

Leahy	Obama	Snowe
Lieberman	Pryor	Specter
Lott	Reid	Stevens
Lugar	Roberts	Sununu
Martinez	Rockefeller	Talent
McCain	Salazar	Thomas
McConnell	Santorum	Thune
Mikulski	Schumer	Vitter
Murkowski	Sessions	Voinovich
Nelson (FL)	Shelby	Warner
Nelson (NE)	Smith (OR)	Wyden

NAYS—18

Biden	Dorgan	Levin
Boxer	Feingold	Lincoln
Cantwell	Jeffords	Murray
Corzine	Kennedy	Reed
Dayton	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stabenow

NOT VOTING—1

Inouye

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 81, the nays are 18. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

NOMINATION OF PRISCILLA RICHMAN OWEN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I read from the King James version of the Holy Bible, from the 22nd chapter of Proverbs, the 28th verse:

Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set.

Mr. President, in his second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln observed that:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God give us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds. . . .

Mr. President, I have always believed that the Senate, by its nature, attracts and probably also creates men and women of the quality and character who are able to step up when faced with crises that threaten the ship of

state, to calm the dangerous seas which, from time to time, threaten to dash our Republic against rocky shoals and jagged shores.

The Senate proved it to be true again yesterday, when 14 Members—from both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats; 14 Members—of this revered institution came together to avert the disaster referred to as the “nuclear option” or the “constitutional option”—these men and women of great courage.

As William Gladstone said, in referring to the Senate of the United States, the Senate is that remarkable body, the most remarkable of all the inventions of modern politics.

I thank all of those Republicans and Democrats who worked together to keep faith with the Framers and the Founding Fathers. We have kept the faith with those whose collective vision gave us this marvelous piece of work, the Constitution of the United States. Thank God—thank God—that this work has been done and that it has been preserved, that a catastrophe has been averted.

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution gives to the President the power to nominate, and “by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate,” to “appoint . . . Judges of the supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States. . . .”

There are two parts to that phrase: the “advice” on the one hand, and the “consent” on the other, and both must be present before any President can appoint any nominee to the Supreme Court or any other Federal court. It is, therefore, a shared responsibility between the U.S. Senate and the President of the United States.

By its agreement yesterday, the Senate is keeping that construct alive, this shared responsibility between the President of the United States, on the one hand, and the Senate of the United States, on the other.

The agreement that was obtained yesterday by the cooperation between and among the 14 Members of the Senate—representing Republicans and Democrats—it was that agreement that reminds us of the words of our Constitution, by encouraging the President of the United States, on the one hand, to consult with the Senate of the United States, on the other. In other words, the Senate will be in on the takeoff, meaning prior to sending up his nominees for our consideration. In recent times—and by that I mean under Presidents of both parties—there has not been all that much consultation by the President with the Senate.

So here we are, in the Senate, offering the hand of partnership to the Chief Executive and saying: Consult with us. That is what the Framers intended, that the President of the United States should consult with the Senate. You don't have to take our ad-

vice, but here it is. And by considering that advice, it only stands to reason that any President will be more assured that his nominees will enjoy a kinder reception in the Senate.

The agreement, which references the need for “advice and consent,” as contained in the Constitution, proves once again, as has been true for over 200 years, that our revered Constitution is not simply a dry piece of parchment. It is a living document.

Yesterday's agreement was a real-life illustration of how this historical document continues to be vital in our daily lives. It inspires, it teaches, and yesterday it helped the country and the Senate avoid a serious catastrophe.

Mr. President, for this reason and others, I ask that at the end of my remarks the agreement reached by the 14 Senators be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do this so that we in the Senate and the President may all have a way of easily revisiting the text of that agreement for future reference.

On the heels of this agreement, I believe that we should now move forward, propelled by its positive energy, in a new direction. We should make every effort to restore reason to the politically partisan fervor that has overtaken our Senate, this city, and our country. We must stop arguing and start legislating.

Divisive political agendas are not America's goals. The right course lies someplace in the middle. It is our job to work as elected representatives of a reasonable people to do what is right, regardless of threats from any of the angry groups that seem dedicated to intimidation. The skeptics, the cynics, the doubters, the Pharisees, those who are intoxicated by the juice of sour grapes did not prevail and must not prevail. The 14 Republican and Democratic Senators rose above those who do not wish to see accord but prefer discord.

Chaucer's “Canterbury Tales”—we have all read Chaucer's “Canterbury Tales” in high school—contains “The Pardoner's Tale.”

The story tells about the journey by the pilgrims to Canterbury, to the shrine of Canterbury. The scene took place in Flanders, where once there sat drinking in a tavern three young men who were much given to folly. As they sat, they heard a small bell clink before a corpse that was being carried to the grave. Whereupon, one of the three called to his knave and ordered him to go and find out the name of the corpse that was passing by.

The boy answered that he already knew and that it was an old comrade of the roisterers who had been slain, while drunk, by an unseen thief called “Death,” who had slain others in recent days.

And so out into the road the three young ruffians went in search of this monster called Death. They came upon an old man and seized him, and with rough language they demanded that he tell them where they could find this cowardly adversary who was taking the lives of their good friends around the countryside.

The old man pointed to a great oak tree on a nearby knoll, saying, "There, under that tree you will find Death," that monster. In a drunken rage, the three roisterers set off in a run until they came to the tree, and there they found a pile of gold—eight basketfuls of florins, newly minted, round, gold coins. Forgotten was the monster called Death, as the three pondered their good fortune. And they decided that they should remain with the gold until nightfall, when they would divide it among themselves and take it to their respective homes. It would be unsafe, they reasoned, to attempt to do so in broad daylight, as they might be fallen upon by thieves who would take their treasure from them.

It was proposed that the three draw straws, and the person who drew the shortest straw would go into the nearby village and purchase some bread and wine and cheese, which they could then enjoy as they whiled away the daylight hours. So off toward the village the young man who drew the shortest straw went. When he was out of sight, the remaining two decided that there was no good reason why this fortune, this pile of gold, should be divided among three individuals. So one of them said to the other, "When he returns, you throw your arm around him as if in good sport, as in jest, and I will rive him with my dagger, and with your dagger, you can do the same. Then all of this gold will be divided not among three of us but just between two of us—you and me."

Meanwhile, while the two were planning the demise of the third, the youngest rogue, as he made his way into the town, thought to himself what a shame it would be that the gold would be divided among three, when it just as well could be so easily belong only to the ownership of one, himself. Therefore, in town the young man went directly to an apothecary and asked to be sold some poison for the large rats and a polecat that had been killing his chickens. The apothecary—the pharmacist—quickly provided some poison, saying that as much as equaled only a tiny grain of wheat would result immediately in sudden death for the creature that drank the mixture.

Having purchased the poison, the young villain crossed the street to a winery, where he purchased three bottles—two for his friends, one for himself. After he left the village, he sat down, opened two bottles of wine and deposited an equal portion in each, and then returned to the oak tree, where

the two older villains did as they had planned. One threw his arm, as if in jest, around the shoulders of the third, and both buried their daggers in him. He fell dead on the pile of gold. The other two villains then sat down, broke the bread, cut the cheese, and opened the two bottles of wine. Each took a good, deep swallow, and then, suffering a most excruciating pain, both fell dead upon the pile of gold and upon the body of the third. So there they were across the pile of gold, all three of them dead.

Their avarice, their greed for gain, their love of material things had destroyed them. There is a lesson here in Chaucer's *Tales*, as given to us by "The Pardoner." The strong temptation for political partisanship that has prevailed in the Senate can tear this Senate apart and can tear the Nation apart and confront all of us with destruction, so that in the end we three—the President, the Senate, and the people—will all be destroyed, as it were.

So we almost saw that happen here on the Senate floor—until yesterday, when that catastrophe, looming as it was before the Senate, was averted. I applaud the fact that the center, the anchor, held, and we stood together for the good of the country against mean-spirited, shallow, political ends.

Mr. President, I implore all of us to endeavor to lift our eyes to the higher things. We can perform some much needed healing on the body politic. If we can come together in a dignified way to orderly and expeditiously move forward on these nominations, perhaps we can yet salvage a bit of respect and trust from the American people for all of us, for the Senate, and for our institutions of free government.

We have a duty, at this critical time, to rise above politics as usual, in which we savage one another, and in so doing, destroy ourselves, like the three villains in "The Pardoner's Tale."

Let us put the Nation first. The American people want us to do that. In the long run, that is how we will be judged and, more importantly, it is how the Senate will be judged.

It is easy to tear down; it is difficult to build.

I saw them tearing a building down,

A group of men in a busy town.

With a "Ho, Heave, Ho and a lusty yell,

They swung a beam and the sidewall fell.

I said to the foreman, "Are these men skilled?"

The type you would hire if you had to build."

He laughed, and then he said, "No indeed,

Just common labor is all I need;

I can easily erect in a day or two,

That which takes builders years to do."

I said to myself as I walked away,

"Which of these roles am I trying to play?

Am I a builder who works with care,

Building my life by the rule and square?

Am I shaping my deeds by well-laid plan,

Patiently building the best I can?

Or am I a wrecker who walks the town

Content with the labor of tearing down."

Mr. President, it is easy to tear down, but it takes a long time to build. We have been 217 years in building this Senate, making it what it was intended to be by the Framers who wrote it 219 years ago, who established three equal coordinate branches of Government, who established a separation of powers, who established checks and balances in this Constitution of the United States.

The work of those Framers and the work of the larger group of Founders took 219 years. It was about to be destroyed in a single day, this day. But thank God 14 Senators from both sides of the aisle met and rose above partisan politics and kept the faith with the Framers and with the Founders so that our posterity might enjoy the blessings of liberty, the blessings of freedom of speech, the roots of which go all the way back to the reign of Henry IV, who reigned from 1399 to 1413 and who in 1407 proclaimed that the members of Parliament—the House of Lords and the House of Commons—could speak freely and without fear.

