

lot of people have schedules tomorrow afternoon and tomorrow evening they will want to keep.

While it would be difficult for us to agree at this point to begin the deliberative process on the conference report until we have actually had a chance to see it and review it, there is no reason why we cannot begin the debate.

We are suggesting that we informally begin the debate, have people address the issues if they want to be heard on the issues. If we can get a copy of a conference report in the next couple of hours, we may be in a position then to retroactively agree to the time already spent and make a commitment with regard to the time certain on the conference report itself. That could be as early as tomorrow between 9:30 and 10.

It would then be our hope we could move to the debt limit. We are not sure yet how many amendments may be offered, but we will try to limit the amount of time on each amendment so we can accommodate the schedules, with the expectation that by early afternoon we could depart.

The majority leader has articulated this understanding accurately and we will work with him to see if we can accomplish this in the next few hours.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me add, for tomorrow we do the jobs and growth package, we would take what time is necessary on the debt ceiling extension, and then we also have one other issue, which is unemployment insurance, which we will be addressing tomorrow. Again, all of this can be done in a very short period of time. These are not new issues. In each and every one of them, we know what the consequences are. They have been debated. The jobs and growth package we talked a lot about, although it is not exactly as written now, but the issues we talked about and discussed.

On all three of these issues, we will finish them. We could finish them, actually, early afternoon tomorrow if we stay focused, and that will be my intent. I understand some people on the other side of the aisle may want to talk on the debt ceiling and possibly unemployment insurance as well.

I think if we work together in a collegial way, we will be able to complete all of this legislation. Again, it has been an ambitious schedule for the week, but based on what we have seen over the last 3 years, we are making progress as we go forward.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CONSUELO MARIA CALLAHAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Consuelo Maria Callahan, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 10 minutes evenly divided prior to the vote on the nomination.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEAHY. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on this nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I express my enthusiastic support for the confirmation of Consuelo Callahan to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Justice Callahan is an outstanding nominee with broad support on both sides of the aisle. She has the support of both of the distinguished senators from her home state of California, and she was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee the day after her hearing.

Justice Callahan received her undergraduate degree from Stanford University and her law degree from McGeorge School of Law. In 1976, she began her 10-year career as a Deputy District Attorney with the San Joaquin County District Attorney's Office where she specialized in the prosecution of child abuse and sexual assault cases. During her 10-year career as a prosecutor, she handled more than 50 jury trials.

Justice Callahan also has first-hand experience with breaking the gender barrier. In 1992, she was appointed to the Superior Court in San Joaquin County, where she was the first female and Hispanic to serve on that court. She was also the first female member of two local social and service organizations. In 1996, Justice Callahan became the first judge from San Joaquin County to be elevated to the California Court of Appeal in more than 73 years.

In addition to her outstanding career as a prosecutor and a jurist, she has donated her time to organizations involved in addressing the problem of child abuse and sexual assault and has received an award for her work in this area. She has received other awards during her career, including the Governor's award for Criminal Justice Programs and the Susan B. Anthony award for Women of Achievement. In 1999, Justice Callahan was inducted into the San Joaquin County Mexican-American Hall of Fame.

The Committee has received numerous letters supporting Justice Callahan's nomination to the Ninth Cir-

cuit. The La Raza Lawyer's Association of Sacramento described Justice Callahan's professional qualifications in the following way: "as a state appellate court justice, her opinions have been detailed, thoughtful and supportive of legal precedent. . . . She possesses both the intellect and temperament to be an outstanding justice of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals."

The ten justices that serve with Justice Callahan on the Third Appellate District and work with her every day also sent a letter to the Committee praising her skills as a jurist. They write, "During her more than six years on our court, Connie has shown that she has the integrity, capacity, collegiality, and diligence to serve with distinction on the Ninth Circuit. Our only reservation in recommending her confirmation is that it will mean a significant loss to our court. We will miss Connie's energy and enthusiasm, her legal skills, and the positive way in which she fulfills her responsibilities as an appellate jurist."

Her colleagues' loss will be the federal judiciary's gain, as I have great confidence that the beleaguered Ninth Circuit will greatly benefit from her confirmation. I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, each of the Senators from California would like to speak.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of Justice Callahan to go from the California State appellate court to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. This woman was really born in Senator BOXER's and my backyard. She is a Bay area person. She was born in Palo Alto. She attended Stanford, graduated with honors, attended the University of the Pacific McGeorge Law School. She has been both a deputy city attorney and deputy district attorney. She founded the first child abuse unit in the DA's Office of San Joaquin County. In 1996 she was elevated to the State Court of Appeals from the Superior Court of San Joaquin County. She has served with distinction for the past 6 years, has extraordinarily strong support.

