooperating party, grantee, investigator, or detailee.

“(d) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) TOTAL AMOUNT.—The total amount of cash prizes available for award in competitions under the program under this section in any fiscal year may not exceed \$50,000,000.

“(2) APPROVAL REQUIRED FOR LARGE PRIZES.—No competition under the program may result in the award of more than \$1,000,000 in cash prizes without the approval of the Administrator or a designee of the Administrator.

“(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER AUTHORITY.—The Administrator may utilize the authority in this section in conjunction with or in ad-

dition to the utilization of any other authority of the Administrator to acquire, support, or stimulate basic and applied research, technology development, or prototype demonstration projects.

“(f) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated for the program authorized by this section shall remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 403. COMMERCIAL GOODS AND SERVICES.

It is the sense of the Congress that NASA should purchase commercially available space goods and services to the fullest extent feasible in support of the human missions beyond Earth and should encourage commercial use and development of space to the greatest extent practicable.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 501. EXTENSION OF INDEMNIFICATION AUTHORITY.

Section 309 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2458c) is amended by striking “December 31, 2002” and inserting “December 31, 2007”, and by striking “September 30, 2005” and inserting “December 31, 2009”.

SEC. 502. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROVISIONS.

Section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of [1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2457 et seq.),] 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2457) is amended by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) ASSIGNMENT OF PATENT RIGHTS, ETC.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Under agreements entered into pursuant to paragraph (5) or (6) of section 203(c) of this Act (42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(5) or (6)), the Administrator may—

“(A) grant or agree to grant in advance to a participating party, patent licenses or assignments, or options thereto, in any invention made in whole or in part by an Administration employee under the agreement; or

“(B) subject to section 209 of title 35, grant a license to an invention which is Federally owned, for which a patent application was filed before the signing of the agreement, and directly within the scope of the work under the agreement, for reasonable compensation when appropriate.

“(2) EXCLUSIVITY.—The Administrator shall ensure, through such agreement, that the participating party has the option to choose an exclusive license for a pre-negotiated field of use for any such invention under the agreement or, if there is more than 1 participating party, that the participating parties are offered the option to hold licensing rights that collectively encompass the rights that would be held under such an exclusive license by one party.

“(3) CONDITIONS.—In consideration for the Government’s contribution under the agreement, grants under this subsection shall be subject to the following explicit conditions:

“(A) A nonexclusive, nontransferable, irrevocable, paid-up license from the participating party to the Administration to practice the invention or have the invention practiced throughout the world by or on behalf of the Government. In the exercise of such license, the Government shall not publicly disclose trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged or confidential within the meaning of section 552 (b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, or which would be considered as such if it had been obtained from a non-Federal party.

“(B) If the Administration assigns title or grants an exclusive license to such an invention, the Government shall retain the right—

“(i) to require the participating party to grant to a responsible applicant a nonexclusive, partially exclusive, or exclusive license to use the invention in the applicant’s licensed field of use, on terms that are reasonable under the circumstances; or

“(ii) if the participating party fails to grant such a license, to grant the license itself.

“(C) The Government may exercise its right retained under subparagraph (B) only in exceptional circumstances and only if the Government determines that—

“(i) the action is necessary to meet health or safety needs that are not reasonably satisfied by the participating party;

“(ii) the action is necessary to meet requirements for public use specified by Federal regulations, and such requirements are not reasonably satisfied by the participating party; or

“(iii) the action is necessary to comply with an agreement containing provisions described in section 12(c)(4)(B) of the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(c)(4)(B)).

“(4) APPEAL AND REVIEW OF DETERMINATION.—A determination under paragraph (3)(C) is subject to administrative appeal and judicial review under section 203(b) of title 35, United States Code.”.

SEC. 503. RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION.

Title III of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by section 502 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 317. RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator may, whenever the Administrator considers it desirable, relinquish to a State all or part of the legislative jurisdiction of the United States over lands or interests under the Administrator’s control in that State. Relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction under this section may be accomplished (1) by filing with the Governor of the State concerned a notice of relinquishment to take effect upon acceptance thereof, or (2) as the laws of the State may otherwise provide.”.

SEC. 504. RECOVERY AND DISPOSITION AUTHORITY.

Title III of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by section 603 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 318. RECOVERY AND DISPOSITION AUTHORITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) CONTROL OF REMAINS.—Subject to paragraph (2), when there is an accident or mishap resulting in the death of a crewmember of a NASA human space flight vehicle, the Administrator may take control over the remains of the crewmember and order autopsies and other scientific or medical tests.

“(2) TREATMENT.—Each crewmember shall provide the Administrator with his or her preferences regarding the treatment accorded to his or her remains and the Administrator shall, to the extent possible, respect those stated preferences.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CREWMEMBER.—The term ‘crewmember’ means an astronaut or other person assigned to a NASA human space flight vehicle.

“(2) NASA HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT VEHICLE.—The term ‘NASA human space flight vehicle’ means a space vehicle, as defined in section 308(f)(1), that—

“(A) is intended to transport 1 or more persons;

“(B) designed to operate in outer space; and

“(C) is either owned by NASA, or owned by a NASA contractor or cooperating party and operated as part of a NASA mission or a joint mission with NASA.”.

SEC. 505. REQUIREMENT FOR INDEPENDENT COST ANALYSIS.

Section 301 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 2459g) amended—

(1) by striking "Phase B" in subsection (a) and inserting "implementation";

【(2) by striking "\$150,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting "\$250,000,000";】

【(3)】 (2) by striking "Chief Financial Officer" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting "Administrator";

【(4)】 (3) by inserting "and consider" in subsection (a) after "shall conduct"; and

【(5)】 (4) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) IMPLEMENTATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'implementation' means all activity in the life cycle of a program or project after preliminary design, independent assessment of the preliminary design, and approval to proceed into implementation, including critical design, development, certification, launch, operations, disposal of assets, and, for technology programs, development, testing, analysis and communication of the results to the customers."

SEC. 506. ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES.

Title III of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by section 604 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 319. ELECTRONIC ACCESS TO BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may implement a pilot program providing for reduction in the waiting period between publication of notice of a proposed contract action and release of the solicitation for procurements conducted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(b) APPLICABILITY.—The program implemented under subsection (a) shall apply to non-commercial acquisitions—

"(1) with a total value in excess of \$100,000 but not more than \$5,000,000, including options;

"(2) that do not involve bundling of contract requirements as defined in section 3(o) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(o)); and

"(3) for which a notice is required by section 8(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)) and section 18(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(a)).

"(c) NOTICE.—

"(1) NOTICE OF ACQUISITIONS SUBJECT TO THE program authorized by this section shall be made accessible through the single Government-wide point of entry designated in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, consistent with section 30(c)(4) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 426(c)(4)).

"(2) Providing access to notice in accordance with paragraph (1) satisfies the publication requirements of section 8(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)) and section 18(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(a)).

"(d) SOLICITATION.—Solicitations subject to the program authorized by this section shall be made accessible through the Government-wide point of entry, consistent with requirements set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, except for adjustments to the wait periods as provided in subsection (e).

"(e) WAIT PERIOD.—

"(1) Whenever a notice required by section 8(e)(1)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)(1)(A)) and section 18(a) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(a)) is made accessible in accordance with subsection (c) of this section, the wait period set forth in section 8(e)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)(3)(A)) and section 18(a)(3)(A) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(a)(3)(A)), shall be reduced by 5

days. If the solicitation applying to that notice is accessible electronically in accordance with subsection (d) simultaneously with issuance of the notice, the wait period set forth in section 8(e)(3)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)(3)(A)) and section 18(a)(3)(A) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(a)(3)(A)) shall not apply and the period specified in section 8(e)(3)(B) of the Small Business Act and section 18(a)(3)(B) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act for submission of bids or proposals shall begin to run from the date the solicitation is electronically accessible.

"(2) When a notice and solicitation are made accessible simultaneously and the wait period is waived pursuant to paragraph (1), the deadline for the submission of bids or proposals shall be not less than 5 days greater than the minimum deadline set forth in section 8(e)(3)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)(3)(B)) and section 18(a)(3)(B) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416(a)(3)(B)).

"(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—

"(1) Nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying regulatory requirements set forth in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, except with respect to—

"(A) the applicable wait period between publication of notice of a proposed contract action and release of the solicitation; and

"(B) the deadline for submission of bids or proposals for procurements conducted in accordance with the terms of this pilot program.

"(2) This section shall not apply to the extent the President determines it is inconsistent with any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

"(g) STUDY.—Within 18 months after the effective date of the program, NASA, in coordination with the Small Business Administration, the General Services Administration, and the Office of Management and Budget, shall evaluate the impact of the pilot program and submit to Congress a report that—

"(1) sets forth in detail the results of the test, including the impact on competition and small business participation; and

"(2) addresses whether the pilot program should be made permanent, continued as a test program, or allowed to expire.

"(h) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall publish proposed revisions to the NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement necessary to implement this section in the Federal Register not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005. The Administrator shall—

"(1) make the proposed regulations available for public comment for a period of not less than 60 days; and

"(2) publish final regulations in the Federal Register not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of that Act.

