

First, we should move ahead with the advanced technology and loan guarantees, the investment tax credits, the risk assurance that was enacted in the Energy bill in July.

Second, we should move ahead with research and discussion of reprocessing and recycling so that we can reduce by 90 percent the amount of waste that we would have to store at Yucca Mountain, or similar facilities, and reduce by more than that the heat in that spent fuel.

And finally, we should discuss an international protocol so that while other countries such as the United States, Russia, and others might invent the technology for small, new nuclear powerplants, there would be some sort of international protocol that would lease the spent fuel, supervise its processing, and supervise its permanent storage so that we and the world in this generation can deal with global warming, energy independence, clean air, and a variety of other issues that deal with our lives.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Democratic leader.

ASBESTOS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the American people want to know what is wrong with Washington, they should take a look at what is being debated in the Senate this week—*asbestos* legislation.

I have said on a number of occasions that Lord Acton, whom I studied when I was in college, is right—power tends to corrupt, and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. Look what we have on the Senate floor today—*asbestos* legislation, legislation that, of course, is not ready to be here, but it is being brought here because of tremendous pressure by the folks downtown.

What do I mean by folks downtown? Washington has been run by the lobbyists. The Jack Abramoff scandal is no surprise to people who have been watching this. The K Street Project and other such things came about as a result of too much concentration of power.

Why do I say that this is an example of why we need lobbying reform in Washington today? This legislation is on the floor for one reason: 15 companies that are pushing this legislation. Thousands of companies oppose it.

The 15 companies that support this legislation spent \$144.5 million on lobbying in 2 years.

Actually, I am wrong; 13 companies spent \$144.5 million in 2 years on lobbying.

Why is this legislation on the floor today? Why are we not doing something about education?

My friend from Tennessee talked about another very important issue—whether this country should move to nuclear power.

Wouldn't it be nice if we had a debate on the Senate floor about that? Or

about wind energy? Or about why we don't have tax credits for wind, for Sun, for geothermal, and for biomass that last more than 2 or 3 years?

Why are we not taking a look at nuclear energy? That would be good. We could have a debate on this floor about these topics and spend a couple days very profitably.

But we are not doing that. Instead we are talking about *asbestos* because 13 companies spent \$144.5 million in 2 years lobbying to get it here. For the 13 companies, I guess that was money well spent because they are going to save billions if this legislation passes.

It would be nice if we spent some time on the Senate floor talking about why this country is going into financial bankruptcy because of its spending these last 5 years.

Remember, during the last years of the Clinton administration we paid down the debt by \$5 trillion. Not this administration. We are going to be asked in a few days to increase the debt ceiling above \$8.2 trillion.

As I said, it would be nice if we had a debate on the Senate floor about education.

I know my friend, the Presiding Officer, has been working in conjunction with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the junior Senator from New Mexico, JEFF BINGAMAN, about why this country is falling behind scientifically in this country. It would be nice if we had a debate on that.

However, these folks who Senator ALEXANDER and Senator BINGAMAN are talking to about increased funding for research cannot afford to spend \$144.5 million in 2 years for lobbyists to get the goods. So we will spend time the Senate does not have on this piece of legislation that is flawed, flawed, flawed. Later I will explain what is wrong with it.

We will spend valuable time on the Senate floor because the lobbyists won. Chalk one up for the lobbyists. Do we need lobbying reform? Yes. For example, we do not even know all the companies involved in this so-called *asbestos* study group. ASG would have to disclose their membership under the lobby-reform legislation we have proposed. They would not be able to do it in secret, then pay their money under the plan.

I bet they are jumping with joy today—some of whom we do not know who they are—because they were able to buy their way into the Senate, paying for a bunch of lobbyists.

These 13 companies employed 168 lobbyists. It is pretty easy to figure out what is going on.

I am going to vote opposing the motion to proceed. Rarely do I do that. It is so important that I do it here. I don't know if we have enough votes to stop it from going forward, but for the good of the American people, I hope so. If we do not, there are a lot of other ways we can fight this very bad piece of legislation.

The Super Bowl was last night. The underdog, Pittsburgh Steelers, won.