I certainly believe, and I believe Senator BOXER concurs in this, that she is going to be an excellent judge of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. I am delighted to support her and to recommend her and to vote for her.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join with my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, in support of this fine nominee,

To support Consuelo "Connie" Callahan to be a judge for the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Judge Callahan is a native Californian, born in Palo Alto. She is a graduate of Stanford University and the McGeorge School of Law at the University of the Pacific.

She was the first female and the first Hispanic judge to sit on the San Joaquin County Superior Court. She currently serves on the Third District Court of Appeals located in Sacramento.

She has been a champion of protecting children. When she served as a prosecutor, she focused on major felony prosecutions in the area of child abuse. She has received public recognition for her work on this issue.

She also is a former board member and President of the San Joaquin County Child Abuse Prevention Center. I applaud her involvement in this very serious cause.

I am pleased to join with my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, to support this nominee. In addition to having the support of both of her home-state senators, Judge Callahan received unanimous support from the Judiciary Committee.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this well-qualified, mainstream nominee.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we vote to confirm Judge Consuelo Maria Callahan to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. This is another judicial nominee of President Bush whom Senate Democrats have strongly supported and whose consideration we had expedited through the Judiciary Committee.

I thank the Democratic leader and assistant leader for supporting Judge Callahan's nomination and working out this arrangement with the Republican leadership so that this consensus nomination can be considered without further delay. I appreciate that the majority leader has been willing to work with us to allow this nomination to go forward today.

I still do not know who on the Republican side delayed consideration of this consensus nominee. Just as Senate Democrats last month cleared the nomination of Judge Edward Prado to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit without delay, so, too, the nomination of Judge Callahan to the Ninth Circuit was cleared on the Democratic side promptly. All Democratic Senators serving on the Judiciary Committee voted to report her nomination favorably. All Democratic Senators indicated that they were eager to proceed with her nomination and, after a reasonable period of debate, vote on her nomination.

Unlike the divisive nomination of Carolyn Kuhl to the same court, both home-State Senators support the nomination of Judge Callahan and she is expected to be confirmed by an extraordinary majority—maybe unanimously. Rather than disregarding time-honored rules and Senate practices, I urged my friends on the other side of the aisle to help us fill more judicial vacancies more quickly by bringing those nominations that have bipartisan support,

like Judge Callahan, to the front of the line for committee hearings and floor votes. I noted in a statement last week to make the point that the nomination of Judge Callahan to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was cleared on the Democratic side.

We still do not know who on the Republican side delayed consideration of the consensus nomination of Judge Prado for a month. I thank the Congressional Hispanic Caucus for its support of that nomination as well as for its support of Judge Callahan, and for working with the Senate to bringing fair evaluation of these nominees and for adding their voice to the discussion of these lifetime appointments.

It is most unfortunate that so many partisans in this administration and on the other side of the aisle insist on bogging down consensus matters and consensus nominees in order to focus exclusively on the most divisive and controversial of this President's nominees as he continues his efforts to pack the courts. Democratic Senators have worked very hard to cooperate with this administration in order to fill judicial vacancies. What the other side seeks to obscure is our effort, our fairness and the progress we have been able to achieve without much help from the other side or the administration.

The fact is that when Democrats became the Senate majority in the summer of 2001, we inherited 110 judicial vacancies. Over the next 17 months, despite constant criticism from the administration, the Senate proceeded to confirm 100 of President Bush's nominees, including several who were divisive and controversial, several who had mixed peer review ratings from the ABA and at least 1 who had been rated not qualified. Despite the additional 40 vacancies that arose, we reduced judicial vacancies to 60, a level below that termed "full employment" by Senator HATCH. Since the beginning of this year, in spite of the Republican's fixation on the President's most controversial nominations, we have worked hard to reduce judicial vacancies even further. As of today, the number of judicial vacancies has been reduced to 45 and is the lowest it has been in 13 years. That is lower than at any time during the entire 8 years of the Clinton administration. We have already reduced judicial vacancies from 110 to 45, in 2 years. We have reduced the vacancy rate from 12.8 percent to 5.2 percent, the lowest it has been in the last two decades. With some cooperation from the administration, think of the additional progress we could be making.

