

They are not going to all be out a year from now. There will be plenty for them to do. I have talked about the four or five major responsibilities they can pursue a year or so from now and for some time after that. But I think that sends the kind of signal the American people are waiting to hear. I think it sends a real strong message to the Iraqis as well that our patience is not infinite, that we have expectations of them, that they need to step up. Again, another sports analogy: They need to step up to the plate. This is their time. This is their country. It is not our country, it is their country. If they want to have a country, they have to make the decisions. If they want to have a country, they need to do what is necessary to bring their people together and to build an institution in their country that can survive and persevere and hopefully can prosper.

As we end this week, a week that has seen a lot of ups and downs here in the Senate, a week that has seen more than its usual degree of acrimony, this is a place where we actually mostly like each other, have a pretty good ability to work together with a fairly high degree of civility and comity. A lot of times too often this week that civility and comity has been lacking. Fortunately, when we left here this morning about 1 o'clock, I felt some of the bumps and bruises were now at least behind us, and we were back to a better footing. I hope as we rejoice here on Monday, we will pick up where we left off early this morning with the near unanimous passage of the Higher Education Act, something Senator KENNEDY and Senator ENZI and others have worked on, crafting together a very fine bipartisan bill, that the spirit we walked out of here with this morning will be waiting for us when we return on Monday.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I came to the floor a month or two ago and indicated at that time that I had had conversations with my counterpart, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL. I related to the Senate that Senator MCCONNELL had said to me that judicial nominations were very important to him. I said if that is the case, then they are important to me, and that I would do everything I could to expedite judicial nominations in spite of what had gone on in recent years relative to how Republicans had treated Democratic nominees of President Clinton.

As the majority leader, I take very seriously the Senate's constitutional duty to provide advice and consent with regard to all Presidential nominees, but especially judicial nominees. The judiciary is the third branch of our Federal Government and is entitled to great respect. The Senate shares a responsibility with the President to ensure that the judiciary is staffed with men and women who possess outstanding legal skills, suitable temperament, and the highest ethical standing.

In a floor statement I have given on more than one occasion—I just recounted one I gave—I expressed regret that the process for confirming judicial nominees had become too partisan in recent years. From 1995 to 2000, the Republican-controlled Senate treated President Clinton and his judicial nominees with great disrespect, leaving almost 70 nominees languishing in the Judiciary Committee without even a hearing. Some of them were there for 4 years with nothing happening. Of course, Republicans have had their complaints—most of which I feel are unjustified, but they are entitled to their opinion—about the way a handful of nominees were treated in the early years of the Bush administration.

The partisan squabbling over judicial nominees reached a low point last Congress when Majority Leader Frist threatened to use the so-called nuclear option, an illegitimate parliamentary maneuver that would have changed Senate rules in a way to limit debate on judicial nominations. It would have had long-term negative ramifications for this body. At the time I said that it was the most serious issue I had worked on in my entire time in Government, that the Republicans would even consider changing the rules so the Senate would become basically the House of Representatives. The Founding Fathers set up a bicameral legislature. The Senate has always been different from the House. That is what the Founding Fathers envisioned. That is the way it should continue. But the so-called nuclear option would have changed that forever.

The effort was averted by a bipartisan group of Senators that was unwilling to compromise the traditions of the Senate for momentary political advantage. I was never prouder of the Senate than when it turned back this misguided attempt to diminish the constitutional role of the Senate just to confirm a few more judges. I believed that had a vote taken place, that never would have happened. There were people who stepped forward. I had a number of Republicans come to me and say: I will not say anything publicly, but what is being attempted here is wrong. But remember, we only had 45 Democrats at the time, so we had to be very careful what would happen. Rather than take the chance on a vote, I was so happy that we had 14 Senators, 7 Republicans and 7 Democrats, who stepped in and said: That is not the way it should be. We were able to nego-

ciate. As a result of that negotiation, we let some judges go that with up-or-down votes here, it wouldn't have happened. But it didn't work out that way.

We averted the showdown as a result of the goodwill of 14 Democratic and Republican Senators. It went away. That is the way it should have gone away.

But in the 2 years since the nuclear option fizzled, I have worked hard, first with Senator Frist and now with Senator MCCONNELL, to keep the process for considering judicial nominees on track. I said then that if the nuclear option had been initiated, and I became leader, I would reverse it. I believed so strongly it was wrong, even though we would have had an advantage at the time.