And those words were written into the Declaration of Rights, which declaration was submitted to William III of Orange and Mary, a Declaration of Rights which included freedom of speech in Parliament. That declaration was presented on February 13, 1689, to William III and Mary. They both accepted it and were then proclaimed by the House of Commons joint sovereigns of the nation.

Then, on December 18, 1689, those words were included in a statute, the English Bill of Rights—freedom of speech, the roots going back a long way. That freedom of speech then was provided to those of us in the Senate, provided by the Constitution, and since 1806, when the provision for the previous question was discarded upon the recommendation of Vice President Aaron Burr, since 1806 that provision for the previous question or the sudden cutting off debate was discarded. Since 1806, until the year 1917, the year in which I was born during the administration of Woodrow Wilson, that freedom of speech has prevailed in the Senate, and it has lived since then except for unanimous consent agreements and the cloture provision which was first agreed to in 1917, the cloture provision shutting off debate under the rules of the Senate.

Freedom of speech has reigned in this body, and it still lives, thanks again to the 14 Republicans and Democrats who rose above politics yesterday and came forward with this accord.

So, Mr. President, let us be true to the faith of our fathers and to the expectation of those who founded this Republic. The coming days will test us again and again, but let us go forward together hoping that in the end, the Senate will be perceived as having stood the test, and may we, both Republicans and Democrats and Independents, when our work is done, be judged

by the American people and by the pages of history as having done our duty and as having done it well.

Our supreme duty is not to any particular person, not to any particular President, not to any political party, but to the Constitution, to the people of the Nation, and to the future of this Republic. It is in that spirit that we may do well to remember the words of Benjamin Hill, a great Senator, a great orator from the State of Georgia, his words being inscribed on a statue in Atlanta, GA, as they are and as they appear today upon that monument:

Who saves his country saves himself, saves all things, and all things saved do bless him. Who let's his country die dies himself ignobly, and all things dying curse him.

Remember that ancient proverb: Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set.

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

EXHIBIT 1

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

We respect the diligent, conscientious efforts, to date, rendered to the Senate by Majority Leader Frist and Democratic Leader Reid. This memorandum confirms an understanding among the signatories, based upon mutual trust and confidence, related to pending and future judicial nominations in the 109th Congress.

This memorandum is in two parts. Part I relates to the currently pending judicial nominations; Part II relates to subsequent individual nominations to be made by the President and to be acted upon by the Senate's Judiciary Committee.

We have agreed to the following:

PART I: COMMITMENTS ON PENDING JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

A. Votes for Certain Nominees. We will vote to invoke cloture on the following judicial nominees: Janice Rogers Brown (D.C. Circuit), William Pryor (11th Circuit), and Priscilla Owen (5th Circuit).

B. Status of Other Nominees. Signatories make no commitment to vote for or against cloture on the following judicial nominees: William Myers (9th Circuit) and Henry Saad (6th Circuit).

PART II: COMMITMENTS FOR FUTURE NOMINATIONS

A. Future Nominations. Signatories will exercise their responsibilities under the Advice and Consent Clause of the United States Constitution in good faith. Nominees should only be filibustered under extraordinary circumstances, and each signatory must use his or her own discretion and judgment in determining whether such circumstances exist.

B. Rules Changes. In light of the spirit and continuing commitments made in this agreement, we commit to oppose the rules changes in the 109th Congress, which we understand to be any amendment to or interpretation of the Rules of the Senate that would force a vote on a judicial nomination by means other than unanimous consent or Rule XXII.

We believe that, under Article II, Section 2, of the United States Constitution, the word "Advice" speaks to consultation between the Senate and the President with regard to the use of the President's power to make nominations. We encourage the Executive branch of government to consult with

members of the Senate, both Democratic and Republican, prior to submitting a judicial nomination to the Senate for consideration.

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

We firmly believe this agreement is consistent with the traditions of the United States Senate that we as Senators seek to uphold.

E. Benjamin Nelson, Mike DeWine, Joe Lieberman, Susan Collins, Mark Pryor, Lindsey Graham, Lincoln Chafee, John McCain, John Warner, Robert C. Byrd, Mary Landrieu, Olympia Snowe, Ken Salazar, and Daniel Inouye.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the time I consume come out of my time postcloture.

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

RETIREMENT OF COLONEL RUSS HOWARD, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of Colonel Russ Howard, head of the department of social sciences and director of the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point. Colonel Howard is retiring June 3, 2005, after 37 years of Active and Reserve military service.

In his previous position, he was the deputy department head of the department of social sciences. Prior to that, Colonel Howard was an Army chief of staff fellow at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University. Formerly, Colonel Howard was the commander of the 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne) at Fort Lewis, WA. Other recent assignments include assistant to the Special Representative to the Secretary General during UNOSOM II in Somalia, deputy chief of staff for I Corps, and chief of staff and deputy commander for the Combined Joint Task force, Haiti/Haitian Advisory Group. He also served as the administrative assistant to ADM Stansfield Turner and as a special assistant to the commander of SOUTHCOM.

When Colonel Howard was commander of 3rd Battalion, 1st Special Warfare Training Group (Airborne) at Fort Bragg, NC, he developed the curriculum for the first ever graduate degree program for the Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations officers.

Prior to Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, Colonel Howard took a

mobile training team to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia to train the "lost boys," newly appointed Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations officers already deployed to the Persian Gulf.

The newly trained officers performed superbly during operations and 3rd Battalion won the Army Superior Unit Award, largely due to the efforts and foresight of Colonel Howard.

As a newly commissioned officer, a much younger officer, Colonel Howard served as "A" team commander in the 7th Special Forces Group from 1970 to 1972.

He left the Active component and served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1972 to 1980. During this period, he served as an overseas manager, American International Underwriters Melbourne, Australia, and China tour manager and Canadian Pacific Airlines.

He was recalled to active duty in 1980 and served initially in Korea as an infantry company commander. Subsequent assignments included classified project officer, U.S. Army 1st Special Operations Command at Fort Bragg, and operations officer and company commander 1st Battalion, 1st Special Forces Group in Okinawa, Japan.

Colonel Howard earned a bachelor of science degree in industrial management from San Jose State University, bachelor of arts degree in Asian studies from the University of Maryland, a master of arts degree in international management from the Monterey Institute of International Studies, and a masters of public administration degree from Harvard University.

Colonel Howard was an assistant professor of social sciences at the U.S. Military Academy and a senior service college fellow at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University.

During his extraordinary career of public service, Colonel Russ Howard was a dedicated leader, enlightened visionary, effective operator, and exemplary role model for cadets, soldiers, and civilians.

For the past 7 years, he made enormous contributions to the U.S. Military Academy, its graduates, and to the Nation through his relentless pursuits of excellence in the department of social sciences and his advancement of education, research, and policy development in the global war on terror.

He was the right person at the right time in exactly the right job as the Academy and the Nation responded to the events of 9/11 and the global war on terror. Building on his extraordinary skills as a researcher and educator, he knew the intellectual response to the war on terror would have to be as significant as the operational response and set a course for the department and the Academy to lead this response.

Building on an exceptional experience as a Special Forces officer who commanded at every level from team leader to Special Forces Group, he was

able to integrate the intellectual issues of understanding terrorism with the practical issues of countering terrorism and include them in the curriculum, and eventually led to the establishment of the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point.

He inspired support from the academy leadership, from General-retired Wayne Downing, Mr. Vinnie Viola, Mr. Ross Perot, and many others, so that the U.S. Military Academy has become the international leader in undergraduate terrorism education and research.

Simultaneously, Colonel Howard enhanced all aspects of the academy and the Department of Social Sciences by supporting a robust teaching program. He taught more than 15 different courses, created 4 new ones, published 3 books and 15 articles, and encouraged and cultivated resources for other faculty to follow his example.

His support for faculty and cadet development through the scholarship, debate, model U.N., domestic affairs forum, finance forum, sports, and a myriad of other activities was exceptional. Most importantly, he is a trusted, caring, concerned, and dedicated leader who evokes the best from everybody with whom he comes in contact.

It has been my privilege to know Colonel Howard for many years, to respect him as a soldier and a scholar, and to at this moment congratulate him on a career of exceptional service to the Army and to the Nation. As he parts for other venues and other responsibilities, I wish him well.

I yield back my time, and 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. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to speak about an issue that has been worked on in the country for some period of time. Soon, a House vote will take place on embryonic stem cell research. The issue that will soon be voted on in the House—and may come before this body—is whether to allow the taxpayer funding of destruction of young human life.

This legislation being considered in the House of Representatives would take young human embryos, would provide taxpayer dollars to destroy these embryos and conduct research on the stem cells derived from them. I believe we all have a duty to protect innocent life. We have a duty and a responsibility to look out for the downtrodden, those who do not have a voice. These are the youngest of human lives; they should be protected, and they should not be researched on.

We have at times in the past in the United States researched on other human beings. Whenever we have done so, at the moment in time when it was done, people did it on the basis that we need to know, or we need to be able to conduct this research, or this research will provide a cure for something. Yet in every instance—either in this country or others—when it has been done and the society at large has allowed it, we have always, always regretted it later. It has always been wrong for one group of humans who are in a more powerful position to research on somebody in a lesser position. That has always been true, and it remains true today. We should not use taxpayer dollars to fund research on the youngest of human lives. It is wrong, it is not necessary, and it should be stopped.