However, turning from football to lobbying, the lobbyists are not underdogs when they are given \$144.5 million to bring a bill to the Senate. They are on the winning side. \$144.5 million was paid to lobbyists by 13 companies. That is why we are here today. That is why we need lobbying reform. With reform we would at least know all the companies involved in the so-called ASG, *asbestos* study group. Talk about a blight on legislative standards, bringing this bill to the Senate and leaving real problems to someone else another day.

This bill is anything but fair. But like a lot of things around here, we still call it the Fairness in *Asbestos* Injury Resolution Act. This is part of the Orwellian world we live in here, where the Clear Skies Initiative pollutes the skies, where the Healthy Forests Initiative ruins our forests, where the Leave No Child Behind Act leaves children behind, where the Budget Deficit Reduction Act increases the deficit. Now, we are going to be asked to deal with the Fairness in *Asbestos* Resolution Act, which is anything but fair.

It is unfair to victims of *asbestos* exposure. It is unfair to small businesses. It is unfair to thousands of businesses in this country. It is unfair to the American taxpayer. If this goes through, they likely will have to bail out the trust fund created under the bill. It is unfair to organized labor. It is unfair to the insurance industry. It is unfair to veterans.

As I said, I don't lightly oppose a motion to proceed. I recognize that generally it is the prerogative of the majority leader to set the agenda. In this case, however, opposing this motion is absolutely justified. This is a terrible piece of legislation to bring before the Senate with the state of the legislative calendar that we have. I wish the Government Operations Committee, led by Senators Lieberman and Collins, would get Congress some lobbying reform. That is what we need to do. That would be more important than this.

This bill is not ready for consideration. It is not even a close call. There are so many unanswered questions raised by the current bill, too many questions about solvency and adequacy of the trust fund, too many questions about the impact of this bill on the lives of countless Americans with *asbestos*-related illnesses. This alone should disqualify this legislation from being on the Senate floor.

The Senate could debate this bill for the next 60 legislative days, and we still could not fix the structural flaws of this trust fund. The only reasonable approach is to take it back to the Judiciary Committee and find a better approach.

This bill should also be referred to the Senate Committee on the Budget before the Senate debates it. Senator CONRAD and Senator GREGG have said it is not ready for the Senate floor. They have written a letter to me and to Senator FRIST asking for more time to review the massive fiscal impact of this program.

Asbestos companies, it is estimated—and it is not much of an estimate but pretty certain—will save over \$20 billion with this legislation. Fortune 500 companies will have dramatic reductions in their asbestos liability. The sad part about this is that companies who are responsible for exposing victims to asbestos could see the harmful effects coming. Way back in the 1960s, for example, Dow Chemical knew the hazards of asbestos. They had done research and they said “asbestos has long been known to be capable of causing asbestosis.” They did not mention mesothelioma.

Three decades before Dow Chemical recognized this, in 1938, a report by the U.S. Public Health Service, which DOW received, described how asbestos textile factory workers were exposed to asbestos fibers, which led to the development of diseases that killed them. In 1951, companies were reporting that exposure to asbestos would kill you. We know from reading—pick any book you want—the book titled “Libby, Montana,” W.R. Grace knew that what they were doing was killing their workers. They knew about it. It is documented.

Is it any wonder that some are asking why we are here? When we consider the \$144.5 million and 2 years spent for lobbyists, we begin to understand why we are here. If these numbers do not add up, and they don't, wouldn't it be well advised to have the Committee on the Budget involved in crafting this legislation? There is a need for legislation that improves the way victims of asbestos exposure receive compensation, but this is not it.

Since this bill was initiated, there have been reforms at the State level that have been credible and important in advancing the cause of the victims. Our best hope of achieving whatever Federal reforms may be appropriate rests with further deliberation at the committee level, not in the Senate. I hope my colleagues seriously consider joining me in voting no on the motion to proceed. There are just too many problems with this bill.