As Senate leaders, we have worked hand in hand with the very able leaders of the Judiciary Committee, Senators LEAHY and SPECTER. In the last Congress the Senate considered two Supreme Court nominees—I opposed both—Roberts and Alito. In hindsight, I did the right thing with the decisions they have made. But I worked with Senators LEAHY and SPECTER to make sure both nominees received prompt, fair, and thorough consideration in the committee and on the Senate floor.

After Senate Democrats gained a majority in last November's elections, I publicly pledged that the Senate would continue to process judicial nominees in due course and in good faith. I explained that I could not commit to a specific number of confirmations because the right way to measure the success of this process is the quality of the nominees, rather than the quantity of nominees and, ultimately, judges. I said the Senate will work hard to confirm mainstream, capable, experienced nominees who are the product of bipartisan cooperation. President Bush made a wise decision at the beginning of this Congress by not resubmitting a number of controversial judicial nominations from previous years. I took that as a sign of good faith and have tried to reciprocate by working with Chairman LEAHY to confirm non-controversial nominees in an expeditious fashion.

So far this year we have confirmed three court of appeals nominees. Again in hindsight, that is three more than were confirmed in a similar year in the last Clinton term. But we have confirmed three, including a nomination to the Ninth Circuit about which there was some dispute as to whether the seat should be filled by a Californian or someone from Idaho. We have also confirmed 22 district court nominees, and we continue to vote on those at a steady pace.

The judicial confirmation process is working well. We have confirmed 25 judges. It is certainly working much better than it worked when there was a Republican Senate processing President Clinton's nominees. As a result, the judicial vacancy rate is at an all-time low. I have said on the floor and

publicly, this is not payback time with judges. We are going to treat the Republican nominees differently than they treated our nominees.

But all of this hard work cannot prevent good-faith disagreements about the merits of particular nominations. There is one nomination pending in the Judiciary Committee that has aroused significant controversy, the nomination of former Mississippi State Judge Leslie Southwick to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Senator SPECTER recently said that I told Senator MCCONNELL that Judge Southwick would be confirmed by Memorial Day. Obviously, I can only commit to my own actions, not the actions of others. But I did urge strongly that the Judiciary Committee hold hearings on this, and they did. I urged strongly that this matter be moved as expeditiously as possible, and it has. I urged the Judiciary Committee to do everything it could to move this along, and they did. The problem was, the nomination proved to be controversial and, therefore, it has not moved forward.

The Judiciary Committee has not yet voted on Judge Southwick. But as reported in the press, some Republicans are already threatening to retaliate against the rejection of the Southwick nomination by slowing down Senate business. How much more could they slow it down? What has gone on this year is untoward. Cloture has been filed about 45 times on things that, really, I don't understand why they are doing what they do. To threaten, because of the Southwick nomination, that they are going to slow things down is absurd because they have already slowed things down. They were gearing up to oppose judicial nominees of future Democratic Presidents. That is what they have said. This is so senseless. I think the reaction would be completely unjustified.

My pledge that the Democratic majority would consider judicial nominees in due course and in good faith was hardly a guarantee that every Bush nominee would be confirmed. I was told early on that Judge Southwick was noncontroversial. He had a high rating from the ABA. He had participated in lots of cases. There was no problem. I accepted those representations and, after having accepted them, pushed very hard to move this nomination along. But the facts of his background and his decisionmaking are different than had been represented to me. The Judiciary Committee must still do its work with care, and it should only report those nominees who deserve a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench.

The nomination of Judge Southwick has already been treated more kindly than dozens of Clinton nominees, including nominees to the Fifth Circuit. We have held a hearing. I repeat, during the Clinton administration, almost 70 languished with no hearings. If Southwick has been unable to convince Judiciary Committee members of suit-

ability for the Federal bench, that is his misfortune. Remember, about 70 nominations of President Clinton never even had a hearing. Southwick has had a hearing, and to this point, he has been unable to convince the Judiciary Committee he is the person for the job. Senator LEAHY has stated that anytime Senators LOTT and COCHRAN ask him to put him on the calendar for a vote, he will do so. They haven't asked him to do that yet. Why? Because at this stage it appears Democrats are going to oppose this nomination. But Senator LEAHY said anytime they want to test the vote, they may do that.