I am pleased that the President has promised to veto this legislation. However, I also intend to not let this piece of legislation make it forward, to move to the President's desk. If others choose to bring this destruction of human life—taxpayer-funded destruction of human life—in front of this body, I intend that we are going to talk about it for a long time and address a whole series of issues, whether it be human cloning, which is associated with this human destructive legislation, or the creation of human-animal crosses for research purposes. We are going to spend a lot of time discussing this because young human lives are at stake. I will not sit idly by and acquiesce in their tragic destruction.

If this human destructive legislation, or a Senate counterpart, comes before this body, I will use all means available to impede its progress. At the very least, we should have a lengthy debate on this issue before taking any action. The reason is that young human lives are at stake. I believe the very nature of our culture—whether we will have a culture of life or not is at stake. Will we honor human life because it is sacred per se, or are we going to use it for a research apparatus for the benefit of others? We have always regretted that when we have done it before. Today is a similar type of discussion.

Some are saying this doesn't really look like a human life; it is so small, so microscopic in some cases, that some say it really cannot be human life. Yet, according to the biological and scientific definition, this is young human life. If allowed to be nurtured, it becomes you, me, or anybody watching. Life has to be nurtured at all stages. It is no different biologically at that stage versus at a later stage. It has the same biological components, or "software," if you will, or DNA structure. It needs to be nurtured, and it matures into an adult human. If we are going to proceed on this, I think we are really hurting ourselves as a society.

I also point out that some people are saying we need to do this to find cures.

I want to find cures, also—cures for people with cancer, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injuries, or juvenile diabetes—and I have been working on that. The thing is, we have a route to find these cures that is ethical and moral.

The House is also considering a cord blood bill from Congressman SMITH today, and there are also adult stem cells. We have had this discussion before, but I think people hear "stem cells," and they say: I am for it. We need to be clear that there are different types of stem cells: There are cord blood stem cells in the umbilical cord, there are embryonic stem cells, where you have to destroy the embryo itself to get the stem cells, and there are adult stem cells in my body and yours and anybody watching. These adult stem cells are a kind of repair cell that goes around the body fixing different parts of the body. We have been able to take adult stem cells out and grow them outside the body to the point that, today, over 58 different human diseases are being treated in human patients. There are published clinical studies using adult stem cells—the stem cells from one's own body.

A Parkinson's disease patient, treated with his own adult stem cells, continues to exhibit relief of 80 percent of his symptoms more than 6 years after the surgery. I had the man come in himself, who was treated with his own adult stem cells taken from the base of his nose, grown outside the body, put in the left-hand side of his brain, with a substantial improvement on the right-hand side of his body. That is purely ethical research. It is working and getting the job done.

Spinal cord injuries. Dr. Carlos Limas treated 34 patients in Portugal with their own adult stem cells. I had two of them in to testify at a hearing last year—one is a paraplegic and one is a quadriplegic—and they are walking with the assistance of braces and their own adult stem cells.

Also, umbilical cord blood cells were used to treat a South Korean woman who had been paralyzed for 19 years. She had not walked for 19 years, and she can now walk with braces.

What about juvenile diabetes? This disease affects a lot of people. This is one that has vexed a lot of people. We all want to find a cure for juvenile diabetes.

Dr. Denise Faustman at Harvard is a leading diabetes researcher. She has completely reversed end-stage juvenile diabetes in mice and has FDA approval to begin human clinical trials using adult stem cell therapy.

My point in mentioning these 3 of the 58 different areas is that we have an ethical answer. We have an answer that does not involve the destruction of human life, and it is right before us. We can do it. We can fund it, and we can move forward with it. We do not

have to destroy young human life to do this, and it is wrong if we do.

There is going to be a big discussion. We are going to have a lot of debate about this issue on the floor or in committee or other places if people decide to move this legislation forward. This is not about banning human embryonic stem cell research. This is about taxpayer funding of human embryonic stem cell research. Embryonic stem cell research is legal. It is being conducted in this country. It is being funded by the Government of the United States on a limited set of lines. The President had the discussion and put forward the guidelines—a limited set of lines that were identified, on which a life-and-death decision had already been made prior to funding. That research continues and goes on today.

The House bill would expand that and say we can kill young human life today for research on embryonic stem cells, and we want to do it with taxpayer funding. That is what I am saying I am opposed to is the taxpayer funding where a life-and-death decision has not been made, and we involve the destruction of young human lives. The House bill should not move forward.

Mr. President, there are two statements that the President has put forward saying that he would veto such legislation if it comes forward. I ask unanimous consent to print these statements in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY—MAY 24, 2005

H.R. 2520—STEM CELL THERAPEUTIC AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2005

(Rep. Smith (R) NJ and 78 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 2520, which would facilitate the use of umbilical-cord-blood stem cells in biomedical research and in the treatment of disease. Cord-blood stem cells, collected from the placenta and umbilical cord after birth without doing harm to mother or child, have been used in the treatment of thousands of patients suffering from more than 60 different diseases, including leukemia, Fanconi anemia, sickle cell disease, and thalassemia. Researchers also believe cord-blood stem cells may have the capacity to be differentiated into other cell types, making them useful in the exploration of ethical stem cell therapies for regenerative medicine.

H.R. 2520 would increase the publicly available inventory of cord-blood stem cells by enabling the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to contract with cord-blood banks to assist them in the collection and maintenance of 150,000 cord-blood stem cell units. This would make matched cells available to treat more than 90 percent of patients in need. The bill would also link all participating cord-blood banks to a search network operated under contract with HHS, allowing physicians to search for matches for their patients quickly and effectively in one place. The bill also would reauthorize a similar program already in place for aiding the use of adult bone marrow in

medical care. There is now \$19 million available to implement the Cord Blood Cell Bank program; the Administration will work with the Congress to evaluate future spending requirements for these activities. The bill is also consistent with the recommendation from the National Academy of Science to create a National Cord Blood Stem Cell Bank program.

The Administration also applauds the bill's effort to facilitate research into the potential of cord-blood stem cells to advance regenerative medicine in an ethical way. Some research indicates that cord blood cells may have the ability to be differentiated into other cell types, in ways similar to embryonic stem cells, and so present similar potential uses but without raising the ethical problems involved in the intentional destruction of human embryos. The Administration encourages efforts to seek ethical ways to pursue stem cell research, and believes that—with the appropriate combination of responsible policies and innovative scientific techniques—this field of research can advance without violating important ethical boundaries. HR 2520 is an important step in that direction.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY—MAY 24, 2005

H.R. 810—STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

(Rep. Castle (R) DE and 200 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 810, which would require Federal taxpayer dollars to be used to encourage the ongoing destruction of nascent human life. The bill would compel all American taxpayers to pay for research that relies on the intentional destruction of human embryos for the derivation of stem cells, overturning the President's policy that supports research without promoting such ongoing destruction. If H.R. 810 were presented to the President, he would veto the bill.

The President strongly supports medical research, and worked with Congress to dramatically increase resources for the National Institutes of Health. However, this bill would support and encourage a line of research that requires the intentional destruction of living human embryos for the derivation of their cells. Destroying nascent human life for research raises serious ethical problems, and many millions of Americans consider the practice immoral.

The Administration believes that government has a duty to use the people's money responsibly, both supporting important public purposes and respecting moral boundaries. Every year since 1995, Congress has on a bipartisan basis upheld this balance by prohibiting Federal funds for research in which an embryo is destroyed. Consistent with this provision, the President's policy permits the funding of research using embryonic cell lines created prior to August 9, 2001, along with stem cell research using other kinds of cell lines. Scientists can therefore explore the potential application of such cells, but the Federal government does not offer incentives or encouragement for the destruction of nascent human life.

H.R. 810 seeks to replace that policy with one that offers very little additional practical support to the research, while using Federal dollars to offer a prospective incentive for the destruction of human embryos. Moreover, H.R. 810 relies on unsupported scientific assertions to promote morally troubling and socially controversial research. Embryonic stem cell research is at an early

stage of basic science, and has never yielded a therapeutic application in humans. It is too early to say if a treatment or a cure will develop from embryonic stem cell research.

The Administration believes that the availability of alternative sources of stem cells further counters the case for compelling the American taxpayer to encourage the ongoing destruction of human embryos for research. Researchers are continually exploring alternative ways to derive pluripotent stem cells. And alternative types of human stem cells—drawn from adults, children, and umbilical-cord blood without doing harm to the donors—have already achieved therapeutic results in thousands of patients with dozens of different diseases.

Moreover, private sector support and public funding by several States for this line of research, which will add up to several billion dollars in the coming few years, argues against any urgent need for an additional infusion of Federal funds which, even if completely unrestricted, would not approach such figures. Whatever one's view of the ethical issues or the state of the research, the future of this field does not require a policy of Federal subsidies offensive to the moral principles of millions of Americans.

H.R. 810 advances the proposition that the Nation must choose between science and ethics. The Administration, however, believes it is possible to advance scientific research without violating ethical principles: both by enacting the appropriate policy safeguards and by pursuing the appropriate scientific techniques. HR 810 is seriously flawed legislation that would undo those safeguards and provide a disincentive to pursuing those techniques.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, we will have much discussion of this issue if it comes before this body. I am going to be working aggressively with a number of individuals to see that we continue this stem cell work in an ethical manner, but not where it involves the destruction of human life.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I voted no on cloture, and I will vote no on the nomination of Priscilla Owen to be a judge on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit Court. I would like to take a few minutes today to explain my votes. I also would like to make a few comments on the events that led up to these votes.

I strongly oppose the threat of the nuclear option. I believe this was an illegitimate tactic, a partisan abuse of power that was a threat to the Senate as an institution and to the country. Attempting to blackmail the minority into giving up their rights that have been part of the Senate's traditions and practices for centuries was a new low for a majority that has repeatedly been willing to put party over principle. Unfortunately, the blackmail

was partially successful. While I do applaud the efforts of the Senators who worked hard to broker an agreement, the end result is that three nominees who do not deserve lifetime appointments to the judiciary will now be confirmed.