Let me first focus on people whom this is supposed to be all about, the victims of asbestosis and mesothelioma, diseases that come about as a result of being exposed to asbestos. If you get mesothelioma, you die. Once that disease is diagnosed, no one has ever survived. You die. With asbestosis you might continue to live but likely will have a long, slow, advance toward death. Sometimes it kills quicker than others. People have lived for some time with asbestosis but never mesothelioma. The average life expectancy after discovery is less than a year and a half. Asbestos is one of the most lethal substances ever used in the workplace, and it was unleashed knowingly on communities all over our country. More than 27.5 million workers have been exposed to asbestos. They were exposed while they were working with the stuff. However, countless others

were exposed because this work was going on in their neighborhoods. Asbestos was used in schoolyards. And as we have come to learn, a worker coming home and having his wife wash his clothes exposed her and the family to asbestos-related diseases. And these spouses have died. Children who hugged their father, after coming home from work carrying his lunch bucket, have gotten these diseases and have died. Hundreds of thousands are gravely ill as we speak, hundreds of thousands of people.

The diseases caused by asbestos exposure are painful, debilitating, and, as I have indicated, mostly incurable. Every State in America has been touched by this scourge. In the relatively sparsely populated State of Nevada, Margie Urnberg, Carson City, wrote a letter. She lost her father, Ronald. Will Glienke's father died of mesothelioma. Kellie Appleton-Hultz lost her husband due to asbestos poisoning and is still coping with this as I speak.

This problem has affected me on a personal level. My three brothers and I had no place to live when high school started, so we lived with other families or acquaintances. My older brother, Don, lived in Henderson, NV, with the Hansen family, a wonderful family. They took in my brother so he could go to high school. One of the Hansens who played football with my brother, Don, was named Harold. My brother and Harold were both halfbacks on the football team. Harold went away to college and later became a mechanical engineer. He worked for the State of Nevada all of his life. He hung around the State employee workshop. He learned less than a year ago that he had mesothelioma. He is dead now. He never worked with asbestos, but in the workshop where he spent some of his time, they replaced brakes and brake linings containing asbestos. Harold Hansen is dead because of this.

I see in the Chamber the assistant Democratic leader, my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. He and I served in the House of Representatives together. I can remember another man who was so helpful to me while I was in the House of Representatives. I had been a Member of the House for just a short period of time, and this man and I were walking down the aisle to vote. He said: You know, I love Nevada. I want to help you get a national park. We did not have a national park in Nevada at the time. He was the subcommittee chair of the then-called Interior Committee of National Parks. His name was Bruce Vento. Oh, what a great guy he was. I worked out at the same time he did in the House gym for many years.

He was probably 6 foot 1 or 2, but really a strong man. He had been in Congress for more than 20 years. He practiced law before that. He never worked with his hands except once, when he was a very young man, around 20 years old. He worked for a while at

summer jobs, like we all had. He obviously was exposed to asbestos. And just like that, he was diagnosed with mesothelioma. He died within 6 months.

Bruce Vento—and we have a national park in Nevada now; much of it due to Bruce Vento's advocacy; the Great Basin National Park, a wonderful national park; the only one we have in Nevada—dead because of mesothelioma.

Tomorrow I am going to introduce a resolution designating April 1 of this year as Asbestos Disease Awareness Day. The purpose of this resolution is to raise awareness that asbestos exposure is still prevalent, that asbestos-related diseases continue to kill many Americans each year, and that more needs to be done to protect Americans from this lethal substance.

A truly fair asbestos reform bill should meet the unmet needs of asbestos victims. This bill does not. Every major asbestos victims group opposes this legislation—every one. In an open letter to the Senate, dated February 1 of this year, the Committee to Protect Mesothelioma Victims, the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, the Asbestos Victims Organization, the White Lung Association, and the White Lung Asbestos Information Center wrote that they oppose this legislation. Specifically, they wrote:

We do not want this proposed government policy forced upon us. We believe the program will fail to treat victims fairly, while benefitting the very companies that caused the problem.

And that is what has happened here. But we have these companies that spent \$144.5 million for 2 years to get lobbyists down here to push this bill. I forget the number, about 170 or so lobbyists, as indicated in a report by Public Citizen. I will bet they are watching TV right now, in their Gucci shoes, having just piled out of their limousines, bragging about what they did: bringing the asbestos bill to the floor. They have a lot of other important things to do, but what are they doing? Because they are good at what they do, we have this bill on the Senate floor. Lobbying reform is what we really need.

An asbestos bill that faces such widespread opposition from the victims of asbestos disease is obviously the wrong approach to this national problem. The problem seems to be that the so-called FAIR Act—remember, that is what this is called in this Orwellian world we live in—places the needs of a few large companies with asbestos liability above the needs of those suffering from asbestos-related illnesses. This is the fundamental flaw of this legislation.