"(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program authorized by this section shall take effect on the date specified in the final regulations promulgated pursuant to subsection (h)(2).

"(2) LIMITATION.—The date so specified shall be no less than 30 days after the date on which the final regulation is published.

"(j) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to conduct the pilot program under subsection (a) and to award contracts under such program shall expire 2 years after the effective date established in the final regulations published in the Federal Register under subsection (h)(2)."

SEC. 507. REPORTS ELIMINATION.

(a) REPEALS.—The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 2451 note).

(2) Section 304(d) of the Federal Aviation Administration Research, Engineering, and Development Authorization Act of 1992 (49 U.S.C. 47508 note).

(3) Section 323 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2000.

(b) AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 315 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2459j) is amended by striking subsection (a) and redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (a) through (e).

(2) Section 315(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2487a(c)) is amended by striking subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

VETERANS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 218, S. 1235.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1235) to amend chapters 19 and 37 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the availability of \$400,000 in coverage under the servicemembers' life insurance and veterans' group life insurance programs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with an amendment.

(Strike the part shown in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.)

S. 1235

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

【SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

【This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2005".】

【SEC. 2. GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.

【(a) SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.—Section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, as in effect on October 1, 2005, is amended—

【(1) in subsection (a)—

【(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

【“(C) With respect to a policy of insurance covering an insured member, the Secretary of Defense shall make a good-faith effort to notify the spouse of a member if the member elects, at any time, to—

【“(i) reduce amounts of insurance coverage of an insured member; or

【“(ii) name a beneficiary other than the insured member's spouse.

【“(D) The failure of the Secretary of Defense to provide timely notification under subparagraph (C) shall not affect the validity of an election by the member.

【“(E) If a servicemember marries or remarries after making an election under subparagraph (C), the Secretary of Defense is not required to notify the spouse of such election. Elections made after marriage or remarriage are subject to the notice requirement under subparagraph (C).”]; and

[(B) in paragraph (3)—

[(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) In the case of a member, \$400,000.”; and

[(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “member or spouse” and inserting “member, be evenly divisible by \$50,000 and, in the case of a member’s spouse”; and

[(2) in subsection (d), by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$400,000”.

[(b) DURATION OF COVERAGE.—Section 1968(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

[(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “one year” and inserting “2 years”; and

[(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “one year” and inserting “2 years”.

[(c) VETERANS’ GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.—Section 1977(a) of title 38, United States Code, as in effect on October 1, 2005, is amended by striking “\$250,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$400,000”.

SEC. 3. ADJUSTABLE RATE MORTGAGES.

[Section 3707(c)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “1 percentage point” and inserting “such percentage as the Secretary may prescribe”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

[The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2005, immediately after the execution of section 1012(i) of Public Law 109–13.]

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2005”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INSURANCE MATTERS

Sec. 101. Group Life Insurance.

Sec. 102. Treatment of stillborn children as insurable dependents under Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance program.

TITLE II—HOUSING MATTERS

Sec. 201. Adjustable rate mortgages.

Sec. 202. Technical corrections to Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004.

Sec. 203. Permanent authority for housing loans for Native American veterans.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 301. Annual plan on outreach activities.

Sec. 302. Extension of reporting requirements on equitable relief cases.

Sec. 303. Inclusion of additional diseases and conditions in diseases and disabilities presumed to be associated with prisoner of war status.

Sec. 304. Post traumatic stress disorder claims.

TITLE I—INSURANCE MATTERS

SEC. 101. GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.

(a) **SERVICEMEMBERS’ GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.**—Section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, as in effect on October 1, 2005, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) With respect to a policy of insurance covering an insured member, the Secretary concerned shall make a good-faith effort to notify the spouse of the member, at the last address of the spouse in the records of the Secretary concerned, if the member elects, prior to discharge from the military, naval, or air service, to—

“(i) reduce amounts of insurance coverage of the member; or

“(ii) name a beneficiary other than the member’s spouse or child.

“(D) The failure of the Secretary concerned to provide timely notification under subparagraph (C) shall not affect the validity of an election by a member.

“(E) If an unmarried member marries after having made one or more elections to reduce or decline insurance coverage or to name beneficiaries, the Secretary concerned is not required to notify the spouse of such marriage of such elections. Elections made after such marriage are subject to the notice requirements under subparagraph (C).”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) In the case of a member, \$400,000.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “member or spouse” and inserting “member, be evenly divisible by \$50,000 and, in the case of a member’s spouse”; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$400,000”.

(b) **DURATION OF COVERAGE.**—Section 1968(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “one year” and inserting “2 years”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “one year” and inserting “2 years”.

(c) **VETERANS’ GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.**—Section 1977(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “\$250,000” each place it appears and inserting “\$400,000”.

(d) **CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN OTHER AMENDMENTS.**—Notwithstanding subsection (h) of section 1012 of Public Law 109–13, the amendments made by subsections (a)(1), (c), (d), (e)(2), (f), and (g) of such section shall not go into effect on September 1, 2005, as otherwise provided by such subsection (h), and shall not be treated for any purposes as having gone into effect on that date.

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—(1) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on September 1, 2005.

(2) The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall take effect on October 1, 2005, immediately after the execution of section 1012(i) of Public Law 109–13.

(3) If the date of the enactment of this Act occurs after September 1, 2005, and before October 1, 2005, the provisions of paragraph (2) of section 1967(a) of title 38, United States Code, shall, for purposes of the execution of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section, be such provisions as in effect on May 10, 2005, the day before the date of the enactment of Public Law 109–13.

SEC. 102. TREATMENT OF STILLBORN CHILDREN AS INSURABLE DEPENDENTS UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS’ GROUP LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **TREATMENT.**—Section 1965(10) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) The member’s stillborn child.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 101(4)(A) of such title is amended by striking “section 1965(10)(B)” in the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting “subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 1965(10)”.

TITLE II—HOUSING MATTERS

SEC. 201. ADJUSTABLE RATE MORTGAGES.

Section 3707A(c)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “1 percentage point” and inserting “such percentage as the Secretary may prescribe”.

SEC. 202. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO VETERANS BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2004.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2101 of title 38, United States Code, as amended by section 401 of the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–454), is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) a new subsection (c) consisting of the text of subsection (c) of such section 2101 as in effect immediately before the enactment of such Act, modified—

(A) by inserting after “(c)” the following: “ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “paragraph (1), (2), or (3)” and inserting “subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (2)”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “the second sentence” and inserting “paragraph (3)”; and

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”; and

(3) in subsection (a)(3), by striking “subsection (c)” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting “subsection (d)”.
(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect immediately after the enactment of the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–454).

SEC. 203. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR HOUSING LOANS FOR NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS.

(a) **PERMANENT AUTHORITY.**—Section 3761 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§3761. Authority for housing loans for Native American veterans

“(a) The Secretary shall make direct housing loans to Native American veterans in accordance with the provisions of this subchapter.

“(b) The purpose of loans under this subchapter is to permit Native American veterans to purchase, construct, or improve dwellings on trust land.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 3762 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “under this subchapter” after “Native American veteran” in the matter preceding paragraph (1);

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(E), by striking “in order to ensure” and all that follows and inserting a period;

(3) in subsection (c)(1)(B), by striking “shall be the amount” and all that follows in the second sentence and inserting “shall be such amount as the Secretary considers appropriate for the purpose of this subchapter.”;

(4) in subsection (d)(1), by striking the second sentence;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “of the pilot program” and all that follows and inserting “of the availability of direct housing loans for Native American veterans under this subchapter.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “under the pilot program” and all that follows and inserting “under this subchapter”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “in participating in the pilot program” and inserting “in participating in the making of direct loans under this subchapter”; and

(6) by striking subsection (j).

(c) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—(1) The heading of subchapter V of chapter 37 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“Subchapter V—Housing Loans for Native American Veterans”.

(2) The table of contents for such chapter is amended—

(A) by striking the matter relating to the subchapter heading of subchapter V and inserting the following new item:

“SUBCHAPTER V—HOUSING LOANS FOR NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS”;

and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 3761 and inserting the following new item:

“3761. Authority for housing loans for Native American veterans.”.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 301. ANNUAL PLAN ON OUTREACH ACTIVITIES.

(a) **ANNUAL PLAN REQUIRED.**—Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 38, United States Code, is

amended by inserting after section 523 the following new section:

“§523A. Annual plan on outreach activities

“(a) ANNUAL PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall prepare each year a plan for the outreach activities of the Department for the following year.

“(b) ELEMENTS.—Each annual plan under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) Directors for efforts to identify veterans who are not enrolled or registered with the Department for benefits or services under the programs administered by the Secretary.

“(2) Plans for informing veterans and their dependents of modifications of the benefits and services under the programs administered by the Secretary, including eligibility for medical and nursing care and services.

“(c) COORDINATION IN DEVELOPMENT.—In developing an annual plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with the following:

“(1) Directors or other appropriate officials of organizations approved by the Secretary under section 5902 of this title.