The agreement reached by our colleagues states that filibusters should be reserved for extraordinary circumstances. For me, that has always been the test. I think Democrats have stuck to that standard in blocking just 10—just 10—out of the 218 nominations of President Bush that have been brought to the floor. A number of very conservative and very controversial nominees have been confirmed by the Senate. Jeffrey Sutton, now a judge on the Sixth Circuit, was confirmed by a vote of 52 to 41. No filibuster was used there. Jay Bybee, the author of the infamous torture memo, now sits on the Ninth Circuit. He was not filibustered. Michael McConnell, a very conservative and anti-choice law professor, often mentioned as a possible Supreme Court nominee, was confirmed for the Tenth Circuit. He was not filibustered. Dennis Shedd was confirmed to the Fourth Circuit by a vote of 55 to 44. He could have been filibustered, but he was not filibustered.

The idea that the filibuster has been used over the past several years as a tool to block all the nominees that the minority opposed is ludicrous. There were, and there continue to be, very good reasons to block a certain small number of nominees. Nothing that occurred last night changed that one iota. I will continue to vote against cloture only in extraordinary circumstances. I did that when we voted on cloture on the Owen nomination in 2003 and each subsequent time, and I have done that again today. For the majority to have created this constitutional crisis over what came down to five nominees was wrong, was an abuse of power. The American people did not support it, and I do not think they will support it in the future.

With respect to the Owen nomination, there are a number of factors that I believe require us to give this nomination very careful consideration. First, we should consider that judges on our courts of appeal have an enormous influence on the law. Whereas, decisions of the district courts are always subject to appellate review, the decisions of the courts of appeals are only subject to discretionary review by the Supreme Court. The decisions of the courts of appeal are, in almost all cases, final, as the Supreme Court agrees to hear only a very small percentage of the cases on which its views are sought. That means that the scrutiny we give to circuit court nominees must be greater than that we give to district court nominees. And then, of course, the scrutiny we give to Supreme Court nominees will even be greater.

Another important consideration is the ideological balance of the Fifth Circuit. The Fifth Circuit is comprised of Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The Fifth Circuit contains the highest percentage of minority residents, over 40 percent of any circuit other than the DC Circuit. It is a court that, during the civil rights era, issued some of the most significant decisions supporting the rights of African-American citizens to participate as full members of our society.

As someone who believes strongly in freedom, liberty, and equal justice under law and the important role of the Federal courts to defend these fundamental American principles, I am especially concerned about the makeup of our circuit courts and their approaches to civil rights issues.

Even after 8 years of a Democratic President, the Fifth Circuit had twice as many Republican appointees as Democratic appointees. That is because during the last 6 years of the Clinton administration, the Judiciary Committee did not report out a single judge to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. As we all know, that was not for a lack of nominees to consider. President Clinton nominated three well-qualified lawyers to the Fifth Circuit—Jorge Rangel, Enrique Moreno, and Alston Johnson. None of these nominees even received a hearing before the committee.

Then-Chairman LEAHY held a hearing in July 2001 on the nomination of Judge Edith Brown Clement for a seat on the Fifth Circuit only a few months after she was nominated and less than 2 months after Democrats took control of the Senate. It was the first hearing in the Judiciary Committee for a Fifth Circuit nominee since September 1994. And Judge Clement, of course, was confirmed later in the year.

The fact is, there is a history here and a special burden on President Bush to consult with our side on nominees for this circuit; otherwise, we will be simply rewarding the obstructionism that the President's party engaged in over the last 6 years of the Clinton administration by allowing him to fill, with his choices, seats that his party held open for years, even when qualified nominees were advanced by President Clinton.

I say, once again, my colleagues on the Republican side bear some responsibility for this situation. There was a time when I thought they might help resolve it by urging the administration to address the Senate's failure to take up Clinton nominees. This entire controversy over judges that has come to a head over the last several weeks could have been avoided if our Republican colleagues had convinced the President to renominate even a few of those Clinton nominees who never received a hearing or vote in the committee, including nominees to the

Fifth Circuit. But, of course, that did not happen. There was no effort to reach a real compromise to take into account the concerns of all parties.

A compromise at the point of a gun is not a compromise. That, I'm afraid, is what we had last night.

With that background, let me outline the concerns that have caused me to reach the conclusion that Justice Owen should not be confirmed.

Justice Owen has had a successful legal career. She graduated at the top of her class from Baylor University Law School, worked as an associate and partner at the law firm of Andrews and Kurth in Houston, and has served on the Texas Supreme Court since January 1995. These are great accomplishments.

But Justice Owen's record as a member of the Texas Supreme Court leads me to conclude that she is not the right person for a position on the Fifth Circuit. I am not convinced that Justice Owen will put aside her personal views and ensure that all litigants before her on the Fifth Circuit received a fair hearing. Her decisions in cases involving consumers' rights, worker's rights, and reproductive rights suggest that she would be unable to maintain an open mind and provide all litigants a fair and impartial hearing.

Justice Owen has a disturbing record of consistently siding against consumers or victims of personal injury and in favor of business and insurance companies. When the Texas Supreme Court, which is a very conservative and pro-business court, rules in favor of consumers or victims of personal injury, Justice Owen frequently dissents. According to Texas Watch, during the period 1999 to 2002, Justice Owen dissented almost 40 percent of the time in cases in which a consumer prevailed. But in cases where the consumer position did not succeed, Justice Owen never dissented.

At her first hearing, Senator KENNEDY and then-Senator Edwards asked Justice Owen to cite cases in which she dissented from the majority and sided in favor of consumers. Justice Owen could cite only one case, *Saenz v. Fidelity Guaranty Insurance Underwriters*. But Justice Owen's opinion in this case hardly took a pro-consumer position since it still would have deprived the plaintiff of the entire jury verdict. She did not join Justice Spector's dissent, which would have upheld the jury verdict in favor of Ms. Saenz.

Also during that first hearing, Senators FEINSTEIN and DURBIN questioned Justice Owen about *Provident American Ins. Co. v. Castaneda*. In that case, the plaintiff sought damages against a health insurer for denying health care benefits, after the insurer had already provided pre-operative approval for the surgery. Justice Owen, writing for the majority, reversed the jury's verdict in

favor of the plaintiff and rejected the plaintiff's claim that the health insurer violated the Texas Insurance Code and the Deceptive Trade Practices Act. At the hearing, Justice Owen defended her opinion by saying that she believed that the plaintiff was seeking extra-contractual damages and that the plaintiff had already received full coverage under the policy and statutory penalties. But, in the words of her colleague, Justice Raul Gonzalez, who wrote a dissent, Justice Owen's opinion "may very well eviscerate the bad-faith tort as a viable case of action in Texas." The cause of action for bad faith is designed to deter insurers from engaging in bad faith practices like denying coverage in the first place.

In addition, with respect to several decisions involving interpretation and application of the Texas parental notification law, I am deeply troubled by Justice Owen's apparently ignoring the plain meaning of the statute and injecting her personal beliefs concerning abortion that have no basis in Texas or U.S. Supreme Court law. In 2000, the Texas legislature enacted a parental notification law that allows a minor to obtain an abortion without notification of her parents if she demonstrates to a court that she has complied with one of three "judicial bypass" provisions: (1) that she is "mature and sufficiently well informed" to make the decision without notification to either of her parents; (2) that notification would not be in her best interest; or (3) that notification may lead to her physical, sexual, or emotional abuse.

During Justice Owen's first confirmation hearing, Senator CANTWELL questioned Justice Owen about her positions in cases interpreting this law, focusing on Justice Owen's insistence in *In re Jane Doe*. In that case, a teenager is required to consider "philosophic, social, moral, and religious" arguments before seeking an abortion. In her opinion, Justice Owen cited the Supreme Court's decision in *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey* to support her contention that States can require minors to consider religious views in their decision to have an abortion. But, as Senator CANTWELL noted, *Casey* in no way authorizes States to require minors to consider religious arguments in their decision on whether to have an abortion. Upon this further questioning, Justice Owen then said that she was referring to another Supreme Court case, *H.L. v. Matheson*, even though her opinion only cited *Casey* for this proposition. And even *Matheson* does not say that minors can be required by State law to consider religious arguments. It is my view that Justice Owen was going beyond not only a plain reading of the Texas statute, but Supreme Court case law, and inappropriately injecting her own personal views to make it more difficult for a minor to comply

with the statute and obtain an abortion.

I was also not satisfied with Justice Owen's responses to my questions about bonuses to Texas Supreme Court law clerks. I asked her at the hearing whether she saw any ethical concerns with allowing law clerks to receive bonuses from their prospective employers during their clerkships. I also explored the topic further with her in followup written questions. Justice Owen stated repeatedly in her written responses to my questions that she is not aware of law clerks actually receiving bonuses while they were employed by the court. She reaffirmed that testimony in her second hearing. This seems implausible given the great amount of publicity given to Ian investigation pursued by the Travis County attorney of exactly that practice and the well publicized modifications to the Texas Supreme Court's rules that resulted from that investigation and the accompanying controversy.

Even more disturbing, Justice Owen took the position, both at the first hearing and in her responses to written questions, that because the Texas Supreme Court Code of Conduct requires law clerks to recuse themselves from matters involving their prospective employers, there really is no ethical concern raised by law clerks accepting bonuses while employed with the court. I disagree. It is not sufficient for law clerks to recuse themselves from matters involving their prospective employers if they have received thousands of dollars in bonuses while they are working for the court. The appearance of impropriety and unfairness that such a situation creates is untenable. As I understand it, the Federal courts have long prohibited Federal law clerks both from receiving bonuses during their clerkships and from working on cases involving their prospective employers. I am pleased that the Texas Supreme Court finally recognized this ethical problem and changed its code of conduct for clerks. Justice Owen, in contrast, seems intent on defending the prior, indefensible, practice.