But to show what these lobbyists have done, we need only look at what they have done to fool the veterans. These big companies, of course, are paying veterans to come back to Washington. They have convinced a few of the veterans this legislation is good for them. Not true. But if you have this much money to spend, you can pass it around.

This asbestos study group is claiming that victims who are veterans are not recovering under the present system. Unfortunately, the facts do not support their claim. Many veterans will be completely shut out of all means of compensation if this trust fund proposed under this legislation becomes law.

These false claims about veterans seem to be another effort to ensure that corporations receive the more than \$20 billion bailout they seek on the backs of veterans. It does not matter because the lobbyists have done their job. They have this bill and they have a few veterans straggling in to talk about what a good thing this is for them.

If this asbestos bill wins, the corporations win and the veterans lose. Today, veterans can and do use the court system every day to get help with the health and financial consequences of the diseases they have.

Tragically, it is true that many veterans are victims of asbestos disease. Much of it came from Navy ships before the 1970s that contained high levels of asbestos. Thirty percent of the mesothelioma victims are veterans. World War II, as I have indicated, is where most of these veterans got exposed to asbestos—World War II. The average age of the World War II veteran is about 80. About 1,500 World War II veterans are dying every day.

This legislation will stop some of them from recovering the compensation they are owed. If they now have pending trial dates or pending settlements, those will be eviscerated if this legislation passes. They immediately have their causes of action stayed and would become part of the queue of over 600,000 claimants waiting for the proposed fund to become operational. Most of them will die before recovering the money owed to them.

Veterans receive no priority status or special protection under this bill. They will be tossed into an untested and underfunded bureaucracy with all other claimants even though every independent analyst says the fund is destined to fail. I repeat, every major asbestos victims organization opposes this bill because it is underfunded and unfair to all victims, including veterans.

Veterans are recovering under the current system but will have a much harder time recovering if this bill becomes law.

Though veterans cannot sue the Government for compensation for asbestos poisoning, they have successfully sued manufacturers of asbestos products, like other claimants have done. This right will be stripped from them under S. 852. Thousands and thousands of veterans have successfully sued asbestos companies. And, frankly, it has been shown that veterans who are dying of mesothelioma and these other serious cancers generally receive greater compensations through the courts than is provided under S. 852.

Under this fund, the awards will be one size fits all. In many cases, veterans' asbestos exposure as civilians is far greater than their exposure in the military. Lester M. Cable, who lives in Bridgeport, CT, is a typical case. He was exposed to asbestos as a boilerman in the Navy in 1950 and 1951, and also in civilian life doing home construction and repair projects working with asbestos-containing household appliances and heating systems.

He suffers from malignant mesothelioma and has a trial date set for this July as an accelerated living mesothelioma case in the Bridgeport Superior Court. If the proposed asbestos legislation is enacted, his case would be wiped out immediately, forcing him to start all over again under the proposed trust fund. He will not live that long.

It is no wonder that asbestos victims oppose a bill that deprives them of their legal rights in the traditional civil justice system and offers them instead a trust fund that is inadequate and will likely become insolvent. Numerous experts have concluded that the cost of the program will exceed the amount allotted for the trust fund. Mr. President, \$140 billion sounds like a lot of money, but, remember, 27.5 million American workers have been exposed to asbestos. This does not include, as I have indicated, people living in the neighborhoods, the spouses, children.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated the program could generate at least \$10 billion more in claims than the trust fund is designed for. But even that figure understates the problem because the bill does not adequately take into account the trust fund's borrowing costs, further depleting the compensation available to victims. And that is what they are, victims. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that approximately \$8 billion would be required in the first decade, an amount that will saddle the fund with a huge debt over the life of the program.

Other experts, though, say the bill is on even less solid fiscal footing. For instance, the Bates White economic consulting firm has concluded that the program will cost at least \$300 billion, and with certain contingencies could cost as much as \$600 billion. The General Accounting Office has recently issued a report describing how at least four other Federal trust fund compensation systems that were smaller in scope than this had trouble funding the shortfalls.