“(2) Directors or other appropriate officials of State and local education and training programs.

“(3) Representatives of non-governmental organizations that carry out veterans outreach programs.

“(4) Representatives of State and local veterans employment organizations.

“(5) Businesses and professional organizations.

“(6) Other individuals and organizations that assist veterans in adjusting to civilian life.

“(d) INCORPORATION OF ASSESSMENT OF PREVIOUS ANNUAL PLANS.—In developing an annual plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into account the lessons learned from the implementation of previous annual plans under such subsection.

“(e) INCORPORATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE OUTREACH AND AWARENESS.—In developing an annual plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall incorporate the recommendations for the improvement of veterans outreach and awareness activities included in the report submitted to Congress by the Secretary pursuant to section 805 of the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-454).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 523 the following new item:

“523A. Annual plan on outreach activities.”.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS ON EQUITABLE RELIEF CASES.

Section 503(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “December 31, 2004” and inserting “December 31, 2009”.

SEC. 303. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL DISEASES AND CONDITIONS IN DISEASES AND DISABILITIES PRESUMED TO BE ASSOCIATED WITH PRISONER OF WAR STATUS.

Section 1112(b)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(L) Atherosclerotic heart disease or hypertensive vascular disease (including hypertensive heart disease) and their complications (including myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure and arrhythmia).

“(M) Stroke and its complications.”.

SEC. 304. POST TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER CLAIMS.

The Secretary shall develop and implement policy and training initiatives to standardize the assessment of post traumatic stress disorder disability compensation claims.

Amend the title so as to read: “To amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the availability of \$400,000 in life insurance coverage to servicemembers and veterans, to make a stillborn child an insurable depend-

ent for purposes of the Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance program, to make technical corrections to the Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 2004, to make permanent a pilot program for direct housing loans for Native American veterans, and to require an annual plan on outreach activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.”.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, the amendment to the title be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1235), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The title amendment was agreed to.

ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES AFFECTED BY HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA ACT OF 2005

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3864 which was received from the House.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3864) to assist individuals with disabilities affected by Hurricanes Katrina or Rita through vocational rehabilitation services.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 3864) was read the third time and passed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SANDRA FELDMAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 256, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 256) honoring the life of Sandra Feldman.

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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I extend my deepest sympathies to the family and friends of Sandy Feldman at her untimely passing. We have lost a dedicated educator, a proud labor leader, a committed reformer, and someone my

wife Teresa, and I were so proud to have as a friend in our lives.

From her early days as a civil rights advocate, Sandy had an unshakeable sense of justice and fairness. Sandy did not just talk about helping teachers and their students—she actually did it. While her career spanned more than four decades, Sandy’s commitment grew out of her early work in the civil rights movement. An advocate for civil rights and social justice, she was an activist in the Freedom Rides and the 1963 March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. It was her firsthand knowledge of the power of an excellent teacher that led Sandy to a lifetime of activism. Sandy understood the importance of quality public education and the wealth of opportunities it can unleash for every student, regardless of who they are or where they’re from.

“Created my future,” that is what Sandy always said about growing up in Brooklyn and the public schools and libraries she spent her childhood in. Sandy’s commitment to education was fueled by her childhood experiences and her dedication to bettering the lives of students and teachers. Beginning as a second grade teacher, Sandy quickly became a union activist when she led the teachers at her elementary school to organize. In 1986, Sandy became president of AFT’s largest affiliate, New York City’s United Federation of Teachers, UFT. During her years as UFT president and then since 1997 when she became president of the AFT, Sandy earned the respect of Presidents, of her colleagues, and of many of us in Congress.

Calling early childhood education “getting it right from the start,” Sandy consistently called for greater investment in public education and a greater emphasis on high standards and increased accountability. Sandy’s focus on early childhood education led her to introduce a program that would provide extended learning opportunities for disadvantaged students before and after the normal kindergarten school year. Within a few years, Sandy’s program, Kindergarten-Plus, had been introduced as Federal legislation, passed or considered in several State legislatures, and passed into law in at least one State.

My hope is that her tragic passing after a courageous battle with cancer will inspire all of us to do just what Sandy fought her entire life for—to make sure we are getting it right from the start and to stand by our children and our teachers. Sandy was an amazing American. I will miss her wisdom and her counsel very much. Our hearts go out to her husband Arthur and their family in this difficult time.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble 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. Res. 256) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 256

Whereas Sandra Feldman was born Sandra Abramowitz in October, 1939, to blue-collar parents living in a tenement in Coney Island, New York;

Whereas Sandra Feldman, while at James Madison High School, Brooklyn College, and New York University, began a life-long dedication to education, both in the United States and abroad;

Whereas Sandra Feldman began her career by teaching fourth grade at Public School 34 on the Lower East Side of New York City;

Whereas during her service as union leader at Public School 34, Sandra Feldman became employed by the United Federation of Teachers in New York City, and was elected president in 1986, after 20 years of service;

Whereas Sandra Feldman's tenure as president of the United Federation of Teachers was distinguished by her devotion to better working conditions for the teachers she represented;

Whereas in 1997, the American Federation of Teachers elected Sandra Feldman to serve as their president, until she retired 7 years later;

Whereas Sandra Feldman effectively represented the educators, healthcare professionals, public employees, and retirees who made up the membership of the American Federation of Teachers;

Whereas Sandra Feldman was a tireless advocate for public education, working with President George W. Bush on the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 to improve accountability standards and provide increased resources to schools to help increasing professional development to better equip teachers to instruct students, and using research-driven methods to redesign school programs;

Whereas Sandra Feldman was equally devoted to promoting the rights of public servants, fighting against discrimination, raising the nursing shortage into national public awareness, advocating for smaller class sizes and patient-to-nurse ratios promoting increased benefits and compensation for workers, and spreading her message beyond her own membership by advocating for workers overseas as well;

Whereas Sandra Feldman lent her expertise to both the national and international labor movements in her capacities as a member of the AFL-CIO executive council and a vice president of Education International; and

Whereas Sandra Feldman succumbed on September 18, 2005, to a difficult struggle against breast cancer at the age of 65: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the loss of Sandra Feldman, a vibrant and dedicated public servant;

(2) recognizes the contributions of Sandra Feldman to public education;

(3) expresses its deepest condolences to those who knew and loved Sandra Feldman; and

(4) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Sandra Feldman.

RECOGNIZING THE SPIRIT OF
JACOB MOCK DOUB

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 257, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 257) recognizing the spirit of Jacob Mock Doub and many young people who have contributed to encouraging youth to be physically active and fit, and expressing support for "National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day."

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble 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. Res. 257) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 257

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, obesity rates have nearly tripled in adolescents in the United States since 1980;

Whereas overweight adolescents have a 70 percent chance of becoming overweight or obese adults;

Whereas research conducted by the National Institutes of Health indicates that, while genetics do play a role in childhood obesity, the large increase in childhood obesity rates over the past few decades can be traced to overeating and lack of sufficient exercise;

Whereas the Surgeon General and the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports recommend regular physical activity, including bicycling, for the prevention of overweight and obesity;

Whereas Jacob Mock "Jack" Doub, born July 11, 1985, was actively involved in encouraging others, especially children, to ride bicycles and was an active youth who was introduced to mountain biking at the age of 11 near Grandfather Mountain, North Carolina, and quickly became a talented cyclist;

Whereas Jack Doub died unexpectedly from complications related to a bicycling injury on October 21, 2002;

Whereas Jack Doub's family and friends have joined, in association with the International Mountain Bicycling Association, to honor Jack Doub's spirit and love of bicycling by establishing the Jack Doub Memorial Fund to promote and encourage children of all ages to learn to ride and lead a physically active lifestyle;

Whereas the International Mountain Bicycling Association's worldwide network, which is based in Boulder, Colorado, includes 32,000 individual members, more than 450 bicycle clubs, 140 corporate partners, and 240 bicycle retailer members, who coordinate more than 1,000,000 volunteer trail work hours each year and have built more than 5,000 miles of new trails;

Whereas the International Mountain Bicycling Association has encouraged low-impact riding and volunteer trail work participation since 1988; and

Whereas "National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day" was established in honor of Jack Doub in 2004 by the International Mountain Bicycling Association, and is celebrated on the first Saturday in October of each year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the health risks associated with childhood obesity;

(B) the spirit of Jacob Mock "Jack" Doub and so many others who have been actively

promoting physical activity to combat childhood obesity; and

(C) Jack Doub's contribution to encouraging youth of all ages to be physically active and fit, especially through bicycling;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of "National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day", which was established in honor of Jack Doub in 2004 by the International Mountain Bicycling Association, and is celebrated on the first Saturday in October of each year; and

(3) encourages parents, schools, civic organizations, and students to support the International Mountain Bicycling Association's "National Take a Kid Mountain Biking Day" to promote increased physical activity among youth in the United States.