Earlier this month, we were able to obtain Senate consideration of the nomination of Judge Prado, and another distinguished Hispanic nominee, Judge Cecilia Altonaga, to be a Federal judge in Florida. We expedited consid-

eration of that nominee at the request of Senator GRAHAM of Florida. I am told that she is the first Cuban-American woman to be confirmed to the Federal bench. Indeed, Democrats in the Senate have worked to expedite fair consideration of every Latino nominee this President has made to the Federal trial courts in addition to the nominations of Judge Prado and Judge Callahan.

As I have noted throughout the last 2 years, the Senate is able to move expeditiously when we have consensus nominees to consider. In a recent column, David Broder noted that he asked Alberto Gonzales if there was a lesson in Judge Prado's easy approval, but that Mr. Gonzales missed the point. In Mr. Broder's mind: "The lesson seems obvious. Conservatives can be confirmed for the courts when they are well known in their communities and a broad range of their constituents have reason to think them fair-minded." Judge Consuelo Callahan is another such nominee.

With this confirmation, the Senate will have confirmed 126 judges, including 24 circuit court nominees, nominated by President Bush, 100 in the 17 months in which Democrats comprised the Senate majority. The lesson that less controversial nominees are considered and confirmed more easily was the lesson of the last 2 years, but that lesson has been lost on this White House and the current Senate leadership.

One hundred judicial nominees were confirmed when Democrats controlled the Senate for 17 months, and 26 have been confirmed in the other 12 months in which Republicans have controlled the confirmation process under President Bush. This total of 126 judges confirmed for President Bush is more confirmations than the Republicans allowed President Clinton in all of 1995, 1996 and 1997 the 3 full years of his last term. In those 3 years, the Republican leadership in the Senate allowed only 111 judicial nominees to be confirmed, which included only 18 circuit court judges. We have already exceeded that total by 13 percent and the circuit court total by 33 percent before Memorial Day and with 7 months remaining to us this year.

Today's confirmation makes the seventh court of appeals nominee confirmed by the Senate just this year. That meets the annual average achieved by Republican leadership from 1995 through the early part of 2001. The Republicans have now achieved as much in less than 5 months for President Bush as they used to allow the Senate to achieve in a full year with President Clinton. They are moving two to three times faster for this President's nominees, despite the fact that the current appellate court nominees are more controversial, divisive and less widely supported than President Clinton's appellate court nominees were.

Understand that if the Senate did not confirm another judicial nominee all year and simply adjourned today, we would have treated President Bush more fairly and would have acted on more of his judicial nominees than Republicans did for President Clinton in 1995 to 1997. In addition, the 45 vacancies on the Federal courts around the country are significantly lower than the 80 vacancies Republicans left at the end of 1997. Of course, the Senate is not adjourning for the year and Chairman HATCH continues to hold hearings for Bush judicial nominees at between two and four times as many as he did for President Clinton's.

Unfortunately, far too many of this President's nominees raise serious concerns about whether they will be fair judges to all parties on all issues. Those types of nominees should not be rushed through the process. I regret the administration's refusal to work with us to end the impasse it has created in connection with the Estrada nomination. The partisan politics of division that the administration is practicing with respect to that nomination are not helpful and not respectful of the damage done to the Hispanic community by insisting on so divisive a nominee.

I invite the President to work with us and to nominate more mainstream individuals like Judge Prado and Judge Callahan with proven records and bipartisan support. In connection with the unexplained Republican delay before consideration of the nomination of Judge Prado, some suggested that Judge Prado had been delayed because Democratic Senators were likely to vote for him and thereby undercut the Republican's shameless charge that opposition to Miguel Estrada is based on his ethnicity.

We all know that the White House could have cooperated with the Senate by producing Mr. Estrada's work papers. This would have enabled the Senate to have voted on the Estrada nomination months ago. The request for his work papers was sent last May 15 and has been outstanding for more than a year. Rather than respond as every other administration has over the last 20 years and provide access to those papers, this White House has stonewalled. Rather than follow the policy of openness outlined by Attorney General Robert Jackson in the 1940s, this administration has stonewalled. And Republican Senators and other partisans could not wait to claim that the impasse created by the White House's change in policy and practice with respect to nominations was somehow attributable to Democrats being anti-Hispanic. The charge would be laughable if it were not so calculated to do political damage and to divide the Hispanic community. That is what Republican partisans hope is the result. That is wrong.