I know the administration has sent Judge Southwick around to meet individually with Democratic Judiciary Committee members. Anytime they want that vote, they can have it. Chairman LEAHY and I can only establish a process. We can't promise that the outcome of that process will be to the liking of Republican Senators.

The primary concern that has been raised by Judge Southwick is that he has joined decisions on the Mississippi Appellate Court which demonstrate insensitivity to the rights of racial minorities and others. For example, in the Richmond case, he voted to uphold the reinstatement, with back pay, of a White State employee who used a racial epithet about an African-American coworker.

I ask unanimous consent that the dissent in that opinion by Judge King be printed in the RECORD.

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

BONNIE RICHMOND, APPELLANT V. MISSISSIPPI
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, APPELLEE
NO. 96-CC-00667 COA
COURT OF APPEALS OF MISSISSIPPI
1998 MISS. APP. LEXIS 637, AUGUST 4, 1998,
DECIDED

I dissent from the majority opinion.

The standard of review applied [*19] to administrative decisions is that they must be affirmed if (1) not arbitrary or capricious, (2) supported by substantial evidence and (3) not contrary to law. *Briston v. Public Employees' Retirement System*, 706 So. 2d 258, 259 (Miss. 1998).

In this case, the Mississippi Employee Appeals Board, (hereinafter referred to as "EAB") made no specific findings of fact. Instead, it merely entered an order which affirmed "the Order of November 29, 1994"¹, entered by the Hearing Officer Falton O. Mason, Jr. Because the EAB made no findings of its own, we can only conclude that it incorporated by reference and adopted the findings and order of the hearing officer. It is therefore the findings and opinion of the hearing officer which we subject to our review.

¹The hearing officer's order read as follows:

This came on to be heard on November 16, 1994, at 9:30 a.m. in the Supervisors Board Room, in the DeSoto County Courthouse, Hernando, Mississippi, Falton O. Mason, Jr., Hearing Officer;

After receiving testimony and hearing argument of counsel, the Court being fully advised in the premises finds:

Bonnie Richmond appealed her termination by the Mississippi Department of

Human Services (hereafter MDHS), for an alleged racial statement made in a private meeting, and later made to the individual after she returned to the DeSoto County Office. The proof shows that she made the alleged statement in a private meeting where the atmosphere and setting were for the free flow of comments and ideas and complaints, her statement was in effect calling the individual a "teachers pet" and that she did not repeat that statement, but did in fact apologize to that individual and that individual did in fact accept the apology.

That based upon the allegations set out in the termination letter, the Appealing Party did in fact sustain her burden of proof, and the Appealing Party is reinstated as of July 8, 1994, with back pay and all benefits restored.

SO ORDERED this the 29th day of November, 1994.

[*20] To facilitate that review, I have included at this juncture the full text of the Hearing Officer's opinion, which reads,

I think in my—it appears to me very simply that the department overreacted on this because first I don't find if, in fact, these employees, Bonnie Richmond and Renee Elmore, were in a meeting with Ms. Johnson and Mr. Everett and Ms. Johnson testified that she tried to make them comfortable and relaxed, if it was an open meeting with a give and take atmosphere and this comment was made in the context it was made in, I don't think it was intended at that time for a racial slur.

If the department—if that's correct, if the department takes that as a racial slur, then I see anytime somebody refers to somebody as a honkie or a redneck or a mick or chubby or a good old boy or anything else, it's an action to file an appeal and try to get some response. I think it overreacted.

I do think it would be unprofessional and it is unprofessional to make that remark. I wouldn't be comfortable making it. At the same time, it depends on what company I'm in and under what circumstances.

The other part is as has been pointed out, the termination letter very [*21] clearly states and the testimony in direct opposition to this, further on May 24 you returned to the DeSoto County office. You approached this black employee and told her that you had been in a meeting with Ms. Johnson and had told them that she was a "good ole nigger." That statement is—that's not true. I mean, the testimony indicated that she didn't approach her, she didn't raise it, that it was Renee Elmore that brought it up. She didn't seek out this black employee to tell her anything about it.

