

heard expressed by many opponents of this bill for the growing number of Americans who have no health insurance. We agree that this is a serious problem, and look forward to working with those Senators to address it as soon as possible.

The effort to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights now returns to the House.

Last year, 68 House Republicans joined Democrats to pass a strong patient protection bill very much like this one. We urge our colleagues in the House to resist the special interests one more time. Together, we can send a strong, enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights to President Bush.

We hope that when that happens, the President will reconsider his threatened veto. We hope he will remember the promise he made last fall to the American people to pass a national Patients' Bill of Rights.

Texas has proven that we can protect patients' rights—without dramatically increasing premiums. It is time—it is past time—to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights to protect all insured Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Akaka	Dodd	McCain
Baucus	Dorgan	Mikulski
Bayh	Durbin	Miller
Biden	Edwards	Murray
Bingaman	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Fitzgerald	Reed
Byrd	Graham	Reid
Cantwell	Harkin	Rockefeller
Carnahan	Hollings	Sarbanes
Carper	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kennedy	Snowe
Clinton	Kerry	Specter
Collins	Kohl	Stabenow
Conrad	Landrieu	Torricelli
Corzine	Leahy	Warner
Daschle	Levin	Wellstone
Dayton	Lieberman	Wyden
DeWine	Lincoln	

NAYS—36

Allard	Burns	Frist
Allen	Cochran	Grassley
Bennett	Craig	Gregg
Bond	Crapo	Hagel
Brownback	Ensign	Hatch
Bunning	Enzi	Helms

Hutchinson	McConnell	Smith (NH)
Hutchison	Nickles	Stevens
Inhofe	Roberts	Thomas
Jeffords	Santorum	Thompson
Kyl	Sessions	Thurmond
Lugar	Shelby	Voinovich

NOT VOTING—5

Campbell	Gramm	Murkowski
Domenici	Lott	

The bill (S. 1052), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

AMENDMENT NO. 860

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator KENNEDY and Senator GREGG, the managers of this bill, and me, I send this managers' amendment to the desk and ask unanimous consent it be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 860) was agreed to.

(The text of the amendment is located in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 1668

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1668, which is now at the desk; that the bill be read three times, passed; and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. NICKLES. Reserving the right to object, I will object on behalf of other Members. This bill has not yet been referred to committee. I personally have no objection to the bill, and I expect I will be supportive of it, but it should be referred to the committee so interested Members who have an interest in this particular issue can vet it, maybe improve it, maybe we can pass it. I hope we can pass it as expeditiously as possible.

At this time I object.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, the distinguished Republican whip, I regret this, especially in that I have just completed reading John Adams, the new book out. It is a wonderful book. I recommend it to my friend.

I regret there is an objection to clearing this legislation. This bill, as my friend indicated, authorizes the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams and his legacy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I share my colleague's enthusiasm, both for President Adams and also for David McCullough's book. He is a great historian. I have not finished it. I started it. I look forward to completing it and learning a little bit more about the his-

tory of one of America's great Presidents, one of our real founding patriots.

Again, this is going to be referred to the Energy Committee where I and others, I think, will try to be very supportive in a very quick and timely fashion so the entire Senate can, hopefully, vote on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with, and I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SHINE SOME LIGHT ON THE BLUE SLIP PROCESS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, we are all waiting for the majority leader to come to the floor and deliver the reorganization message. As part of that, I believe he is going to announce that Senator LEAHY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is going to make public the blue slip process.

As a member of that committee, I would like to take a few moments and make a few comments about my experience with the blue slip—in essence, what I think about it.

For those who do not know what the blue slip is, it is a process by which a Member can essentially blackball a judge from his or her State when that Member has some reason to do so.

Why would I object so much? I object so much because there is a history of this kind of thing. Historically, many private clubs and organizations have enabled their board of directors to deliver what is called a blackball to keep out someone they don't want in their club or organization. We all know it has happened. For some of us, it has even happened to us.

The usual practice was, and still is in instances, to prevent someone of a different race or religion from gaining access to that organization or club. This is essentially what the blue slip process is all about.

The U.S. Senate is not a private institution. We are a public democracy. I have come to believe the blue slip should hold no place in this body. At the very least, the use of a blue slip to stop a nominee, to prevent a hearing and therefore prevent a confirmation, should be made public. I am pleased to support my chairman, PAT LEAHY, and the Judiciary Committee in that regard.

Under our current procedure, though, any Member of this Senate, by returning a negative blue slip on a home State nominee, or simply by not returning the blue slip at all, can stop a

nomination dead in its tracks. No reason need be given, no public statement need be made, no one would even know whom to blame. With a secret whisper or a backroom deal, the nomination simply dies without even a hearing. This is just plain wrong.