Unfortunately, in the case of Mr. Estrada, the administration has made no effort to work with us to resolve the impasse. Instead, there has been a series of votes on cloture petitions in which the opposition has grown and from time to time the support has waned. Recently, there have been press reports indicating that Mr. Estrada asked the White House months ago to withdraw his nomination. I understand his frustration. If this administration is not going to follow the practice of every other administration and share with the Senate the government work papers of the nominee—the very practice this administration followed with its own EPA nominee in 2001—then I can understand him not wanting to be used as a political pawn by the administration to score partisan, political points. That the administration has not acceded to his reported request but has plowed ahead to force a succession of unsuccessful cloture votes and to foment division in the Hispanic community for partisan gain is another example of how far this administration is willing to go to politicize the process at the expense of its own nominees.

Judge Callahan is a fine candidate for elevation to the appeals court. She has years of experience serving on the bench in the state of California, first on the California Superior Court and then on the California Court of Appeal. She enjoys the full support of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. Not a single person or organization has submitted a letter of opposition or raised concerns about her. No controversy. No red flags. No basis for concern. No opposition. This explains why her nomination was voted out of the Judiciary Committee with a unanimous, bipartisan vote on an expedited basis.

During President Clinton's tenure, 10 of his more than 30 Latino nominees, including Judge Rangel, Enrique Moreno, and Christine Arguello to the circuit courts, were delayed or blocked from receiving hearings or votes by the Republican leadership. Republicans delayed consideration of a well-qualified Hispanic nominee to the Ninth Circuit, Judge Richard Paez for over 1,500 days, and 39 Republicans voted against him. The confirmations of Latina circuit nominees Rosemary Barkett and Sonia Sotomayor were also delayed by Republicans. Judge Barkett was targeted for delay and defeat by Republicans based on claims about her judicial philosophy, but those efforts were not successful. After significant delays and an unsuccessful Republican filibuster, 36 Republicans voted against the confirmation of Judge Barkett. Additionally, Judge Sotomayor, who had received the ABA's highest rating and had been appointed to the district court by President George H.W. Bush, was targeted by Republicans for delay or defeat when she was nominated to the Second Circuit. She was eventually

confirmed, although 29 Republicans voted against her.

The fact is that the Latino nominations that the Senate has received from this administration have been acted upon in an expeditious manner. They have overwhelmingly enjoyed bipartisan support. Under the Democratic-led Senate, we swiftly granted hearings for and eventually confirmed Judge Christina Armijo of New Mexico, Judge Phillip Martinez and Randy Crane of Texas, Judge Jose Martinez of Florida, U.S. Magistrate Judge Alia Ludlum, and Judge Jose Linares of New Jersey to the district courts. This year, we also confirmed Judge James Otero of California, and we would have held his confirmation hearing last year if his ABA peer rating had been delivered to us in time for the scheduling of our last hearing. As I have noted, we also have recently confirmed Judge Cecilia Altonaga and Judge Edward Prado with unanimous Democratic support.

Judge Callahan's nomination was delayed on the Senate executive calendar unnecessarily in my view. I am pleased to see that at the urging of the Democratic leadership—the Republican majority has agreed to bring up this uncontroversial Latina nominee for a vote. I congratulate Judge Callahan and her family on her confirmation.

Mr. President, I thank both the majority leader and the distinguished Democratic leader for clearing this action. We have tried on this side of the aisle for some time to clear this nomination. I appreciate my friends on the Republican side lifting their hold. I support the nominee and yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Consuelo Maria Callahan, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Ex.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Biden	Burns
Alexander	Bingaman	Byrd
Allard	Bond	Campbell
Allen	Boxer	Cantwell
Baucus	Breaux	Carper
Bayh	Brownback	Chafee
Bennett	Bunning	Chambliss

Clinton	Grassley	Murkowski
Cochran	Gregg	Murray
Coleman	Hagel	Nelson (FL)
Collins	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Conrad	Hatch	Nickles
Cornyn	Hollings	Pryor
Corzine	Hutchison	Reed
Craig	Inhofe	Reid
Crapo	Inouye	Roberts
Daschle	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Dayton	Johnson	Santorum
DeWine	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kohl	Schumer
Dole	Kyl	Sessions
Domenici	Landrieu	Shelby
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Smith
Durbin	Leahy	Snowe
Edwards	Levin	Specter
Ensign	Lieberman	Stabenow
Enzi	Lincoln	Stevens
Feingold	Lott	Sununu
Feinstein	Lugar	Talent
Fitzgerald	McCain	Thomas
Frist	McConnell	Voivovich
Graham (FL)	Mikulski	Warner
Graham (SC)	Miller	Wyden