Further, I don't find anywhere where it is—the other comments, your conduct in returning and repeating, which she didn't do. To return to the DeSoto County office and repeat that phrase, had she repeated that phrase, it would have been unacceptable totally as though it was acceptable to the Mississippi Department of Human Services. I don't find it having created a distraction within the DeSoto county office. Nobody testified to that, or the surrounding areas. I don't think it's caused employees to question whether the department condones the use of racial slurs. You know, I think the department overreacted.

The part that bothers me is to allow you to continue in this position [*22] would discredit the agency, impair the agency's ability to provide services, violates the agency's responsibility to the public to administer nondiscriminatory services, violates the agency's duty to administer working environment free of discriminatory practices and procedures and subject the department to potential liability for unlawful discrimination.

If, in fact, she had returned to the DeSoto County office, had brought this subject up

again, and the only person—the only testimony that we have about anybody else hearing about this thing was somebody who Ms. Johnson and Mr. Everett had to make the comment to somebody else. Ms.—what's her name?

Mr. Lynchard: Varrie Richmond.

The Hearing Officer: Ms. Varrie Richmond said she didn't tell anybody else. She said she didn't call the state office about the situation, and apparently, until she was contacted by the state office, she had accepted Bonnie Richmond's apology. I just think the agency overreacted, and if the agency might find itself in a situation where every time somebody in the agency is called a redneck by some other employee, that they are going to be calling the state office and wanting some relief or [*23] a honkie or a good old boy or Uncle Tom or chubby or fat or slim.

I mean, I understand that the term "nigger" is somewhat derogatory, but the term has not been used in recent years in the conversation that it was used in my youth, and at that point—at that time it was a derogatory remark. I think that in this context, I just don't find it was racial discrimination. I just don't find—she possibly should have a letter of reprimand, but I don't think she needs to be terminated.

I'm going to reinstate her with back pay. The agency can do what they feel like they have got to do.

The Department of Human Services (hereinafter referred to as "DHS") gave written notice of its intent to terminate Richmond on June 21, 1994. That notice identified two separate Group III violations (numbers 11 and 16) and provided separately the underlying facts upon which each violation was based.

The first offense was a violation of item number 11, which is "Acts of conduct occurring on or off the job which are plainly related to job performance and are of such nature that to continue the employee in the assigned position could constitute negligence in regard to the agency's duties to the [*24] public or to other state employees. (emphasis added)

The factual basis given to support this allegation was:

On May 23, 1994 while in conference with Joyce Johnson, Division Director of Family and Children's and Jerald Everett of the Division of Human Resources, you referred to one of our black employees as "a good ole nigger." Further on May 24, 1994 upon returning to DeSoto County you approached this black employee and referred to her using exactly the same words as you used when you were in conference with Joyce Johnson and Jerald Everett the day before.

The hearing officer resolved this issue by finding:

(1) DHS overreacted;
 (2) the remark was made in an open meeting with an atmosphere of give and take;
 (3) the term "good ole nigger" was not a racial slur; (transcript 129)

(4) calling Varrie Richmond a "good ole nigger" was equivalent to calling her "teacher's pet"

(order by Hearing Officer Falton Mason, Jr., November 29, 1994.), and;

(5) Renee Elmore, not Bonnie Richmond, initiated the conversation of May 24, 1994 with Varrie Richmond.

The meeting of May 23, 1994, while hastily scheduled, was a formal meeting with two top tier DHS executives, intended to [*25] allow Bonnie Richmond and Renee Elmore to address what they perceived as problems in the DeSoto County office. While the atmosphere was intended to allow for honest discussion, there is no indication that this was intended as an informal or unofficial meeting. Its purpose was to identify problems, and if necessary to address them.

The fact that a business meeting may be conducted in a relaxed and open atmosphere, is not license to engage in boorish, crude, loutish or offensive behavior. The actions of Bonnie Richmond in referring to Varrie Richmond as a "good ole nigger" was indeed boorish, crude, loutish and offensive behavior. This behavior was not merely inappropriate, but highly inappropriate.

That a white employee would suggest the use of the term "good ole nigger," is less inappropriate in a relaxed meeting, raises significant questions about that person's judgment and whether the agency would be negligent in retaining her. That judgment is demonstrated as especially questionable, when one realizes that Bonnie Richmond worked in a division which is approximately 60% black, in an agency with in excess of 50% black employees. Such a demonstrated gross lack of judgment would [*26] justify the dismissal of Bonnie Richmond.