COMMENDING TIMOTHY SCOTT
WINEMAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 258, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 258) to commend Timothy Scott Wineman.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble 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. Res. 258) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 258

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman became an employee of the United States Senate on October 19, 1970, and since that date has ably and faithfully upheld the high standards and traditions of the staff of the United States Senate for a period that included 19 Congresses;

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman has served in the senior management of the Disbursing Office for more than 25 years, first as the Assistant Financial Clerk of the United States Senate from August 1, 1980 to April 30, 1998, and finally as Financial Clerk of the United States Senate from May 1, 1998 to October 14, 2005;

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman has faithfully discharged the difficult duties and responsibilities of his position as Financial Clerk of the United States Senate with great pride, energy, efficiency, dedication, integrity, and professionalism;

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman has earned the respect, affection, and esteem of the United States Senate; and

Whereas Timothy S. Wineman will retire from the United States Senate on October 14, 2005, with 35 years of service with the United States Senate all with the Disbursing Office: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate commends Timothy S. Wineman for his exemplary service to the United States Senate and the Nation, and wishes to express its deep appreciation and gratitude for his long, faithful, and outstanding service.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Timothy S. Wineman.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY, PROTOCOL AMENDING THE TAX CONVENTION WITH FRANCE—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 109-4

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on September 28, 2005, by the President of the United States: Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with France (Treaty Document No. 109-4). I further ask unanimous consent that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time, that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message of the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a Protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris on August 31, 1994 (the "Convention"), signed at Washington on December 8, 2004 (the "Protocol"). Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Protocol.

The Protocol was negotiated to address certain technical issues that have arisen since the Convention entered into force. The Protocol was concluded in recognition of the importance of U.S. economic relations with France.

The Protocol clarifies the treatment of investments made in France by U.S. investors through partnerships located in the United States, France, or third countries. It also modifies the provisions of the treaty dealing with pensions and pension contributions in order to achieve parity given the two countries' fundamentally different pension systems. The Protocol makes other changes to the Convention to reflect more closely current U.S. tax treaty policy.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Protocol and that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 28, 2005.

REFERRAL OF S. 1219

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1219 be discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

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

EMERGENCY AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT GRANTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1786, introduced earlier today.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1786) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make emergency airport improvement project grants-in-aid under title 49, United States Code, for repairs and costs related to damage from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1786) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1786

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EMERGENCY USE OF GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 AND 2006.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may make project grants under part B, subtitle VII, of title 49, United States Code, from amounts that remain unobligated after the date of enactment of this Act for fiscal years 2005 and 2006—

(1) from apportioned funds under section 47114 of that title apportioned to an airport described in subsection (b)(1) or to a State in which such airport is located; or

(2) from funds available for discretionary grants to such an airport under section 47115 of such title.

(b) ELIGIBLE AIRPORTS AND USES.—The Secretary may make grants under subsection (a) for—

(1) emergency capital costs incurred by a public use airport in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, or Texas that is listed in the Federal Aviation Administration's National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems of repairing or replacing public use facilities that have been damaged as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita; and

(2) emergency operating costs incurred by an airport described in paragraph (1) as a result of Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

(c) PRIORITIES.—In making grants authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to—

(1) airport development within the meaning of section 47102 of title 49, United States Code;

(2) terminal development within the meaning of section 47110 of that title;

(3) repair or replacement of other public use airport facilities; and

(4) emergency operating costs incurred at public use airports in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas.

(d) MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN OTHERWISE APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS.—For purposes of any grant authorized by subsection (a)—

(1) the Secretary may waive any otherwise applicable limitation on, or requirement for, grants under section 47102, 47107(a)(17), 47110, or 47119 of title 49, United States Code, if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary to respond, in as timely and efficient

a manner as possible, to the urgent needs of the region damaged by Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita;

(2) the United States Government's share of allowable project costs shall be 100 percent, notwithstanding the provisions of section 47109 of that title;

(3) any project funded by such a grant shall be deemed to be an airport development project (within the meaning of section 47102 of that title), except for the purpose of establishing priorities under subsection (b) of this section among projects to be funded by such grants; and

(4) no project funded by such a grant may be considered, for the purpose of any other provision of law, to be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1783

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1783 be placed directly on the calendar.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2005

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 29. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time of the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate proceed to executive session and continue consideration of Calendar No. 317, John Roberts to be Chief Justice of the United States; provided further that the time until 10:30 be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we will resume the Roberts nomination tomorrow for a short period of debate. The debate from 10:30 to 11:30 has previously been allocated to the two managers and the two leaders. At 11:30 tomorrow, the Senate will vote on the nomination of Judge Roberts to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. I remind all Senators that the majority leader has asked all Senators to be in the Chamber by 11:20 and seated at their desks for this historic vote.

Following that vote, the Senate is expected to begin consideration of the Defense appropriations bill. Additional votes will occur on Thursday and Friday this week.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the time controlled by the minority.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

EMERGENCY HEALTHCARE RELIEF FOR THE SURVIVORS OF HURRICANE KATRINA

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, before the chairman leaves the floor—he has put in a long day today and has some more things probably to do this evening—I wish to thank him for his extraordinary leadership at this time and also the Senator from Montana who was here earlier. They have been working on this bill now for weeks because they are aware of the great need, the extraordinary need of the people from the State I represent, Louisiana, but also our neighbors now in Texas and in Mississippi and in Alabama.

As the Senator from Iowa knows, and the Senator from Montana, this is the largest natural disaster in the history of the United States. We had one hurricane and major levee failings in a region with over 2 million people. Then on the heels of it, we have had another hurricane, not quite as large but equally as damaging to some rural areas, Mr. President, that you are very familiar with, not big cities but small cities that are gone. They are just gone. There is no more city. There is no more community.

All along the gulf coast—you can ask the Senators from Mississippi—Waveland and Biloxi and Cameron Parish, 10,000 people lived there 5 days ago. No one lives there today.

I flew over the other day. There is one building, the courthouse building, that stood in the Audrey hurricane, it stood in the Rita hurricane. When we rebuilt the Cameron Parish, I told them: Go find the architect who built that courthouse because we are going need to have everything built that way if we are going to live here.

This was not a coast of people sunbathing at resorts or second homes. These were people running our pipelines, our gas lines, our fishing industry. These were people running the refineries, the infrastructure that is on that coast. They didn't just go there in the last decade to retire. Their families have been there for generations, all along this gulf coast. When they went there, there was more land and more protection. But because they are not super rich and because they did not have a lot of extra money and because over a lot of decades the Federal Government did not do what it should—maybe we all missed a little bit here or there—the land is washed away. They find themselves more vulnerable.

But they are not sunbathing down there. They are working on the ports, on the oil and gas industry, and they desperately need our help. These people need immediate medical attention and care. As a doctor, you can understand the anxiety of people who do not know

where to go for health care. They are in strange places. They need to be qualified.

This has been well researched by the staffs. We have had input, of course, Senator VITTER and myself, but this comes straight from the Finance Committee, to extend what is already in the law for people to help them get coverage for 5 months, just 5 months until people can catch their breath, get up on their feet, try to find their families, make decisions. They lost their homes. They lost their business.

It also helps private employers. I have had private employers, little ones, medium ones, and big ones pouring into my office. And this is what they say: Senator, we are not leaving. We want to stay. We are going to exhaust the money in our bank accounts to keep our employees whole. But could you please ask the Federal Government to give us a little help here? We want to keep their coverage. We want to keep our employees. We want them to come back. We don't want our companies to leave. But a lot of them had to leave. They had no choice. They are going to Oklahoma, they are going to Houston but at a lot of cost.

I talked to a gas pipeline company. They are having their employees come back this weekend right in Cameron Parish. But they need our help.

One of the things this bill does is it helps them—if they were giving insurance to their people—continue to give private insurance. If some companies had to leave temporarily, their employees can still get private coverage through a program that already exists.

The chairman and the ranking member put their heads together and said, Let us do this for 5 months.

I know there is an objection, because some have expressed a few objections, that said let us not extend it to all States, let us keep it targeted to Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas.

We thought about that. But the reason there is one provision that allows the other States to keep their Medicaid, 100-percent reimbursement, is because they have taken a lot of our people. Arkansas didn't have a hurricane, but they took our people. They had 75,000 people.

So if we cut the State of Arkansas' health care benefits which may go into effect soon, that is what we were anticipating. It puts so much strain on Arkansas for the 75,000 people.

We think it is reasonable to ask for a 5-month waiver for all of the States just to help us through this difficult period.

We are not trying to expand a Government program. We are trying to use what is available now in the law and extend it to millions of people who need help immediately.

It is not everything we need in health care. We still have problems with losses because companies are out of business. Doctors who want to stay have no place to work. Even if they

showed up to the hospital to work, the city of New Orleans is still virtually empty. It is a large city. One-half our population has been impacted. Almost half, 4.5 million people, live in the southern part of our State.

Everyone has been impacted by these two disasters. A large population in Texas, a large population in Mississippi, and a medium-sized population in Alabama have been affected, but not to the level that, of course, Louisiana has taken. It has taken a hit to its major metropolitan area, as well as then being followed up by another major hit to the rural area to the western side of our State.

I say "rural"—there are good-sized cities, such as Lake Charles and other cities that are in that area.