Finally, I want to note the unusual nature of this particular nomination. Unlike so many nominees during the Clinton years, Justice Owen was considered in the Judiciary Committee under Senator LEAHY's leadership in 2002. She had a hearing, and she had a vote. Her nomination was rejected. This has been the first time in history that a circuit nominee who was formally rejected by the committee, or the full Senate for that matter, has been renominated by the same President to the same position. I do not believe that defeated judicial nominations should be reconsidered like legislation that is not enacted. After all, legislation can be revisited after it is enacted. If Congress makes a mistake when it passes a law, it can fix that

mistake in subsequent legislation. Let us all remember that judicial appointments are for life. Confirmations cannot be taken back or fixed. A vote to confirm a nominee is final. A vote to reject that nominee should be final as well. For the President to renominate a defeated nominee and the Senate to reconsider her simply because of the change of a few seats in an election cheapens the nomination process and the Senate's constitutional role in that process.

I believe Justice Owen is bright and accomplished, but I sincerely believe that based on her judicial record, Justice Owen is not the right choice for this position.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I discuss the nomination of Priscilla Owen to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, and to briefly discuss the compromise before us on the so-called nuclear option.

I continue to oppose all three of the nominees that will proceed to up-or-down votes as the result of this compromise, and I will be voting against cloture on Priscilla Owen as a result. But I do acknowledge the importance of preserving the process of debating judicial nominees. I do not feel that the filibuster has been misused with regard to President Bush's nominees, as I'll explain shortly, but I am impressed at the efforts of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to avoid the all-or-nothing nuclear option vote that threatened to cause us to break down as an institution.

I also express my hope that the term "extraordinary circumstances" that is in this compromise is interpreted sensibly. When extreme nominees threaten the balance of our federal courts, I view those as extraordinary circumstances. I will continue to vote to block any nominee who is not suitable for the bench, and it will continue to be an unusual exception for me not to support a nominee. My standard has been extraordinary circumstances all along.

As a former member of the Judiciary Committee, I attended a hearing on Priscilla Owen that lasted a full day. During that hearing, Owen's record showed a particular disregard for precedent and the plain rule of law.

Anyone who walks into a courtroom as a plaintiff or a defendant in this country should do so having the full confidence that there is impartiality on the part of the judge on the bench. They should have total confidence that the rule of law will be followed, and believe the issues will be judged on their merits rather than viewed through the prism of an individual judge's personal values or beliefs.

There is reason to be concerned about the record of Priscilla Owen. Time after time, even her own Republican colleagues, on a predominantly Republican Texas Supreme Court

bench, criticized her for failing to follow precedent or interpreting statutes in ways that ignore the clear intent of the law.

What some of Owen's colleagues on the bench have said about her opinions I think is important. In a case dealing with a developer seeking to evade Austin's clean water laws, her dissent was called "nothing more than inflammatory rhetoric."

In another case, her statutory interpretation was called "unworkable." In yet another case, the dissent she joined was called "an unconscionable act of judicial activism."

There is another reason this nomination is so important. This is critical to all the nominees we are considering for appointment to the Federal bench, and especially important for you here this morning. That is, what is the judicial philosophy and commitment to upholding current law as it relates to a citizen's right to privacy. I asked Justice Owen at her hearing about her beliefs on the right to privacy. I asked her if she believed there was constitutional right to privacy and where she found that right in the Constitution.

She declined at the time to answer that question without the relevant case information and precedents before her. When Senator FEINSTEIN followed up with a similar question, Owen again would not answer whether she believes a right to privacy does exist within the Constitution.

The question of whether a nominee believes that the right to privacy exists with regard to the ability to make decisions about one's own body is only the tip of the privacy iceberg. I believe that we are in an information age that poses new challenges in protecting the right to privacy. We are facing difficult issues including whether U.S. citizens have been treated as enemy combatants in a prison without access to counselor trial by jury, whether businesses have access to some of your most personal information, whether the Government has established a process for eavesdropping or tracking U.S. citizens without probable cause, and whether the Government has the ability to develop new software that might track the use of your own computer and places where you might go on the Internet without your consent or knowledge. There are a variety of issues that are before us on an individual's right to privacy and how that right to privacy is going to be interpreted. A clear understanding of a nominee's willingness to follow precedent on protecting privacy is a very important criterion for me, and it should be a concern for all Members.

Of course, some of my concern and skepticism about Justice Owen's views on privacy results from the opinions she wrote in a series of cases interpreting the Texas law on parental notification. In 2000 the State of Texas

passed a law requiring parental notification. But they also included a bypass system for extreme cases.

Eleven out of 12 times Owen analyzed whether a minor should be entitled to bypass the notice requirement, she voted either to deny the bypass or to create greater obstacles to the bypass.

Owen wrote in dissent that she would require a minor to demonstrate that she had considered religious issues surrounding the decision and that she had received specific counseling from someone other than a physician, her friend, or her family. Requirements, I believe, that go far beyond what the statute requires.

In interpreting the "best interest" arm of the statute, Owen held that a minor should be required to demonstrate that the abortion itself—not avoiding notification—was in the individual's best interests. In this particular case, I think she went far beyond what the statute required.

Where does that put us? Women in this country rely on the right to choose. It is an issue on which we have had 30 years of settled law and case precedent. In the Fifth Circuit, there are three States that continue to have unconstitutional laws on the books, and legislatures that are hostile to that right to choose. The Federal courts are the sole protector of women's right to privacy in these states. I do not believe that the rights of the women of the Fifth Circuit can be trusted to Justice Priscilla Owen.

The Senate provides each of us with the procedural privilege to thoroughly discuss my concerns about this nominee—the filibuster. The filibuster has been used against me on issues I care deeply about, just as I have used this procedure when it was necessary to protect the people of my state. This body, in which I am so privileged to serve, is more important than any one of us, precisely because even one Senator can stand up for her state in the face of a powerful majority.

This agreement, whatever else I might think of it, preserves the rights in this body that make it unique and that give it the most credibility. Each of us has to respect the views of the rest. When 40 of us stand together, the other 60 must negotiate. That is healthy and that is what happened here. The rules of the Senate, and the existence of the Federal judiciary itself, pose proper checks on majority and Presidential power. That is the way it should stay.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I want to respond to a statement that the Senior Senator from West Virginia made yesterday. In his remarks, the Senator conceded the legitimacy of the constitutional option, what he called the "nuclear option," as a way for the Senate to determine its practices and procedures. The option is, of course, the leader's right to obtain a ruling from

the presiding officer that certain actions of Senators are dilatory and cannot preclude the Senate from voting on a judicial nomination.

Here is what he said: "The so-called nuclear option has been around for a long time. It doesn't take a genius to figure that out." He went on to explain that this constitutional option had been available since at least 1917, and he repeatedly emphasized that this tool has been around "for a long time."

I appreciate this acknowledgment from the Senator from West Virginia, because I know he has studied the history of the Senate, and I know he has intimate familiarity with the workings of the Constitutional Option. There is nothing new about the constitutional option, as I discussed in my May 19 floor speech outlining the legal and constitutional rationale for its exercise. The constitutional option is simply the Senate's exercise of its power to define its own procedures—a power that comes directly from the Constitution and has been affirmed by the Supreme Court. (U.S. v. Ballin, 144 U.S. 1 (1892)) I appreciate that the Senator has acknowledged its legitimacy.

The Senator from West Virginia also argued, however, that past majority leaders have never used the constitutional option to "tamper" with extended debate. As my May 19 statement established, as did yesterday's statements by Senators MCCONNELL, HATCH, and BENNETT, that is not actually the case.

The fact is that the Senator himself used the constitutional option four times when serving as majority leader—in one case to outright eliminate the filibuster for motions to proceed to Executive Calendar nominations. Moreover, in February 1979, he forced the minority to agree to a formal rules change after credibly threatening that he would exercise the constitutional option. At that time, the Senator said on this floor, "if I have to be forced into a corner to try for a majority vote, I will do it because I am going to do my duty as I see my duty, whether I win or lose."

The Senate was nearly forced into a similar "corner" this week. Had Democrats not supported cloture on Priscilla Owen today, then all Senators would have had to make a conclusive decision as to whether it should take 60 or 51 votes to confirm a judge. Instead, we are putting off that decision until another day.

That may still come. And if it does come, I hope that we hear no more talk of the "illegitimacy" of the constitutional option. There is plenty to discuss as to whether exercising the option is prudent in a particular case. Some of the debate these past few days has addressed that prudential question, including some of the discussion from the Senator from West Virginia. But

there has also been talk about the constitutional option being a case of “lawlessness” or “breaking the rules to change the rules.” The constitutional option is a part of Senate history. In Senator BYRD’s words, it “has been around for a long time.”

And it will always be with us. The constitutional option is not, as the minority leader has repeatedly insisted, “off the table.” It is simply unnecessary at present. If it becomes necessary again, we may be called on to live up to our responsibilities to the Constitution and to the Senate to ensure that we restore our traditions and guarantee up-or-down votes to all judicial nominees who reach the Senate floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, at various times during the course of debate in recent days over the nomination of Justice Priscilla Owen, a number of her previous rulings have been badly mischaracterized. Last Thursday, May 19, I rose to speak about a number of those cases and to correct the record. And just this morning, I published an op-ed in National Review Online to further rebut these baseless criticisms. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt of that op-ed be printed in the RECORD.