The hearing officer's ruling that calling Varrie Richmond a "good ole nigger" was equivalent to calling her "teacher's pet" strains credulity, finds no basis in reason and would appear to be both arbitrary and capricious. The word "nigger" is, and has always been, offensive. Search high and low, you will not find any non-offensive definition for this term.²

2 1. a. Used as a disparaging term for a Black person: "You can only be destroyed by believing that you really are what the white world calls a nigger" (James Baldwin) b. Used as a disparaging term for any dark-skinned people. 2. Used as a disparaging term for a member of any socially, economically, or politically deprived group of people.

There are some words, which by their nature and definition are so inherently offensive, that their use establishes the intent to offend. Words such as "nigger" when referring to a black person, or the words, "bitch" or "whore" when referring to a female person. The character [*27] of these terms is so inherently offensive that it is not altered by the use of modifiers, such as "good ole."

Much is made of the fact that Renee Elmore indicated she was not offended by the use of the term, "good ole nigger."

The test is not whether Renee Elmore was offended by the use of this term. Rather it is (1) whether this term is universally offensive, *Brown v. East Miss. Electric*, 989 F.2d 858, 859 (5th Cir. 1993), and (2) whether the use of this term is inappropriate and reprehensible. The answer to each of these is a most definitive "yes."

The majority quotes Elmore on page 7, as saying, "Because I felt as if she was describing the actions of a person, I at that time didn't allow myself to feel anything other than what I felt she was doing and I allowed her that leeway to describe her." I suggest that effect must be given to all portions of that quote. Particularly the phrase, "I at that time didn't allow myself to feel anything." (emphasis added).

It is clear that Renee Elmore made a determination to not personalize or allow herself to become emotionally involved in Bonnie Richmond's remark. It is not uncommon for people to deal with offensive remarks [*28] by refusing to associate the remarks with themselves on a personal basis. This makes the remark no less inappropriate or offensive.

However, the resolution of this matter does not hinge upon that fact. The use of the term by Bonnie Richmond in a meeting with two of the top executives of DHS, an agency with about 5000 employees of whom in excess of 50% are black, and where the Division of Family and Children Services has a 60-40 black-white employee ratio demonstrates such a lack of judgment and discretion that to retain her "could" constitute negligence

in regard to the agency's duties to the public or to other state employees.

The hearing officer and majority opinion seem to suggest that absent evidence of a near race riot, the remark is too inconsequential to serve as a basis of dismissal. Such a view requires a level of myopia inconsistent with the facts and reason.

It is (1) the remark, and (2) the lack of judgment in making it in a professional meeting with top departmental executives, which satisfy the requirement, "that to continue the employee in the assigned position could constitute negligence in regard to the agency's duties . . . to other state employees."

The majority [*29] opinion is a scholarly, but sanitized version of the hearing officer's findings and is subject to the same infirmities found in that opinion.

The second reason given for termination of Bonnie Richmond was "Willful violation of State Personnel Board policies, rules and regulations."

The factual basis for this second allegation was the same as the first, except it raised the issue of DHS's consideration of this behavior and its impact upon the integrity of DHS. The record does not reflect that DHS identified any specific Personnel Board policies, rules or regulations.

However, it must be presumed that an agency has the authority to mandate civil conduct from its employees.

The actions of Bonnie Richmond exceed (1) acceptable civil conduct, (2) acceptable social conduct, and (3) acceptable business conduct.

This conduct was, by definition, offensive to the individual referred to and the black employees of DHS in general.

The actions of the EAB were not supported by substantial evidence, and I would therefore reverse.

PAYNE, J., JOINS THIS OPINION.

Mr. REID. Judge Southwick says the decision was about technical issues, but the dissent in the case by Judge King is eloquent. I mean eloquent. I hadn't read that opinion prior to my conversations with Senator McCONNELL, but I have read it. I understand it. I have a totally different view than I had prior to reading that opinion.

The judge's words are eloquent. Here is part of what he said:

There are some words, which by their nature and definition are so inherently offensive, that their use establishes the intent to offend.