But even if the \$140 billion were adequate—and it is not—there is no guarantee the fund would raise that amount of revenue. The actual amount of revenue available to victims depends on the number of companies that actually contribute. Yet there is no definitive information available to Senators on the number or identity of the participating companies. We have talked about that before. Supporters of this legislation have asserted that there will be between 8,000 and 10,000 such companies, but the Congressional

Budget Office could identify only 1,700 participants. As a result, less than \$140 billion will be available for this fund. If revenues from the private sector are insufficient to fully fund the program, the only options for maintaining solvency of the fund will be to reduce compensation to injured victims or supplement the privately raised funds with tax dollars.

There is a long list of companies that have contacted Senators saying: Please, don't do this. But let me just give an example of a few. These are companies that are really old, some of them more than 100 years old. For example, there is a company called Okonite. They are the only company that makes wire in the country anymore. They have a few manufacturing plants around the country. The chief executive officer said: We'll go bankrupt. If you pass that legislation, there won't be an American company making wire anymore.

Hopeman Brothers, they are ship joiners. They work on big ships. They do finishing work on big ships. They said: We'll drop out. We'll go bankrupt.

Foster Wheeler is an engineering and construction firm: If you sign this into law, we go out of business. They have asbestos claims. They can handle them. One of the companies said: We budget every year what we are going to spend on asbestos claims. We can handle that. But we cannot handle this legislation. We'll go bankrupt.

There is a good argument that the Federal Government should contribute to the fund, since a large number of U.S. servicemen were exposed to asbestos. But that has not happened here. This bill does not tap Federal tax dollars in an honest, straightforward way. But that is what is going to happen if the trust fund is not sufficient. It establishes a private trust fund that will almost certainly become insolvent. As a practical matter, the Federal Government will be left holding the bag when things go wrong. A Federal bailout of a program of this magnitude would have enormous adverse consequences to the Federal budget. But with President Bush holding the records for the highest deficits in the history of the country, maybe we should not be concerned about this.

The structural problems with the trust fund relate to one of the bill's most fundamental flaws: its lack of transparency. From the outset, members of the Judiciary Committee and others asked for full disclosure of the names of companies that will be required to pay into the fund. According to press reports, the major lobbying firms that helped draft the bill possess documents listing the contributing companies and how much each would be required to pay. But this information remains unavailable to Senators and, of course, to the general public.

The Senate is entitled to such relevant information before debate begins, but we are not going to get it. There is no reason to waste the time of

the full Senate debating a bill with so many loose ends and so many unanswered questions and, I am frank to admit, a lot of answered questions. The budgetary concerns are reason enough to defeat the motion to proceed.

I have been contacted by five courageous members of the majority who are going to vote against the motion to proceed because they know this is a budget buster. And maybe others will come along. I have only been contacted by five. First, let me say this: Even if the trust funds were adequately funded, the system set up here is flawed for a number of reasons in compensating the poor, unfortunate individuals who get these diseases. Let me talk about a few of them.

The startup provisions provide that as soon as the bill is enacted, the ability of asbestos victims to obtain compensation in the court system is cut off. It also requires that bankruptcy trusts established to pay victims' claims be shut down, even before the fund is operational. The bill attempts to provide a mechanism through which terminally ill claimants will obtain payments in this interim period, but all other claimants, no matter how serious their illness or disability, would be left without a remedy for an indefinite period of time.

Second, the bill is unfair to victims with pending or settled court cases. I talked a little bit about that. Rather than permit asbestos claims to continue in court while the fund is being established, the bill imposes an immediate 2-year stay on nearly all asbestos cases. This is unfair. Exigent cases are no exception to a stay. They will be automatically stayed for 9 months from the date of enactment. The bill's language is so broad that a trial about to begin would be stopped, and an appellate ruling about to be handed down would be barred.

Third, the sunset process under the legislation leaves too much uncertainty for victims. If the fund fails to operate as promised, instead of allowing victims to return to court, S. 852 allows the administrator of the fund to recommend any number of measures to salvage the program. This means that victims may receive even less compensation or become subject to more stringent medical criteria to have their claims successfully approved.