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

It is now conceded that Justice Owen, Justice Brown, and Judge Pryor all deserve up-or-down votes. I happen to know personally that the case against Justice Owen was especially weak, because I know Priscilla personally from our service together on the Texas supreme court. Just consider the following litany of supposedly “out of the mainstream” rulings for which she was criticized:

A number of senators criticized Justice Owen’s opinion in *Montgomery Independent School District v. Davis*. One senator specifically attacked her for failing to protect a teacher who was “wrongly dismissed.” The case involved the authority of a local school board to dismiss a poorly performing and abusive teacher. The teacher had admitted that she had referred to her students as “little s***s.” When confronted, the teacher justified the use of the expletive on the bizarre ground that she used exactly the same language when talking to her own children. The teacher regularly insulted parents as well. The opinion joined by Justice Owen concluded that the school board was authorized to dismiss this teacher. It noted that the majority’s ruling “allows a state hearing examiner to make policy decisions that the Legislature intended local school boards to make,” and that the majority had “misinterpreted the Education Code.”

One senator attacked Justice Owen for her opinion in *Texas Farmers Insurance Co. v. Murphy*. In this case, Justice Owen simply joined an opinion holding that neither an arsonist nor his spouse should benefit from his crime by recovering insurance proceeds. The opinion followed two unanimous decisions of the Fifth Circuit, the very court to which Justice Owen has been nominated.

Justice Owen was also criticized for a ruling she and I both joined in *Peeler v. Hughes & Luce and Darrell C. Jordan*—in which we simply held that an admitted criminal could not benefit from criminal activity by suing the criminal-defense attorney for malpractice.

A number of senators focused on Justice Owen’s opinion in *FM Properties Operating Co. v. City of Austin*. One senator specifically criticized her for refusing to rule that a Texas water law “was an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority.” Yet liberal attorneys regularly criticize the non-delegation doctrine and claim that conservatives wrongly use it to invalidate laws duly enacted by the legislature. In fact, just last month one senator criticized another nominee, Bill Pryor, for championing the non-delegation doctrine. So Justice Owen’s critics seem to argue that if you support the nondelegation doctrine, you are out of the mainstream, and that if you oppose the non-delegation doctrine, you are out of the mainstream. It reminds me of a country-western song: “Darned If I Don’t, Danged If I Do.”

One senator claimed that, in *Read v. Scott Fetzer Co.*, Justice Owen ruled that a woman raped by a vacuum-cleaner salesman could not sue the company that had employed him after failing to undertake a standard background check—an allegation recently articulated in an op-ed in *Roll Call*. Yet as my letter to the editor noted, that allegation is plainly false. As the opinion joined by Justice Owen noted, “[n]o one questions that [the company that had hired the rapist] is liable.” The justices simply disagreed on whether another company—one that had not hired the rapist and had no relationship with the rapist—should also have been held liable.

Justice Owen was also criticized for her ruling in *Hyundai Motor Co. v. Alvarado*. In that case, an automobile alleged to be defective had in fact fully satisfied the federal standard then in effect. The plaintiff chose to sue anyway, despite federal law. Justice Owen simply held that Congress had forbidden such lawsuits once the federal standard had been met—a technical legal doctrine known as federal preemption. For this, she was sharply criticized. Yet her opinion simply followed the “solid majority of the courts to consider this issue”—including precedents authored by judges appointed by President Jimmy Carter. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court later adopted Justice Owen’s approach (*Geier v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.*), in an opinion authored by Clinton appointee, and former Democrat chief counsel of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Justice Stephen Breyer.

Justice Owen was likewise criticized for her rulings in *Quantum Chemical Corp. v. Toennies*, a case involving a Texas civil-rights law expressly modeled after Title VII of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, and *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, a Texas open-government law modeled after the federal Freedom of Information Act. Once again, all she did was follow precedents adopted by appointees of Presidents Carter and Clinton.

Justice Owen and I happened to disagree in *Weiner v. Wasson*, a case involving a technical matter of applying a statute of limitations to a medical malpractice suit. One senator argued that my opinion was “a lecture to the dissent” about the importance of *stare decisis* and following precedent. The argument is baseless. In fact, Justice Owen didn’t try to overturn precedent in that case; only the defendant did. Moreover, Justice Owen’s ruling contained an equally emphatic “lecture” to the defendant about the importance of following precedent.

And of course, there were the now-famous cases involving the popular Texas parental-notification law—a parental-rights law that generally requires minors to notify one parent before obtaining an abortion. Readers

should ask themselves one simple question: Who would you trust to analyze and determine the quality of Justice Owen’s legal analysis in those cases? The author of the Texas law—who supports Owen? Her former colleagues on the court, including former Justices Alberto Gonzales and Greg Abbott, who support her? Now-Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, who has testified—under oath—that he supports Justice Owen and that, contrary to false reports, he never accused her of “judicial activism”? The pro-choice Democrat law professor appointed by the Texas supreme court to set up procedures under the statute—who supports Owen, and who has written: “If this is activism, then any judicial interpretation of a statute’s terms is judicial activism”? Or do you trust the liberal special-interest groups who sharply opposed the Texas law, and never wanted that law to be enacted in the first place? Or the groups who literally make a living destroying the reputation of this president’s nominees?

The attacks on these rulings by Justice Owen reminded me of what Mark Twain once said: “A lie can travel halfway around the world while the truth is still putting on its shoes.” But let’s keep our eye on the ball. The American people know a controversial ruling when they see one—whether it’s the redefinition of marriage, or the expulsion of the Pledge of Allegiance and other expressions of faith from the public square—whether it’s the elimination of the three-strikes-and-you’re out law and other penalties against convicted criminals, or the forced removal of military recruiters from college campuses. Justice Owen’s rulings fall nowhere near this category of cases. There is a world of difference between struggling to interpret the ambiguous expressions of a legislature, and refusing to obey a legislature’s directives altogether.

Thankfully, the Senate has now effectively acknowledged this important distinction, by guaranteeing Justice Owen an up-or-down vote after four long years.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. What is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate business is the nomination of Priscilla Owen to be United States Circuit Court Judge.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak as in morning business for such time as I consume.

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

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, over the past few weeks, I have debunked the notion of scientific consensus about global warming. The claim there is consensus rests on four fundamental pillars. My previous talks made clear that the first three pillars are made of sand.

It is not true, for example, that the National Academy of Sciences believes the science of climate change is settled. In fact, the report is replete with caveats, warning the reader of the many uncertainties associated with claims of global warming. Yet advocates continue to recite small excerpts while ignoring the caution about uncertainties contained within the same paragraph or even the same science.

It is also not true that the second pillar, the U.N. science report known as the IPCC, proves a consensus. The flagship study on which the IPCC report relies, known as the hockey stick, which shows an unprecedented rise in 20th century temperatures, has been thoroughly discredited by scientists on both sides of the debate. In fact, recently, and since 1999, there hasn't been anyone who has agreed there is authenticity to the issue. In addition, the U.N. report relies on an explosive increase in emissions from poor countries over the next century based on the political decision by the report's author that countries such as Algeria will be as wealthy or wealthier than the United States.

The third pillar, supposedly proving that the science is settled that the Arctic is melting, is based on political science. Arctic temperatures are no warmer than they were in the 1930s. Similarly, the thickness of the Arctic glaciers and the sea ice appears to vary naturally by as much as 16 percent annually.

These and other factors which the alarmists find inconvenient would seem to indicate that projections of an Arctic climate catastrophe are speculative, at best.

Today I conclude the series on the four pillars of climate alarmists by discussing the problems associated with global climate models.

Let me begin by briefly explaining the climate models and how they function. Climate models help scientists describe changes in the climate system. They are not models in the conventional sense; that is, they are not physical replicas. Rather, they are mathematical representations of the physical laws and processes that govern the Earth's climate. According to Dr. David Legates of the University of Delaware, climate models "are designed to be descriptions of the full three-dimensional destruction of the earth's climate." Dr. Legates claims models are used "in a variety of applications, including the investigation of the possible role of various climate forcing mechanisms and the simulation of past and future climates."

Thousands of climate changes studied rely on computer models. The Arctic Council, whose work I addressed last week, stated that arctic warming and the impact stemming from that warming are firmly established by computer models.

Quoting from him:

While the models differ in their projections of some of the features of climate change, they are all in agreement that the world will warm significantly as a result of human activities, and that the Arctic is likely to experience noticeable warming, particularly early and intensely.

Similarly, the IPCC, which I also discussed in the earlier talks, relied on such earlier models to project a long-term temperature increase ranging from 2.5 to 10.4 degrees Celsius and assorted and potentially dangerous climate changes over the next century.

According to Dr. Kenneth Green, Dr. Tim Ball, and Dr. Steven Schroeder, the politicians clearly do not realize that the major conclusions of the IPCC's reports are not based on hard evidence and observation but, rather, largely upon the output of assumption-driven climate models.

The alarmists cite the results of climate models as proof of the catastrophic warming hypotheses. Consider one alarmist's description, who wrote recently:

Drawing on highly sophisticated computer models, climate scientists can project, not predict, how much temperatures may rise by say 2100 if we carry on with business as usual.

He continues:

Although scenarios vary, some get pretty severe, and so do the projected impacts of climate change, rising sea levels, species extinctions, glacier melting and so forth.

It sounds pretty scary, but the statement is completely false. It sheds no light on the likelihood or reliability of such projections. If, for example, a model shows a significant temperature increase over the next 50 years, how much confidence do we have in that projection? Attaching probabilities to model results is extremely difficult and rife with uncertainties.

In the 2000 edition of "Nature," four climate modelers noted that:

A basic problem with all such predictions to date has been the difficulty of providing any systematic estimate of uncertainty.

This problem stems from the fact that:

These [climate] models do not necessarily span the full range of known climate system behavior.

According to the National Academy of Sciences:

... without an understanding of the sources and degree of uncertainty, decision-makers could fail to define the best ways to deal with the serious issue of global warming.

