Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote? The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

**YEARS—59**

Akaka  Darbin  Nelson (FL)
Alexander  Feinstein  Nelson (NE)
Bennett  Harkin  Obama
Biden  Inouye  Pryor
Bingaman  Knechtley  Reed
Bond  Kerry  Reid
Boxer  Klobuchar  Rockefeller
Brown  Landrieu  Salmon
Byrd  Lautenberg  Sanders
Cantwell  Leahy  Schumer
Cardin  Levin  Specter
Carper  Lieberman  Snowe
Casey  Lincoln  Stabenow
Clinton  Logar  Stabenow
Coats  McCaskill  Stevens
Collins  McConnell  Voinovich
Conrad  Menendez  Warner
Dodd  Mikulski  Webb
Domenech  Markowski  Whitehouse
Dorgan  Murray  Wyden

**NAYS—38**

Allard  DeMint  Kohl
Baucus  Dole  Kyl
Bayh  Eastin  Martinez
Brownback  Emi  Roberts
Bunning  Feingold  Sessions
Burr  Graham  Shelby
Chambliss  Grassley  Smith
Coburn  Gregg  Sununu
Coleman  Hare  Thomas
Corzine  Hatch  Thompson
Craig  Isakson  Vitter
Grassley  Johnson  Lott  McCain

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. 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.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak in morning business.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa, my dear friend, I have to file a cloture motion. It will take me just a minute.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Surely.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 107, S. 378, the Court Security Improvement bill.


**MORNING BUSINESS**

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent we be allowed to proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein. The Senator from Iowa wishes to speak for a half hour. After that, Senators will be recognized for up to 10 minutes each.

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

**FINISHING CONSIDERATION OF S. 378**

Mr. REID. Madam President, if I could take another minute of the time of the distinguished Senator, we hope we can finish this bill tomorrow. That would be my desire. Tomorrow is Thursday. I am filling this tonight. The time ripens for voting on this Friday morning. But Friday morning occurs at 1 a.m. We have to finish this bill as soon as we can. I am alerting everyone, there could be a vote Friday morning at 1 a.m.

I also suggest that I have been trying for some time now to do a bipartisan bill that has been worked on by many Senators. There are 50 cosponsors of this legislation, dealing with competitiveness. On our side it will be managed by Senator BINGAMAN. It is my understanding on the other side it will be managed by Senator ALEXANDER. I hope we can have an agreement to move to that. I hope I do not have to file a motion to proceed to that piece of legislation. Remember, next week we need to complete work to send to the President the supplemental appropriations bill.

Having said that, I want to alert everyone I think it is too bad. This bill that is before the body now, the Court Security bill, has been passed by the Senate on two separate occasions. We have filed cloture; cloture was invoked. I appreciate very much the minority allowing us to move to the bill. But this afternoon I had a meeting with Mr. Clark, head of the U.S. Marshals Service. This year, threats to Federal judges have gone up 17 percent. We have had vile things done to judges all over the country, even in the State of Nevada, and we need to give Federal courts and local police this year. We need to be a country that is ruled by the finest judicial system in the world, which we have now, and we cannot have bad people take away our court system—and violence can do that.

I hope we can finish this bill in a reasonable time tomorrow. If not, tomorrow will be a long night.

I appreciate very much my friend from Iowa allowing me to speak for a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

**DRUG SAFETY**

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today I wanted to speak on an issue I speak on many times, drug safety. Today is a little different for it, though, because earlier today the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions began marking up S. 1062, the Food and Drug Administration Revitalization Act. For the first time in almost a decade we have an opportunity to reform, to improve, and to reestablish the FDA as an institution committed to making patient safety as important as bringing new drugs to the market.

S. 1062 presents a framework for the future of drug and device safety. I am gratified by some of its current contents and I express some disappointment about others. That is the purpose of my speaking to my colleagues.

First, I am gratified the bill attempts to address some of the overarching issues plaguing the FDA that have been repeatedly revealed by the investigations I conducted of the FDA over the last 3 years. In 1062 takes a number of steps to address the issue of transparency, the issue of accountability, and the issue of respect for the scientific process that has been lacking for some time at the FDA. S. 1062, for example, requires that within 30 days of approval, the action package for approval of a new drug must be posted on the FDA’s Web site. This requirement, however, only applies to a drug with an active ingredient that has not been previously approved by the FDA. The action package would contain all documents generated by the FDA related to the review of a drug application, including a summary review of all conclusions and, among other things, any disagreements and how these disagreements were resolved. If a supervisor disagreed with the review, then the supervisor’s opposing review would be available to the public. And to address the many allegations that the Food and Drug Administration safety reviewers are sometimes coerced into changing their findings, I greatly welcome the provision that states a scientific review of an application is considered the work of the reviewer and must not be changed by FDA managers or the reviewer once that review is final.

The bill also takes steps to bring more resources to the FDA for drug safety, another matter I have been discussing for years. This bill requires the Food and Drug Administration’s Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee to meet