Fourth, the bill requires some victims to prove that asbestos was a substantial contributing factor to their disease—a higher burden than victims must meet in court, where it is sufficient to show that asbestos exposure was a contributing factor, no matter how substantial a factor. The whole concept of a no-fault trust fund is that it is nonadversarial, but this higher burden of proof creates the potential for endless litigation and a high number of rejected claims.

Finally, I have serious concerns about the manner in which the FAIR Act treats lung cancer and silica diseases victims. Under this bill, an entire

category of lung cancer victims who were exposed to asbestos for 15 years or more cannot bring a claim. This bill would deny these victims their right to recover damages in court for their exposure and deny them benefits under the fund as well. This is an unacceptable affront to the rights of an entire class of asbestos victims.

As for the suffering from silica disease, this act limits recovery by individuals who have both asbestos disease and silica-related diseases. I know something about silicosis. My dad had it. He worked in the mines. I thought all kids' dads coughed the way my dad did, but they didn't. My dad was exposed to what we called at the time quartz silica. It is well known in Nevada, at the Tonopah mining camp, they would only hire, as they referred to it at the time, "foreigners" because they knew if they hired people who were nonforeigners in Tonopah, they would die. It was the worst of any place in the country. It was bad all over Nevada, so I know something about silica.

This legislation prevents someone who has both silica and asbestos exposure from going forward with their claim. The only recourse for victims of both diseases will be to seek compensation for their asbestos disease from the asbestos fund, but victims of silica-related disease, including those who have asbestos disease, should also have a right to seek redress in the courts. They should be able to do it because of their silica disease, silicosis. This is a particular problem in Nevada where many miners have contracted both silicosis and asbestosis.

In this and so many other ways, this bill does not meet the needs of my constituents or of the American people in general. I predict the bill's sponsors will attempt to answer my concerns and those of other Senators, as I have heard, by telling us there is going to be a managers' amendment to cure all of the problems of the bill. There will be so many problems with this bill that this managers' amendment will effectively be a substitute bill. I am reminded of the old English proverb—I don't know if it is an old English proverb—don't buy a pig in a poke. The sponsors of the bill should make the text of that managers' amendment available before we vote on the motion to proceed. The Senate should not vote to proceed on this asbestos bill and find itself debating a different asbestos bill.

Let's move the process along, some have said. We will fix the problems in conference with the House. Boy, we have heard that a lot of times. Some of us have been around here long enough to know that doesn't work. That gambit should be rejected. If the Senate decides to debate this bill, it should be one where we confront the tough questions now and get them right before the bill leaves the Senate.

I am convinced, unfortunately, that we are not ready to face these tough questions at this time. The committee-reported bill is too deeply flawed. We

don't have sufficient information to address these flaws through the amendment process. We owe asbestos victims and their families a better bill and a better process. The only proper course at this time is to defeat the motion to proceed.

I would say this: Again, the winners today are the 13 companies that paid \$144.5 million to take the much needed time of the Senate to debate these issues. But we are going to be wasting time on this very flawed piece of legislation.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FAIRNESS IN ASBESTOS INJURY RESOLUTION ACT OF 2005—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 852 is now pending.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I take strong offense to the statements made by the Senator from Nevada. His accusation that lobbyists are buying their way into the Senate is an outrageous violation of rule XIX, which provides that no Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

To say that this bill, which Senator LEAHY and I have led for the better part of the last 3 years, is the result of lobbyists "buying their way into the Senate" is slanderous. That is a violation of rule XIX. It may be that the Senator from Nevada is used to slander, is used to libel, because that is what he did recently to 33 Senators. Regrettably, nobody has challenged him under rule XIX.

Rule XIX relates to what is done on the floor of the Senate, but in this day and age of debates outside the Senate, of debates on television and radio and in the newspaper, 33 Senators were victimized by the Senator from Nevada, who then scribbled out a form apology letter which was meaningless in the context of what was done. And to talk about lobbyists buying their way onto the Senate floor is an outrageous distortion of what has happened on this bill.

The fact is, over the course of the last 2½ years, there have been 36 meetings held in my office, attended by people who have an interest in this legislation or their representatives. The AFL-CIO was there. Trial lawyers were there. Representatives of the manufacturers and representatives of the insurers and anybody else who wanted to come in were welcome. I didn't see the Senator from Nevada there once.

He has talked about the bill in a rambling, disconnected way, which proves