This fact should temper the enthusiasm of those who support Kyoto-style regulations that will harm the American economy.

Previously, we have talked about the harm to the economy and have referred to the Wharton Econometric Survey which was conducted by the Wharton School of Economics. It gets into a lot of detail as to what is going to happen. For example, to comply with Kyoto, it

would cost the average family of four some \$2,700 a year. So it is a very significant thing.

Now note, too, the distinction between "project" and "predict." The alarmist writer noted earlier creates the misimpression that a projection is more solid than a prediction. But a projection is the output of a model calculation. Put another way, it is only as good as the model's equations and inputs. As we will see later in this presentation, such inputs or assumptions about the future can be extremely flawed, if not totally divorced from reality. And this, to be sure, is only one of the many technical shortcomings that limit the scientific validity of climate modeling.

Unfortunately, rarely does any scrutiny accompany model simulations. But based on what we know about the physics of climate models, as well as the questionable assumptions built into the models themselves, we should be very skeptical of their results. This is exactly the view of the National Academy of Sciences. According to the NAS:

Climate models are imperfect. Their simulation skill is limited by uncertainties in their formulation, the limited size of their calculations, and the difficulty of interpreting their answers that exhibit as much complexity as in nature.

At this point, climate modeling is still a very rudimentary science. As Richard Kerr wrote in *Science* magazine:

Climate forecasting, after all, is still in its infancy.

Models, while helpful for scientists in understanding the climate system, are far from perfect. According to climatologist Gerald North of Texas A&M University:

It's extremely hard to tell whether the models have improved; the uncertainties are large.

Or as climate modeler Peter Stone of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology put it:

The major [climate prediction] uncertainties have not been reduced at all.

Based on these uncertainties, cloud physicist Robert Charlson, professor emeritus at the University of Washington-Seattle, has concluded:

To make it sound like we understand climate is not right.

This is not to deny that climate modeling has improved over the last three decades. Indeed, scientists have constructed models that more accurately reflect the real world. In the 1970s, models were capable only of describing the atmosphere, while over the last few years models can describe, albeit inadequately, the atmosphere, land surface, oceans, sea ice, and other variables.

But greater complexity does not mean more accurate results. In fact, the more variables scientists incorporate, the more uncertainties arise.

Dr. Syukuro Manabe, who helped create the first climate model that coupled the atmosphere and oceans, has observed:

Models that incorporate everything from dust to vegetation may look like the real world, but the error range associated with the addition of each new variable could result in near total uncertainty. This would represent a paradox: The more complex the models, the less we know.

We are often reminded that the IPCC used sophisticated modeling techniques in projecting temperature increases for the coming century. But as William O'Keefe and Jeff Kueter of the George C. Marshall Institute pointed out in a recent paper:

The complex models envisioned by the IPCC have many more than twenty inputs, and many of those inputs will be known with much less than 90 percent confidence.

Also, tinkering with climate variables is a delicate business—getting one variable wrong can greatly skew model results. Dr. David Legates has noted that:

Anything you do wrong in a climate model will adversely affect the simulation of every other variable.

Take precipitation, for example. As Dr. Legates noted:

Precipitation requires moisture in the atmosphere and a mechanism to cause it to condense (causing the air to rise over mountains, by surface heating, as a result of weather fronts, or by cyclonic rotation). Any errors in representing the atmospheric moisture content or precipitation-causing mechanisms will result in errors in the simulation of precipitation.

Dr. Legates concluded:

Clearly, the interrelationships among the various components that comprise the climate system make climate modeling difficult.

The IPCC, in its Third Assessment Report, noted this problem, and many others, with climate modeling, including—this is a quote from their report; the very basis that many of the alarmists are basing their decisions on:

Discrepancies between the vertical profile of temperature change in the troposphere seen in observations and models.

Large uncertainties in estimates of internal climate variability (also referred to as natural climate variability) from models and observations.

Considerable uncertainty in the reconstructions of solar and volcanic forcing which are based on limited observational data for all but the last two decades.

Large uncertainties in anthropogenic forcings associated with the effects of aerosols.

Large differences in the response of different models to the same forcing.

I want to delve a little deeper into the first point concerning the discrepancies between temperature observations in the troposphere and the surface. This discrepancy is very important because it tends to undermine a key assumption supporting the warming hypothesis—that more rapid warming should occur in the troposphere

than at the surface, creating the so-called greenhouse “fingerprint.” But the National Research Council believes real-world temperature observations tell a different story.

In January of 2000, the NRC panel examined the output from several climate models to assess how well they mimicked the observed surface and lower atmospheric temperature trends. They found that:

Although climate models indicate that changes in greenhouse gases and aerosols play a significant role in defining the vertical structure of the observed atmosphere, model-observation discrepancies indicate that the definitive model experiments have not been done.

John Wallace, the panel chairman and professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Washington, put it more bluntly. He said:

There really is a difference between temperatures at the two levels that we don't fully understand.

More recently, researchers at the University of Colorado, Colorado State University, and the University of Arizona, examined the differences between real-world temperature observations with the results of four widely used climate models. They probed the following question: Do the differences stem from uncertainties in how greenhouse gases and other variables affect the climate system or by chance model fluctuations; that is, the variability caused by the model's flawed representation of the climate system?

As it turned out, neither of these factors was to blame. According to the researchers:

Significant errors in the simulation of globally averaged tropospheric temperature structure indicate likely errors in tropospheric water-vapor content and therefore total greenhouse-gas forcing, precipitable water, and convectively forced large-scale circulation.

Moreover, based on the “significant errors of simulation,” the researchers called for “extreme caution in applying simulation results to future climate-change assessment activities and to attributions studies.

They also questioned “the predictive ability of recent generation model simulations, the most rigorous test of any hypothesis.”

There does not seem to be much wiggle room here: Climate models are useful tools, but unable, in important respects, to simulate the climate system, undermining their “predictive ability.”

Based on this hard fact, let me bring you back to the alarmist writer I referenced earlier. As he wrote recently:

Drawing on highly sophisticated computer models, climate scientists can project—not predict—how much temperature may rise by, say, 2100, if we carry on with business as usual.

Again, based on what I have just recounted, this is disingenuous at best. I think a fairminded person would find it horribly misleading and inaccurate.

Another serious model limitation concerns the interaction of clouds and water vapor with the climate system.

Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, professor of meteorology at MIT, reports of “terrible errors about clouds in all the models.” He noted that these errors “make it impossible to predict the climate sensitivity because the sensitivity of the models depends primarily on water vapor and clouds. Moreover, if clouds are wrong,” Dr. Lindzen said, “there's no way you can get water vapor right. They're both intimately tied to each other.”

In fact, water vapor and clouds are the main absorbers of infrared radiation in the atmosphere. Even if all other greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, were to disappear, we would still be left with over 98 percent of the current greenhouse effect. But according to Dr. Lindzen, “the way current models handle factors such as clouds and water vapor is disturbingly arbitrary. In many instances the underlying physics is simply not known.”

Dr. Lindzen notes that this is a significant flaw, because “a small change in cloud cover can strongly affect the response to carbon dioxide.” He further notes, “Current models all predict that warmer climates will be accompanied by increasing humidity at all levels.” Such behavior “is an artifact of the models since they have neither the physics nor the numerical accuracy to deal with water vapor.”

I think sometimes you have to look at the science and the contradictions, and even if we don't thoroughly understand what these people are saying, the fact is, they contradict each other. Sometimes you have to go back and look at reality. If they say the increase in the use of carbon dioxide and the presence of it is the major thing causing anthropogenic gases and global warming temperatures, look at what happened right after the war. After the war, they increased the use of CO₂ by 85 percent. You would think that would precipitate a warmer period, but it didn't. It precipitated a cooling period. When you get back to the arguments and discrepancies, they agree there are problems.

Along with water vapor and clouds, aerosols, or particles from processes such as dust storms, forest fires, the use of fossil fuels, and volcanic eruptions, represent another major uncertainty in climate modeling. To be sure, there is limited knowledge of how aerosols influence the climate system. This, said the National Academy of Sciences, represents “a large source of uncertainty about future climate change.”

Further, the Strategic Plan of the U.S. Climate Change Science Program, CCSP, which was reviewed and endorsed by the National Research Council, concluded that the “poorly understood impact of aerosols on the formation of both water droplets and ice

crystals in clouds also results in large uncertainties in the ability to project climate changes."

Climate researcher and IPCC reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray reached an even stronger conclusion, stating that "the effects of aerosols, and their uncertainties, are such as to nullify completely the reliability of any climate models."

Another issue affecting model reliability is the relative lack of available climate data, something the National Research Council addressed in 2001. According to the NRC, "[a] major limitation of these model forecasts for use around the world is the paucity of data available to evaluate the ability of coupled models to simulate important aspects of past climate."

There is plenty of evidence to support this conclusion. Consider, for example, that most of the surface temperature record covers less than 50 years and only a few stations are as much as 100 years old. The only reliable data come from earth-orbiting satellites that survey the entire atmosphere. Notably, while these temperature measurements agree with those taken by weather balloons, they disagree considerably with the surface record.

There is also concern of an upward bias in the surface temperature record, caused by the "urban heat island effect." Most meteorological stations in Western Europe and eastern North America are located at airports on the edge of cities, which have been enveloped by urban expansion. In the May 30, 2003, issue of *Remote Sensing of Environment*, David Streutker, a Rice University researcher, found an increase in the Houston urban heat island effect of nearly a full degree Celsius between 1987 and 1999. This study confirmed research published in the March 2001 issue of *Australian Meteorological Magazine*, which documented a significant heat island effect even in small towns.