Race is a highly sensitive issue throughout the entire United States, but especially in the States that comprise the Fifth Circuit. It took the courageous action of judges, mostly Federal judges, on the Fifth Circuit especially, to carry out the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and destroy the vestiges of the Jim Crow era. Yet even today no African American from Mississippi sits on that court, despite the many qualified African-American lawyers in that State. Concerns about Judge Southwick need to be seen in that context.

I say that Judge Southwick is not being looked at with lack of favor by the Judiciary Committee because of the color of his skin. It is because of his judicial participation in various opinions.

The members of the Judiciary Committee will decide whether to report

this nomination to the full Senate. If they choose to report the nomination, I will schedule action as quickly as I can. If they reject the nomination, that action will also be on the merits.

After I had read the opinion and understood the case, I visited personally with THAD COCHRAN. I think the world of THAD COCHRAN. I have served with him now in the Congress for 25 years. I have served with Senator LOTT for 25 years. I went to both of them and said: I know how strongly you feel about Judge Southwick, but here are the facts. I read to them the dissent of Judge King. I read to them the full dissent. Anyone who cares to hear what Judge King had to say only has to look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I also told them that the Magnolia Bar Association, the African American Bar Association in the State of Mississippi, opposes Judge Southwick. The NAACP opposes Judge Southwick.

Republican Senators may disagree with the decision of the Judiciary Committee when and if it comes, but they should not treat it as an affront or an outrage. It is simply the way in which the Founders envisioned the Senate would work as a partner with the President in deciding who is entitled to lifetime appointments to the Federal bench.

Again, the Judiciary Committee didn't stall Southwick. They scheduled a hearing at a time that was convenient to everyone. It was precise. It was to the point. Everyone was able to ask their questions. They had a full hearing. If he can't convince that committee that he is the man for the job, that is our process. Certainly, at a subsequent time, if and when we get a Democratic President, if they process these nominations in the manner that we have, that will be fine. It is the way we are supposed to work.

Whatever happens with the Southwick nomination, the Senate will continue to process judicial nominations in due course and in good faith, as I have pledged. I repeat, I know how strongly the distinguished Republican leader feels about judges. I think there are a lot of things that are just as important. He feels strongly about this. I accept that. But I would like everyone to look at the record as to what has happened with this nomination. It has been moved expeditiously. They can have a vote anytime they wish in the committee. There are votes that take place almost every Thursday. They can schedule it anytime they want. But I think it would be asking quite a bit for someone to think that when the committee of jurisdiction on an issue turns something down, we should take it up on the floor. That is not how things work.

I would only say, I would think, based on the decisions participated in by Judge Southwick, anyone who has any concern about the feelings of the members of the Judiciary Committee who are Democrats should read this record because it explains very clearly what the problem is in this case.

Mr. President, we were hoping to clear a number of the President's nomi-

nations today—the Export-Import Bank of the United States, two nominees we were ready to clear; the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, one, two, three nominations; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, we have someone there to clear; the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, we have an individual there who has been cleared on our side.

All these nominations have been cleared on our side. The holdups are with the minority. So we are trying to clear the President's nominations. We cannot do it unless the Republicans agree to it. They are his nominations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 980. An act to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 236. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the National Anthem Project, which has worked to restore America's voice by re-teaching Americans to sing the national anthem.

S. Res. 248. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of Dame Lois Browne Evans, Bermuda's first female barrister and Attorney General, and the first female Opposition Leader in the British Commonwealth.

S. Res. 261. A resolution expressing appreciation for the profound public service and educational contributions of Donald Jeffrey Herbert, fondly known as "Mr. Wizard".

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 Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 1840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. DOLE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 1841. A bill to provide a site for the National Women's History Museum in Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FEINGOLD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1842. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for patient

protection by limiting the number of mandatory overtime hours a nurse may be required to work in certain providers of services to which payments are made under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1843. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to clarify that an unlawful practice occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide increased assistance for the prevention, treatment, and control of tuberculosis, and for other purposes.

S. 982

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for integration of mental health services and mental health treatment outreach teams, and for other purposes.

S. 1060

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1060, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, and for other purposes.

S. 1213

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1213, a bill to give States the flexibility to reduce bureaucracy by streamlining enrollment processes for the Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance Programs through better linkages with programs providing nutrition and related assistance to low-income families.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to preserve affordable housing in multifamily housing units which are sold or exchanged.

S. 1338

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a