We have large cities, medium-sized cities, and small villages and communities—such as Cameron—that have been very hard hit.

It is very important that we try to work through whatever the difficulties might be. We don't have that much time.

If we can move on this package in the next day or two, and work out whatever objections there are, I think it would be a great signal to send from this Congress.

I know we have to get it past the House. I know we have to get it signed by the President. But the President has been to our State many times. I have been with him on almost every trip. He has assured me that he understands that people are in desperate need, and he wants to see the Federal Government use the resources that we have to meet that need. I know we can't do everything. But this is minimal. This is basic coverage for people who have nothing right now.

While churches are helping and while the private employers are doing a good job, private employers cannot take on more risk than is their fiduciary responsibility. They have a responsibility to their stakeholders, to their shareholders, and to their board of directors. They cannot run charities.

That is why we have the role of Government. That is why we have to step up and meet them halfway.

I am proud of our employers, but they need our help. The business community needs us to be a partner, and part of this bill would do that.

I see the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question through the Chair?

I came on the floor late. I heard Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY talk about this bill. I want to try to bring it down to the most basic information, so if someone misses the debate, they will understand what we are talking about.

This is generally what we are trying to do. We are taking people who are displaced out of their homes, out of their jobs, out of their communities because of the hurricanes—people who, frankly, are going through a lot of personal and family hardship at this moment—and saying that one thing we

are going to help you with immediately is to make sure that you have health care. If you qualify, you would have Medicaid—that is for people in the lower income categories—or if you had private health insurance where you used to work in a business that has gone away, we are going to step in here for 5 months and say, We are going to give you this peace of mind. You will know that you have health insurance.

Is that what this bill does?

Ms. LANDRIEU. That is what this bill does.

Mr. DURBIN. I understand that this is a bipartisan bill that Senator GRASSLEY, Republican of Iowa, Senator BAUCUS, a Democrat of Montana, have written to make sure that the millions of people who have been displaced will have basic health care.

Is that is what this bill does?

Ms. LANDRIEU. The Senator is correct. That is what this bill does. Senator VITTER from Louisiana and Senator LANDRIEU—and I am almost certain that every Senator of the affected States—have signed off on this, asked for it and said “yes.” We desperately need it.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask the Senator how many times she has brought this bill to the floor. How many times have we tried to provide this basic health care, basic protection to these victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita so far?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I believe the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Montana have been working on this for 2 weeks. We are into our fourth week of Katrina and the first week of Rita.

But again, it is the largest natural disaster that has hit the Continental United States. We are getting ready to rebuild, after we work out our differences, a major American city for the first time since the Civil War and the region that surrounds it. We are learning as we go. There is not a textbook to follow. So we have to use our common sense. We have to trust each other on some of these things.

The Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Montana have run this committee, and their members have put a great bill together that is modest but so needed.

I am hoping the Senator from Illinois can help us figure out how to move this legislation quickly.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator would further yield for a question through the Chair, I thought our biggest complaint about the Federal Government's response to Katrina was that, even when we were warned, we weren't ready. Many of us are calling for a non-partisan, independent commission to answer some basic questions. Why weren't we ready? But when it comes to this issue about health care for the victims of Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita, we know what the need is. And apparently, because of objections heard on the floor of the Senate, we are delaying, postponing, this basic health care for these victims of this hurricane.

Ms. LANDRIEU. That is what it seems to be. It is unfortunate.

I am hoping, through the Chair to the Senator from Illinois—and I see that our minority leader from Nevada is here with us—that we could do our best in the next 24 hours, either through action on this floor or meetings, to answer questions that a few Senators may have. I have heard objections, such as too much corruption. We have problems with Mississippi spending money and corruption, but we shouldn't blame these people. All they want is health care benefits. We can fix that issue. We can work on that issue.

But let us not hold up health care to people until we get the system perfect. If that is the case, we should stop working tonight. The system is never going to be perfect. It can be better.

Let us not take it out on these people. They have already been victimized outside of any of their control.

The Senator should know that one of the objections was that we shouldn't expand a Government program.

But again, I just want to reiterate to the Senator that this is not an expansion. It is in the law. It is 5 months of special help to people who need it and to people who have private insurance that have lost it and can't have it, if we don't meet their employers halfway.

The only expansion for the country is to say in the next 5 months the Federal Government will not cut any State's Medicaid Program because so many of our States are helping our people. Again, in Arkansas, 75,000. It would not be fair to Arkansas, even though they didn't get hit by the hurricane, to cut their State program when they are absorbing some many extra people from Louisiana, Texas, and Mississippi.

I think that makes common sense.

I see the Senator from Nevada. Maybe he can shed some light on this.

I will yield the floor. I have spent the time and more than I was asked for.

I thank the Senators who are here who are trying to get this important bill passed by the end of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to be spread with my appreciation for the statements made today by Senator BAUCUS, Senator LANDRIEU, and Senator DURBIN regarding this most important issue. We saw with Katrina that we have in America a safety net that has some holes in it. We saw in graphic description some of the people fell through that safety net.

That is what this is all about—helping medically. The poorest of the poor in our country are helped by Medicaid. That is what this is all about.

For those people who are watching this, who are listening, this is an instance where there is a bipartisan measure that is now before the Senate that should pass. The Finance Committee, under the direction of Senators GRASSLEY and BAUCUS—Republican and Democrat—came up with this most important piece of legislation. They did

it. They worked it out. No one can challenge the conservative credentials of either of these Senators. They are both fiscally sound. They do good work for their Finance Committee.

There are a few people on the Republican side of the aisle who are holding this up. It is not right. No one wants to waste money for Katrina. No one wants to waste money with the billions of dollars that will be spent with Katrina.

I would be happy if Congress selected someone to be a czar to make sure the money was spent properly.

But here we have people who are waiting. This is going for 5 months. They will be waiting for the most simple medical measures that would help them—and help the States that are taking care of them.

The State of Arkansas alone has 60,000 evacuees, most of whom, in some way or another, their family member, would qualify for some part of this.

It is the right thing to do to help States such as Arkansas.

PANDEMIC INFLUENZA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in 1918, the Spanish flu pandemic swept the world for a number of reasons—not the least of which we had soldiers coming from all over the world going places and coming home. As a result, this pandemic that swept our world claimed the lives of about 50 million people, and 500,000 people in the United States alone before it completed its deadly run.

Today, many public health experts are warning us that another flu pandemic is not a matter of if, but when. They tell us that this next pandemic has the potential to be every bit as devastating as what the world witnessed nearly 100 years ago.

A flu pandemic occurs when a new strain of flu emerges in the human population and causes serious illness and death and can easily spread between humans.

The avian flu, referred to as H5-N1 flu strain by scientists, already meets the first step: Roughly half of the 115 people who have been diagnosed with this virus to date have died. At present, all that stands between avian flu and pandemic status is the fact that scientists do not believe the avian flu can easily be transmitted between humans.

Scientists fear it is only a matter of time before the avian flu virus mutates into a form that can spread easily from human to human.

According to the Centers for Disease Control Director Julie Gerberding:

... many influenza experts, including those at CDC, consider the threat of a serious influenza epidemic to the United States to be high. Although the timing and impact of an influenza pandemic is unpredictable, the occurrence is inevitable and potentially devastating.

That was her word, “inevitable.”

You do not have to be an expert to understand the dramatic toll a flu pandemic could have on our Nation and on

the world. Given our capacity for rapid travel around the globe compared to 1918 and the interdependence of our economic markets compared to 1918, both of which have increased dramatically since the last flu pandemic, the potential human and economic costs of the next pandemic are unimaginable.

A respected U.S. health expert has concluded that almost 2 million Americans would die in the first year alone of an outbreak. Pandemic flu outbreak in the United States could cost our economy hundreds of billions of dollars due to death, lost productivity and disruption in commerce, and to our society generally.

Maybe the only thing more troubling than contemplating the possible consequences of the avian flu pandemic is recognizing that neither this Nation nor the world are prepared to deal with it. Administration documents say it will take months to develop an effective vaccine against the avian flu—some say as much as 9 months—once we have been able to identify the particular flu strain in circulation. Administration officials say one of the best opportunities to limit the scope and consequence of any outbreak is to rapidly detect the emergence of a new strain that is capable of sustained human-to-human contact. Yet we are not devoting enough resources to effective surveillance abroad.

The administration has acknowledged we need a detailed pandemic plan outlining our national strategy to address this pandemic. Among other matters, such a plan needs to address those who will spearhead our response to pandemic.

How will our response be coordinated across all levels of Government? And how will we rapidly distribute limited medical resources? Yet our national preparedness plan is still in draft form.

We all know State and local health departments will be on the front lines of a pandemic. They will need to conduct surveillance, coordinate local responses, and help distribute the vaccines and antivirals. Yet we are posed to approve a \$130 million cut for State and local preparedness funding at the Centers for Disease Control. At this time, that is unconscionable.