Although climate modelers have made adjustments to compensate for the urban heat island effect, other researchers have shown such adjustments are inadequate. University of Maryland researchers Eugenia Kalnay and Ming Cai, in *Nature* magazine, concluded that the effect of urbanization and land-use changes on U.S. average temperatures is at least twice as large as previously estimated.

Finally, to expand on a point I raised earlier, climate models are helpful in creating so-called "climate scenarios." These scenarios help scientists describe how the climate system might evolve. To arrive at a particular scenario, scientists rely on model-driven assumptions about future levels of economic growth, population growth, greenhouse gas emissions, and other factors. However, as with the IPCC, these assumptions can create wildly exaggerated

scenarios that, to put it mildly, have little scientific merit. In 2003, scientists with the Federal Climate Change Science Program agreed that potential environmental, economic, and technological developments "are unpredictable over the long time-scales relevant for climate research."

William O'Keefe and Jeff Keuter of the George C. Marshall Institute reiterated this point recently. As they wrote, "The inputs needed to project climate for the next 100 years, as is typically attempted, are unknowable. Human emissions of greenhouse gases and aerosols will be determined by the rates of population and economic growth and technological change. Neither of these is predictable for more than a short period into the future."

Put simply, computer model simulations cannot prove that greenhouse gas emissions will cause catastrophic global warming. Again, here's the National Academy of Sciences: "The fact that the magnitude of the observed warming is large in comparison to natural variability as simulated in climate models is suggestive of such a linkage, but it does not constitute proof of one because—and this is a point I want to emphasize—the model simulations could be deficient in natural variability on the decadal to century time scale."

It's clear that climate models, even with increasing levels of sophistication, still contain a number of critical shortcomings. With that in mind, policymakers should reject ridiculous statements that essentially equate climate model runs with scientific truth.

As I discussed today, climate modeling is in its infancy. It cannot predict future temperatures with reasonable certainty that these predictions are accurate. The physical world is exceedingly complex, and the more complex the models, the more potential errors are introduced into the models. We understand little about how to accurately model the troposphere and about the role of aerosols, clouds and water vapor. Moreover, there are enormous data gaps in the very short temperature records that we have. And surface data often conflict with more accurate balloon and satellite data.

Models can enhance scientists' understanding of the climate system, but, at least at this point, cannot possibly serve as a rational basis for policymaking. It seems foolish in the extreme to undermine America's economic competitiveness with policies based on computer projections about what the world will look like in 100 years. In short, we have no idea what the world will look like in 20 years, or even 10 years.

So this concludes the fourth of the pillars of climate alarmists, hopefully just to show the science is flawed.

I think it is clear, as I mentioned a minute ago, that the science is not there. Since 1999, the old argument of

Michael Mann, the guy who invented the hockey-stick theory, where he was measuring the Earth's temperatures, we come into the 20th century—and that is the blade on the hockey stick—he intentionally left out the fact that between the years 700 A.D. and 1100 A.D., there is another blade on the hockey stick that went up the other way and temperatures were warmer than they are today.

If you read the Wharton Econometrics Survey, you will realize what will happen to America if we were to sign on to this, the economic damage we would have to sustain, the fact it would double the cost of energy, double the cost of gasoline to run our cars, and it would cost the average American family \$2,700, and you have to ask the question: If the science is not real and it would inflict that much danger, what is the reason we are doing it?

I think we can find the answer in quoting from Margot Wallstrom. Margot Wallstrom is the European Union's Environment Commissioner. She states that Kyoto is not about climate change, it is "about leveling the playing field for big businesses worldwide."

One of your favorite people, I am sure, French President Jacques Chirac, in a speech during The Hague in 2000, said that Kyoto represents "the first component of an authentic global governance."

I think we have had an opportunity to discuss this over and over, and it is somewhat warming to me to realize that things are not getting that much warmer, and if that is happening, the science is not showing it is due to anthropogenic gases.

Consequently, we as policymakers, have to look at this and be sure before we make any rash decisions that the science is there. Clearly, the science is not there.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the House of Representatives just minutes ago took a historic stand on behalf of the millions of Americans who can benefit from the enormous promise of stem cell research. By a vote of 238 yeas to 194 nays, the House passed H.R. 810. I congratulate both Congressman CASTLE, a Republican from Delaware, and Congresswoman DEGETTE, a Democrat from Colorado, who led a bipartisan effort in this regard to have this very historic vote in the House of Representatives.

Indeed, a bipartisan majority rejected the restrictive policies of this

administration and voted to expand the number of stem cell lines that are eligible for federally funded research. In doing so, they have brought new hope to Americans who suffer from diseases such as Parkinson's and juvenile diabetes, ALS, as well as spinal cord injuries.

Now it is up to us in the Senate to pass the same bill without amendments so we can send it to the President's desk as soon as possible. The American people cannot afford to wait any longer for our top scientists to realize the full potential of stem cell research.

Regrettably, research has been stymied and slowed under the President's stem cell policy. When President Bush announced his policy, the administration said that 78 stem cell lines were eligible for federally funded research, meaning they had to be derived before the totally arbitrary date and time of August 9, 2001, at 9 p.m. Why it was permissible to use stem cell lines derived before 9 p.m. but not at 9:01 or 9:05 p.m. has always eluded me. Again, it is just an arbitrary time and date.

The administration said there were 78 stem cell lines, but now we know today that only 22 of those are available for research, not nearly enough to reflect the genetic diversity that scientists need. But more importantly, all 22 stem cell lines—all 22—that are available under the President's policy are contaminated with mouse feeder cells, making them useless for humans.

So the President's policy is not a way forward; it is, indeed, a dead-end street. It offers only false hope to the millions of people across this country who are suffering from diseases that could be potentially cured or treated through stem cell research.

We need a policy that offers true, meaningful hope to these patients and their loved ones. That is why Senator SPECTER and I, along with Senators HATCH, FEINSTEIN, SMITH, and KENNEDY, introduced a companion bill to the Castle-DeGette legislation that just passed the House. Our bill expands the number of stem cell lines that federally funded scientists can study by lifting the arbitrary eligibility date of August 9, 2001.

Under our legislation, all stem cell lines would be eligible for Federal research regardless of the date they were derived, as long as they met strict ethical requirements.

Since August of 2001, scientists have made great strides and great advances in deriving stem cell lines. Many of the new lines were grown without mouse feeder cells. So I ask, should not our top scientists be studying those lines that have great potential and which could be used to alleviate human suffering, instead of being limited to the 22 cell lines contaminated with mouse cells that will never be used in humans?

We do not require our astronomers to explore the heavens with 19th century

telescopes. We do not require our geologists to study the Earth with a tape measure. If we are serious about realizing the promise of stem cell research, our biomedical researchers need access to the best stem cell lines available.

I also emphasize that none of the additional lines would require the creation of any new embryos. Instead, these lines could be derived from any of the more than 400,000 embryos that remain from fertility treatments and will otherwise be discarded. We are talking about embryos that are going to be thrown away, legally. Should we not use them instead to ease human suffering?

Think about this: We have 400,000 frozen embryos left over from in vitro fertilization. When a woman who has been a donor of these eggs notifies that they are no longer wanted, that she is not going to use them—maybe she has already had a child or two and does not need these embryos—that person can give permission to discard them. Why should that person not be able to give permission to allow them to be used by our top scientists for stem cell research that could then save other lives? That is what some people are asking us to do—just throw them away, do not let them be used for research that could save human suffering and save human lives. To this Senator, that simply does not make any sense.

So as I said, we have strict ethical guidelines that are set up so that they cannot be used for cloning, they cannot be used for other things; only to derive the stem cells. That is all. If there is a person who can give the authority right now to the in vitro fertilization clinic to discard them, why should that person not have the right to say, No, use those frozen embryos to derive stem cells so that someone with a spinal cord injury might walk again, so that someone with ALS can escape the death sentence, so that someone with Parkinson's can be returned to normal functioning?

The House performed a great public service today. I thank both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, who stepped up and voted for this bill. By passing the Castle-DeGette bill, they have given hope to millions of suffering humans that we will indeed proceed with stem cell research that will alleviate their suffering. It is now time for the Senate to act.

So together with Senator SPECTER, we are going to urge the majority leader to bring up the bill as soon as possible and let us have a vote in the Senate and get this bill to the President so we can move ahead with embryonic stem cell research in this country.

I yield the floor, and 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. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of the Owen nomination tomorrow morning, the time until 12 noon be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; provided further that at noon, all time be expired under rule XXII and the Senate proceed to the vote on the confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; and provided further, following that vote, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent 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.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

MARINE CORPORAL TODD GODWIN

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to an exceptional young man who gave his life in the defense of freedom. Marine Cpl Todd Godwin, from Zanesville, OH, died on July 20, 2004, when the Humvee he was riding in was struck by shrapnel from a roadside explosive in the Al Anbar province in Iraq. He was 21 years old.

CPL Godwin was a sniper with the 1st Battalion, 8th Marines, 2nd Marine Division and was on his second tour-of-duty in Iraq. Always ready with a smile or a joke, Todd was an easy going, respectful person with a big heart. He was also a Marine through and through—something he took very seriously—something he had been training for his whole life.

Born on March 4, 1983, to Bill and Kathy Godwin, Todd was an alert, energetic child who grew up with an interest in the military. His father remembers him playing with G.I. Joes, wearing fatigues, and simulating wars. According to his brother, Aaron, the two boys would hang dolls outside and shoot at them with a BB gun, honing their targeting skills.

Apart from these activities, Todd sought to perfect his body. He could often be found working out at "the Fieldhouse" fitness center or practicing his Tae Kwon Do, for which he received two black-belts. Whether intentional or not, Todd seemed to be grooming himself for the military, acquiring a host of skills that would serve him well in the Marines.

After graduating from Zanesville Christian School in June 2001, he joined