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. 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.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes, and that following my remarks, Senator BEN NELSON be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

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

THE FAIR ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce S. 1125, the bipartisan Fairness in Asbestos Injury Resolution Act of 2003, the FAIR Act. I am joined by my colleagues Senators BEN NELSON, DEWINE, MILLER, VOINOVICH, ALLEN, and CHAMBLISS who share my concern on this important issue and have worked very hard to help bring about a resolution up to this point. They have all felt the impact of this situation in their home States and have shown the courage that we need to move forward to legislate a solution.

I also commend the interests of my good friend and Judiciary partner, Senator LEAHY, as well as Senators DODD and CARPER, whom I would hope will continue to work with us to improve this important legislation.

I also want to recognize and commend my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator NICKLES, who has also been a leader on this issue and recognizes the harm the current system poses to our workers and to our economy.

There can be no doubt that our Nation faces an asbestos litigation crisis. We have all heard the statistics, but they bear repeating. The RAND Institute for Civil Justice tells us that, to date, over 60 companies—I have been informed almost 70 companies—have been forced into bankruptcy—at least three with operations in my own home State of Utah.

The number of claims continues to rise, as does the number of companies pulled into the web of this abusive litigation, often with little, if any, culpability. More than 600,000 people have filed claims, and more than 8,400 companies have been named as defendants in asbestos litigation, some of them for no good reason at all but who are now stuck with horrendous defense costs, even though they would win every case.

This has become such a gravy train for some abusive trial lawyers—just some—that over 2,400 additional companies were named in the last year alone. RAND also notes that “about two-thirds of the claims are now filed by the unimpaired, while in the past they were filed only by the manifestly ill.” Two-thirds of the complaints are

filed by people who are not even sick. Former Attorney General Griffin Bell, amongst many others, has denounced this type of “jackpot justice.”

There is broad support for a comprehensive solution, and I believe that our legislation is a major step in the right direction. I have been and will continue working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to resolve this issue. We need to ensure that the truly sick get paid, while providing stability to our economy by stemming the rampant litigation that has resulted in a tidal wave of bankruptcies, endangering jobs and pensions and health care and almost everything else that workers need in these companies. This crisis reaches far and wide, and it hurts everyone.

I am pretty pleased with what we have been able to accomplish to date. I have worked with all kinds of companies. I have worked with the unions. I have worked with some trial lawyers. And I have worked with insurance companies, reinsurers. You name them—they have been to Senator NELSON’s office and my office. And Senator NELSON has worked long and hard and diligently side by side with me to be able to come up with what we have right now, which is a pretty darn good package and a good bill.

I am proud of the product we are putting forth today, but we are not done. We know that. But we have made significant progress.

Let me tell you what this bill does. We pay victims faster. The FAIR Act creates a fair and efficient system to resolve claims of asbestos victims in a reasonable way that enables legitimate claimants to obtain recovery much faster and easier than the current system. A new specialized court will pay eligible claimants through a no-fault system within just a few months. Asbestos victims will no longer have to wait several years or more to be paid.

Our proposal will streamline the process and decrease the need for attorneys so that claimants will be able to retain more of their awards, without huge attorney’s fees or transaction costs. Transaction costs—most specifically, attorney’s fees—have drained essential resources in the current system, to the point where there will not be resources for those who are truly ill, unless we do this bill.

Non-sick claimants will no longer deplete resources that should pay the truly sick victims. In order to direct the resources to those most in need, the FAIR Act implements measured medical criteria and fair dollar values for claimants so that all those who are sick will be able to get compensation. The medical criteria are modeled on the 2002 Manville Trust Distribution Process. These standards were intensely negotiated with the plaintiff’s bar before they were enacted, and they represent a fair guideline for determining the respective diseases, and for

NOT VOTING—1

Kerry

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President shall be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 392

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have been working with the distinguished Democratic whip. There is a small matter that we wish to wrap up with a UC request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, but no later than June 27, the Senate proceed to a bill introduced by Senators REID and DORGAN on the subject of concurrent receipts, the text of which is at the desk, S. 392. I further ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order to the bill, and that there be 60 minutes equally divided for debate in the usual form. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of that time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of the bill, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we just got a call from the cloakroom, so I withhold my UC request and yield to the Senator from Utah. He has one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withheld.

The Senator from Utah.