We also know that once a flu strain has been identified, we will need to develop an effective vaccine, as I have talked about, and produce enough to eventually inoculate the entire 300 million people in America. Yet our existing stockpile of vaccines, assuming they are effective against the yet unidentified strain, may protect less than 1 percent of all Americans, and we have only one domestic flu vaccine manufacturer located in the United States. It is estimated if our capacity to produce vaccines is not improved, it could take 15 months to vaccinate first responders, medical personnel, and other high-risk groups.

Given it will take months to develop, produce, and distribute a vaccine once we have one that is effective, we know

that antiviral medication will be a crucial stopgap defense against a pandemic. The World Health Organization recommended that countries stockpile enough antiviral medication to cover 25 percent of their populations. Other nations, including Great Britain, France, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, Finland, and New Zealand, have ordered enough Tamiflu, an antiviral pill to cover between 20 and 40 percent of their populations.

We should have learned. It was only last year that we did not have enough vaccine to take care of the people in America. We did not have enough vaccine to take care of the flu strain last time, and everyone knew what that was.

As important as this Tamiflu is, we now have only 2.3 million courses of this pill. Given country, national, and international production capacity, even if we were to increase our order of Tamiflu today, we have been told the United States would have to wait until the end of 2007 before we could secure enough Tamiflu to cover 25 percent of our population. The consequences of pandemic could be far reaching, impacting virtually every sector of our society and our economy.

We also know our medical community needs to be trained to distinguish between the annual flu and avian flu so that an outbreak could be recorded immediately. Doctors, hospitals, and other medical providers must develop surge capacity plans so they can respond to a pandemic. Businesses, also, need to be prepared. They should be encouraged to develop their own plans, establish or expand telecommunicating and network access plans, update medical needs policies, and provide suggestions on how to promote employee health to lessen the likelihood of exposure. The American public also needs to be educated about the importance of annual flu vaccines and steps they can take to prepare for and respond to an avian flu outbreak.

Yet this administration has failed to take appropriate action to prepare the medical community, business community, and the American public. We can do better. We need to do better. Most importantly, we cannot afford to wait to do better. America can do better.

The Federal Government's poor response to Katrina has only served to exacerbate concerns about the toll such an outbreak would have on our Nation and the world. Given the very real possibility of an outbreak, its potentially severe consequences, and our relative lack of preparedness, we need to take action on several fronts to prepare our Nation and the American people for a potential outbreak and reduce its impact, should it occur.

What are some of the steps necessary? We need to improve surveillance and international partnerships so we may detect new flu strains and do it early. We need to prepare for a pandemic by finalizing, implementing, and funding pandemic preparedness re-

sponse plans. Remember, the director of the Centers for Disease Control has told us this is going to happen. It is inevitable. We need to protect Americans with the development, production, and distribution of an effective vaccine. We need to plan ahead for pandemic by stockpiling antiviral medications, medical, and other supplies. We need to strengthen our public health infrastructure. We need to educate Americans by increasing awareness of and education about this flu. Finally, we need to commit to protecting Americans by devoting adequate resources to pandemic preparedness.

Experts have warned that an avian flu pandemic is inevitable. But the devastating consequences that can ensue from an outbreak are not—provided this Nation and the world heed the science community warnings and take action immediately.

I propose to start by committing the resources necessary to protect Americans. We need to start today. We know today that funding certain programs can make dramatic reductions for the consequences of a future avian flu outbreak. We also know many of these programs are either unfunded or massively underfunded.

Tomorrow, when we take up the Defense appropriations bill after we finish the Roberts vote, Senators HARKIN, KENNEDY, OBAMA, and many others, including myself and Senator DURBIN, the two Democrat leaders here who have been elected by our colleagues, will join in this.

This is important. We are going to offer an amendment that will ensure that we begin making the investments necessary to make sure this Nation and the world do everything possible to ensure that history does not repeat itself and we do not have to relive the terror of 1918.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate is scheduled to adjourn at this time.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois have an opportunity to speak. I am happy to relieve the Chair if that is necessary. We have two Senators on the floor to finish their statements. I ask consent that the two Senators from Illinois be recognized to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Could I ask if there is a time limit?

Mr. REID. How long does the senior Senator from Illinois wish to speak?

Mr. DURBIN. No more than 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. The junior Senator from Illinois?

Mr. OBAMA. I was not aware my senior colleague from Illinois was going to speak so I don't want to unnecessarily hold up the entire Chamber.

Mr. REID. The Senator should know I did use your name.

Mr. OBAMA. I am aware of that.

Mr. REID. You have the only comprehensive bill filed regarding the avian flu and I commend you in that regard.

Mr. DURBIN. I will be glad to take 5 minutes and yield to my colleague 5 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. I appreciate that. I know I have presided over a few of the late nights.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I preface my remarks by saying that the first person who brought the avian flu epidemic to my attention was my colleague Senator OBAMA, who identified this issue before most other Senators. I commend the Senator for his leadership on this issue. I am glad he is here this evening to speak to it.

I have had two public health briefings in my time as a Congressman and Senator which stopped me cold. The first one was about 20 years ago. It was on the global AIDS epidemic. I knew it was a problem, but I didn't know what kind of a problem. I left that briefing in the House Committee on the Budget and went home to speak in very sincere terms to my family about what I considered to be a real threat to all of us. It was in the earliest stages.

Today, I had the second public health briefing which stopped me cold again. We were briefed by Secretary Leavitt from the Department of Health and Human Services, Dr. Gerberding from the Centers for Disease Control, and Dr. Fauci, well-known doctor at the National Institutes Of Health. They talked about the possibility of this avian flu epidemic. Senator REID has gone into detail.

Mr. President, the images from Katrina are still with us—children, senior citizens, people with disabilities and chronic medical problems, waiting for days for care and medicine. These are not images we hope to see again anytime soon, and yet, we are told that these scenes will be repeated, in larger numbers, in more cities, and for far longer when the avian flu breaks out in this country.

Scientists and government officials alike, worldwide, agree that the outbreak of avian flu is virtually inevitable and that, like we were for Katrina, this country is woefully underprepared.

A few weeks ago at the U.N., the World Health Organization warned the Assembly of a pending global pandemic. President Bush acknowledged, "If left unchallenged, this virus could become the first pandemic of the 21st century." Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Leavitt and Senator FRIST are as worried as I am. There is a general sense that we are not prepared.

The only antiviral drug that appears to be effective in minimizing the flu's effect is in short supply. The U.S. has enough doses in its stockpile to treat just 2.3 million people. The only vaccine we have in the pipeline is experimental. It may or may not be effective against the mutation that breaks out in humans in this country. And supplies of that vaccine are limited.

Right now, the avian flu primarily infects birds, but we are aware of 115 cases in which people have been infected by the flu. Fifty-nine of them have died. If that pattern were to hold, 55 percent of the people infected with this flu could die.

In many ways, we are better off than we were in 1918 when a flu pandemic struck this country and took 675,000 lives. We know how germs are spread and how to minimize that spread. In other ways we are far more susceptible to this threat. The Wilderness Society believes the avian flu could spread from China to Japan to New York to San Francisco within the first week.

The Council on Foreign Relations dedicated its last volume of Foreign Affairs to the impact of a global pandemic—the prospect of battling an epidemic of flu in several countries at the same time. ABC News reports that officials in London are quietly looking for additional morgue space.

The Bush administration is preparing a plan for responding to an outbreak of avian flu. I think there is more that we can do and that we must do—now. If you listen to the leaders in infectious disease and public health around the world, we may not have the luxury of time on this one.

We need to step up surveillance of infectious disease here in the U.S. and internationally, so that we can track this thing and begin to contain it immediately. We need to invest in research and development to pursue all possibilities for effective vaccines and antiviral drugs. If the avian flu hits with a 55 percent mortality rate within days of infection, as it appears to be doing, we could lose hundreds of thousands of Americans in the first few months. We need to aggressively pursue vaccines now—not after the outbreak has begun.

We need to help states develop their own preparedness plans so that our response is coordinated and organized and will save lives. Where is the medicine stored? How do we make decisions about who gets treatment when there is too little to go around? How will the distribution systems work? This is work we must help states and localities complete now—not during a time of crisis.

Last flu season, we lost about half of our expected supply of flu vaccine at the same time the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention began encouraging everyone to go and get one. It was a mess. We had senior citizens waiting for hours for a vaccine, often to learn that they were too late. We saw people waiting for a flu vaccine standing in lines that snaked through K-Mart parking lots.

I hope we don't have to learn these lessons again the hard way. It is our responsibility to ensure that states and localities are prepared. We need to aggressively pursue effective treatments now—not when flu victims are overwhelming our hospitals before our eyes. And we have to invest now—not

later—in the capability to track this flu so we can stop its spread as quickly and effectively as possible.

If we don't—if we simply wring our hands and hope for the best—when the avian flu hits this country, it will make the scenes of Katrina pale in comparison.

Before I turn it over to my colleague, I will not repeat the remarks of Senator REID, but I will say if you believe you can survive this flu epidemic because you are not an infant or sickly or elderly, that is not the situation. It turns out we have no resistance to this flu strain, and as a consequence we are all in the same situation in terms of vulnerability. That is why this is so serious.

We had a briefing today, and I am sure Senator OBAMA will go into detail on it, but it raises questions as Senator REID raised.

I will yield the rest of my time to my colleague and thank him for his leadership.

I close by saying, we left the Defense appropriations bill, brought it out of committee today. It contains \$50 billion for our continuing efforts in Iraq. I will provide and vote for every penny our service men and women need, but I also believe we have an obligation to Americans here. A stronger America starts at home. That means being prepared for the next challenge we face, and this avian flu pandemic could easily be that challenge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. OBAMA. Thank you very much, Mr. President. I will be brief. I know we have gone way over the time here today.

Mr. President, in the midst of so much difficulty that our Nation is facing—Katrina and Rita, the ongoing challenges in Iraq and Afghanistan—I recognize it is hard to get the public, the leadership in Congress, and senior administration officials to focus on yet one more challenge.

But as has already been stated by the Democratic leader, HARRY REID, and my senior colleague, the minority whip, Senator DICK DURBIN, this is a crisis to which the entire country simply must awaken itself.

When I started talking about this 7 months ago, not too many folks paid attention. Perhaps because the shorthand for this looming crisis is the "bird flu," people assume it is just going to get birds and animals sick.

In reality, however, what is at stake here is the potential of a pandemic that we have not seen in the United States since 1918, 1919. As has already been stated here tonight, our top scientists and medical personnel, including the heads of the NIH, CDC, and the Department of Health and Human Services, all agree that it is almost inevitable that an avian flu pandemic will strike.

The key question is the extent of the damage, especially in terms of lives lost. The answer to this question will,

in large measure, depend on our level of preparedness and the amount of resources we are willing to immediately commit to deal with this looming crisis.

Over the last few months, we have seen alarming reports from countries all over Asia—Indonesia, China, Vietnam, Thailand, and Russia, just to name a few—about deaths that have resulted from the avian flu.

The situation has turned so ominous that Dr. Julie Gerberding, the Director of the CDC, said that an avian flu outbreak is “the most important threat that we are facing [today].”

International health experts say that two of the three conditions for an avian flu pandemic in Southeast Asia already exist.

First, a new strain of the virus, called H5N1, has emerged, and humans have little or no immunity to it. Second, this strain has demonstrated the ability to jump between species.

The only thing preventing a full blown pandemic is a lack of efficient transmission of this strain from human to human. Once that happens, as a consequence of international travel and commerce, there is not going to be any way to effectively contain this pandemic.

Moreover, the news on this last point is not good. In recent months, the virus has been detected in mammals that have never previously been infected, including tigers, leopards and domestic cats. This suggests that the virus is mutating and could eventually emerge in a form that is readily transmittable among humans.

Mr. President, Senator REID and Senator DURBIN both outlined some of the measures that have to be put in place here domestically to protect our population. We have to drastically ramp up our stockpiles of Tamiflu, which, if taken properly, could act as a treatment from the avian flu once a person is infected. Right now, we only have a couple of million doses. We need 80 million to 100 million doses in order to be adequately prepared. That is going to cost us significant amounts of money, as the cost of Tamiflu is approximately \$20 per dose.

In addition, we are going to have to develop flu vaccines of a sort we have not seen in the past. In order to create sufficient quantities, we are going to have to go push the boundaries of existing technologies and science—going beyond the agricultural mechanisms of developing vaccines that we have used in the past.

Third, we are going to make sure that local and State governments understand how urgent this is. We have to ensure there are clear plans, coordination mechanisms, and lines of authority—that will stand up in a time of crisis. Right now, we do not have sufficient plans in place to make sure local and State agencies are able to generate the kinds of rapid responses that are going to be necessary in the case of a flu outbreak.

After Katrina, I hope that local and State governments understand they have to work with the Federal agencies more effectively to deal with these kinds of emergencies.

Another issue I would mention is that we are going to have to establish international protocols to ensure we can alert ourselves rapidly if we have confirmed cases of human-to-human transmission of the avian flu anywhere in the world. Why do I mention this? If we detect efficient human-to-human transmission, it is likely that we are going to have only weeks before we are going to see those first cases in the United States.

This means placing effective trigger mechanisms in all these countries to make sure everyone is cooperating and providing rapid information, which could mean the difference in terms of tens or hundreds of thousands of lives.

Now I don't want to suggest that nothing is being done. For example, months ago, Congress, on a bipartisan basis including myself, Senator LUGAR, Senator MCCONNELL, and Senator LEAHY—included \$25 million as part of the Iraq supplemental to make contribute to an urgent WHO appeal on this issue. Today, this money is making a difference in the field trying to set up some of the international measures I just described.

I, along with Senators LUGAR, DURBIN and others, introduced legislation, S. 969, to enhance our ability to deal with this potential crisis. But that was months ago, and we need to broaden the number of people involved in this effort.

Moreover, these are modest first steps. Going forward, we are going to need significantly more resources. I am eager to work with leaders on health issues, including Senator HARKIN and Senator REID, as well as others across the aisle.

I hope we can work not only to make sure we have an effective international regime to deal with this problem overseas but that we also invest the time, the energy, and the resources needed to put in place effective measures well before we have a full blown crisis on our hands.

An outbreak of the avian flu could occur in a year, 5 years, 10 years, or if we were incredibly lucky not happen at all. But the one good thing about investing in measures to deal with this looming crisis is—and I will end on this point—if we spend the money now, it will pay dividends, even if this particular strain of the avian flu outbreak does not occur.

Why is this the case? The risk of some sort of pandemic, and the mutations of flus for which we have no immunity, is almost inevitable. The H5N1 strain may not be the strain that leads to a full blown pandemic. But, another strain could easily come along a cause serious damage in the future.

Presently, we simply do not have the public health infrastructure to deal adequately with this contingency.

My point is this: undertaking these measures is going to be a wise investment that will help protect the lives of millions of people here in the United States and across the globe.

Mr. President, I appreciate your patience very much and look forward to working with you on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senator.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:37 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 29, 2005, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 28, 2005:

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

JENDAYI ELIZABETH FRAZER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (AFRICAN AFFAIRS), TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 27, 2009. VICE CONSTANCE BERRY NEWMAN.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

HORACE A. THOMPSON, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2011. VICE JAMES M. STEPHENS, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

KENT D. TALBERT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE BRIAN JONES, RESIGNED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

CAROL E. DINKINS, OF TEXAS, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

ALAN CHARLES RAUL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD. (NEW POSITION)

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS PROVIDED BY LAW, THE FOLLOWING FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.

To be lieutenant junior grade

MELISSA M. FORD

To be ensign

MADELEINE M. ADLER
CAROL N. ARSENAULT
JAMES L. BRINKLEY
JOHN E. CHRISTENSEN
SEAN M. FINNEY
LAUREL K. JENNINGS
GUINEVERE R. LEWIS
ALLISON R. MARTIN
JASON R. SAXE
PAUL M. SMIDANSKY
DAVID A. STRAUSS
REBECCA J. WADDINGTON
JAMIE S. WASSER

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING CANDIDATE FOR PERSONNEL ACTION IN THE REGULAR COMPONENT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS:

1. FOR APPOINTMENT:

To be assistant surgeon

LEAH HILL

THE FOLLOWING CANDIDATES FOR PERSONNEL ACTION IN THE REGULAR COMPONENT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS:

1. FOR APPOINTMENT:

To be medical director

GREGORY A. ABBOTT

To be senior surgeon

WANDA DENISE BARFIELD
RUTHANN M. GIUSTI
SONJA S. HUTCHINS

SUSAN A. MALONEY
PATRICIA M. SIMONE
PAMELA STRATTON

To be surgeon

MARTA-LOUISE ACKERS
PAUL MATTHEW ARGUIN
ULANA R. BODNAR
WILLIAM ALFRED BOWER
JOSEPH S. BRESNA
DAVID BOSWELL CALLAHAN
JOHN R. MACARTHUR
JEFFREY W. MCFARLAND
KATHERINE G. MULLIGAN
ROBERT DAVID NEWMAN
KEVIN ANDREW PROHASKA
WILLIAM RESTO-RIVERA
THERESA LOUISE SMITH
JEREMY SOBEL
KAY M. TOMASHEK
MICHELLE S. WEINBERG

To be senior assistant surgeon

MEI LIN CASTOR
EILEEN F. DUNNE
SCOTT ALLEN HARPER
MATTHEW ROBERT MOORE
THOMAS M. WEISER
SARA JEANNE WHITEHEAD
HUI-HSING WONG

To be senior dental surgeon

STEVEN D. FLORER
JOHN W. KING
STEPHEN P. TORNA

To be dental surgeon

WILLIAM DENZELL CAVANAUGH
RENEE JOSKOW
HSIAO P. PENG
DARLA DIANNE WHITFIELD

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

MAYRA ARROYO-ORTIZ
RAYMOND A. DAILEY
KIM NANCY HORT
MARY BETH JOHNSON
ROBERT C. LLOYD, JR.
WILLIAM B. PARRISH
TANYA M. ROBINSON
CURTIS D. SPANN
VANESSA F. THOMAS
EARLENA R. WILSON

To be senior nurse officer

KATHERINE A. COINER
SHEILA F. MAHONEY

To be nurse officer

HELGA C. BACA
NANCY F. BARTOLINI
KATHERINE MARIE BERKHOUSEN
SUSAN KATHRYN BROWN
JUANITA M. FOX
MARGARET K. GRISMER
LISA M. HOGAN
EDECIA ALEXANDRIA RICHARDS
KONSTANTINE K. WELD
ADOLFO ZORRILLA

To be senior assistant nurse officer

AMY FRANCES ANDERSON
LISA A. BARNHART
ELIZABETH ANNE BOOT
ALICIA ANNE BRADFORD
REGINA D. BRADLEY
NICHOLE J. CHAMBERLAIN
ALAN RICHARD CONDON
DAVID ALLEN CROSS
JOHN W. DAVID, JR.
SUSIE PAPAIZIAN DILL
KIMBERLY JILL ELENBERG
BRADLEY JOHN ESPESETH
JOHN S. GARY, JR.
CHERYL LYNN CARZA
PATRICIA NOTTINGHAM GARZONE
GEORGE ROBERT GENTILE
WAYNE KEITH GRANT
NANCY M. HALONEN
LORI A. HUNTER
CYNTHIA RENEE JAMES
NATALIE A. KEATING
NICOLE ANTOINETTE KNIGHT
AKUA O. KWATEMA
YVONNE TERESA LACOUR
YVETTE MARIA LACOUR-DAVIS
CAROL S. LINCOLN
SHERRY LEE LULU
JOHN THOMAS MALLIOS
ROSALIE A. MASHTALIER
CHRISTINE M. MATTSO
MAUREEN JANE MCARTHUR
TAMI LEE MCBRIDE
ALBERTA M. MCCABE
BRIAN M. MCDONOUGH
QUENTIN E. MOORE
VICTORIA LYNN OBOCZKY
DEAN B. PEDERSEN
ALBERT PERRINE, JR.
ALOIS P. PROVOST
JOSIE C. RICCI
KELLY DUANE RICHARDS
ABELARDO F. ROMAN
TIARA ROSE RUFF

ARTHUR S. TAICH
VINCENT M. THRUATCHLEY
HYOSIM S. TRAPP
AMY BETH WEBB
KELLIE LYNN WESTERBUHR
ANGEL L. WILSON
MARC E. WINOKUR

To be assistant nurse officer

DAVID ANDREW CAMPBELL
DARRELL LYONS
CHRISTINE MARIE MERENDA
GLORIA M. RODRIGUES

To be engineer officer

DAVID WILLIAM AUSDEMORE
DEREK W. CHAMBERS
SUSAN KAYE NEURATH
KENNETH TOM SUN

To be senior assistant engineer officer

MARK T. BADER
LORETTA B. BARRANGER
STEVEN J. DYKSTRA
DENNIS I. HAAG
KATHERINE ELIZABETH JACOBITZ
STEPHEN B. MARTIN, JR.
JOHN PAUL NICHOLS
JOHN B. PULSIPHER
MICHAEL B. REA
NICHOLAS R. VIZZONE
SHARI L. WINDT

To be senior scientist

JOSEPH L. DESPINS

To be scientist

JON RUSSELL DAUGHERTY
JOHN MOSELY HAYES
MELANIE FAITH MYERS
BENNIE D. WHEAT

To be senior assistant scientist

RACHEL NONKIN AVCHEN
ARTENSIE RENEE FLOWERS
PETER DAMIAN MCELROY
DIANA LOUISE SCHNEIDER
MARK JOSEPH SEATON

To be environmental health officer

JEAN ANN GAUNCE
DANIEL J. HEWETT
JOSELITO SANCHEZ IGNACIO
TIMOTHY M. RADTKE

To be senior assistant environmental health

DONALD STEWART ACKERMAN
CHARLES M. BLUE
MICHAEL GEORGE BOX
WILLIAM C. CRUMP
RONALD MATTHEW HALL
JAMES R. HOWELL
BOBBY T. VILLINES

To be senior veterinary officer

WALTER R. DALEY

To be veterinary officer

TRACEE A. TREADWELL

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

MARIANNE PHELAN ROSS
REGINA LORAIN TAN
VENTITA B. THORNTON
ALLISON M. WILLIAMS

To be senior pharmacist

M. CARLENE MCINTYRE

To be pharmacist

THOMAS RAYMOND BERRY
BARBARA J. FINNEGAN
BETH FABIAN FRITSCH
STEVEN DAVID MAZZELLA
ANGELA MADDREY PAYNE
ROBERT CHARLES STEYERT
JULIENNE M. VAILLANCOURT
PRESTON L. VANCUREN

To be senior assistant pharmacist

CHRISTOPHER KEITH ALLEN
DEMITRIA J. ARGIROPOULOS
WILLIAM H. BENDER
MARY A. BICKEL
KEVIN D. BROOKS
TAMMY L. BUNTJER
MARY CATHERINE BYRNE
BRIAN NEIL CAMPBELL
JASON FOSTER CHANCEY
JAMES MICHAEL CHAPPLE
KAI L. CHIU
CHAE UN CHONG
WILBERT DARWIN, JR.
CORNELIUS DIAL
DAVID TERWASE DIWA
RICHARD E. ERICKSON II
KRISTA SUE EVANS
JAMES B. GIBSON
STEVEN JOE GRAY
ANDREW STEPHEN HAFFER
JACQUELINE W. LEA
KAREN ELIZABETH MCNABB-NOON

GLENN A. LOUISE MEADE
ANDREW KEVIN MEAGHER
JEFFREY GLENN NEWMAN
CUTHBERT T. PALAT III
KRISTA MARIE SCARDINA
RANDY LEE SEYS
MARTIN H. SHIMER II
STEVEN C. SMALLEY
JACQUELINE KAREN THOMAS
KELLY ERIN VALENTE
SAMUEL YU-SHU WU
CHI-ANN YU WU
SHERRI A. YODER
CHARLA M. YOUNG
BRIAN KEITH JOHNSTON
RYAN LYNN STEVENS
ALICE SZE-MAN TSAO

To be dietitian

JEAN R. MAKIE
VANGIE R. TATE

To be senior assistant dietitian

SUZAN ELIZABETH DUNAWAY

To be senior therapist

SUSAN F. MILLER

To be therapist

MERCEDES J. BENITEZ-MCCRARY
LIZA M. FIGUEROA
KATHLEEN M. MANRIQUE

To be senior assistant therapist

DENISE M. BRASSEAU
ALEXEI A. DESATOFF
JEFFREY JOSEPH LAWRENCE
HENRY PAUL MCMILLAN
LORRIE LEA MURDOCH
SUE N. NEWMAN
ROBERT E. ROE, JR.
STEPHEN SHUMWAY SPAULDING
JULIE MARGARET VAN LEUVEN

To be health services director

DAVID C. KVAMME

To be senior health services officer

RICHARD A. MARCH

To be health services officer

CHRISTOPHER JOHN BERSANI
LINDA KAY BRANDT
KELLIE J. CLELLAND
GREGORY DALE CLIFT
PHILIP SIMMONS MCRAE
JUDY B. PYANT
RAFAEL ANGEL SALAS
JEANEAN DENISE WILLIS
ELISE SIU YOUNG

To be senior assistant health services officer

NOREEN K. ADAY
CLAYTON M. BELGARDE
DAVID J. BELLWARE
JEFFREY S. BUCKSER
GEORGE L. CARTER
KEITH WILLIAM CESPON
DIMITRUS CULBREATH
MICHAEL WILLIAM DAVIS
STEPHEN M. DEARWENT, JR.
LYNETTE R. DZIUK
NIMA N. FELDMAN
PATRICK M. FITZWATER
CELIA SYDORNE GABREL
STACEY R. GOODING
ROBERT T. HARRIS
DANIEL H. HESSELGESSER
ROBIN ANN JACKSON
TOBEY CANDICE MANN
JACK F. MARTINEZ
JOHN D. MAYNARD
FRANCES PAULA PLACIDE
PRISCILLA RODRIGUEZ
CLAUDINE MICHELE SAMANIC
ANGEL GUSTAVO SEINOS
FELICIA BINION WILLIAMS
JAMES F. ZINK

To be assistant health services officer

SHAWN DAVID BLACKSHEAR
SEAN RANDALL BYRD
WILLIAM LEVI COOPER
TORREY BETH DARKENWALD
DEBORAH ANN DOODY
CARL A. HUFFMAN III

THE JUDICIARY

TIMOTHY C. BATTEN, SR., OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE WILLIS B. HUNT, JR., RETIRED.
KRISTI DUBOSE, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, VICE CHARLES R. BUTLER, RETIRED.
THOMAS E. JOHNSTON, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA, VICE CHARLES H. HADEN, II, DECEASED.
VIRGINIA MARY KENDALL, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE SUSANNE B. CONLON, RETIRED.
W. KEITH WATKINS, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, VICE WILLIAM HAROLD ALBRITTON, III, RETIRED.