I have watched the painful process over the last 9 years. During 6 of those years, the blue slip itself contained the words, "no further proceedings on this nominee will be scheduled until both blue slips have been returned by the nominee's home State Senators." As a result, I saw nominees waiting 1, 2, 3, even 4 years, often without as much as a hearing or even an explanation as to why the action was taken. These nominees put their lives on hold. Yet they never have a chance to discuss the concerns that may have been raised about them. These concerns remain secret and the nomination goes nowhere.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I believe our duty is either to confirm or reject a nominee based on an informed judgment that he or she is either fit or not fit to serve; to listen to concerns and responses, to examine the evidence presented at a hearing, and to have a rationale for determining whether or not an individual nominee should serve as a district court judge or circuit court judge or even a U.S. Supreme Court Justice. That duty, in my view, leaves no room for a secret block on nominees by any Member which prevents their hearing and confirmation.

I believe in the last three Congresses, based on information I have been able to come upon, that the blue slip has been used at least 21 times. Consider this: An individual graduates college with honors, finishes law school at the top of the class; he or she may even clerk for a prestigious judge or join a large law firm, or maybe practice public interest law or even serve as staff of the Judiciary Committee. In fact, a nominee can spend years of his or her life honing skills and developing a reputation among peers, a reputation that finally leads to a nomination by the President of the United States to a Federal court.

This must be the proudest day of his or her life. Then the nominee just waits. First for a few weeks. He or she is told things should be moving shortly but the Senate sometimes takes a while to get moving. Then the months start to go by, and maybe friends or associates make some inquiries as to what could be wrong. They don't hear anything, so the nominee is told just to wait a little longer; things will work themselves out.

I have had nominees call me and say: I have children in school. We need to move. Shall we do it? I don't know what to do. Do I continue my law practice?

A year passes with still no hearing or explanation; finally, the second year, and maybe the third, or even the fourth, if one is "lucky" enough to be renominated in the next session. The

time goes by without so much as a word as to why the nomination has not moved forward.

Simply put, the nominee has been blackballed by a blue slip, and there is nothing that can be done about it—no one to hold accountable.

I believe that if a Member wants to use a blue slip to stop a nominee from moving forward, that blue slip should be public. And I also believe that the Member should be prepared to appear before the Judiciary Committee and explain why the Senate should not consider the nominee and hold a hearing.

Making the blue slip public is no guarantee that a nominee will receive a hearing. It is no guarantee that an up or down vote will ever be held. But at least the nominee will have the chance to see who has the problem, and what that problem is. In many cases, a nominee may choose to withdraw. In others, perhaps a misunderstanding can be cleared up. Either way, the process will be in the open, and we will know the reasons.

I believe that many members of this Senate did not even realize they held the power of the blue slip until just recently.

In my view, the rationale behind the blue slip process is faulty. The process was designed to allow home state Senators—who may in some instances know the nominee better than the rest of the Senate—to have a larger say in whether the nominee moves forward. More often than not, however, this power is and will be used to stop nominees for political or other reasons having nothing to do with qualifications.

As a matter of fact, the Member who uses the blue slip, who doesn't send it in, or sends it in negatively, may never have even met the nominee.

If legitimate reasons to defeat a nominee do exist, those reasons can be shared with the Judiciary Committee in confidence, and decisions can be made based on that information—by the entire Committee.

The blue slip process as it now stands is open to abuse.

I would join with those—I am hopeful there are now those—on the Judiciary Committee who would move to abolish the blue slip.

Before I conclude, I want to read from a recent opinion piece by G. Calvin Mackenzie, a professor at Colby College and an expert on the appointment process. In the April 1, 2001 edition of the Washington Post, Mackenzie wrote:

The nomination system is a national disgrace. It encourages bullies and emboldens demagogues, silences the voices of responsibility, and nourishes the lowest forms of partisan combat. It uses innocent citizens as pawns in politicians' petty games and stains the reputations of good people. It routinely violates fundamental democratic principles, undermines the quality and consistency of public management, and breaches simple decency.

I find myself in agreement with every word in that quote. It is quite an indictment of our nominations process.

On both sides of the aisle, we hear: Well, they did it, so we are going to do it. Well, they blocked our nominee, so now we will block their nominee.

I don't believe that has any merit whatsoever. I believe at some point we have to stop this cycle. At some point, nominees have to come to the Senate Judiciary Committee, go promptly or as promptly as they can go to a hearing, have the questions asked, and we do our duty which we took our oath to do, which is to make the judgment whether that nominee qualifies to be a Federal court judge or district court judge.

I make these remarks to say that this is one Member of the Judiciary Committee who will happily vote to do away with the blue slip.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

Madam President, 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. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Pursuant to rule 6, paragraph 2, I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, be granted official leave of the Senate until July 9.

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

FORMAL OPENING OF THE NATIONAL JAPANESE AMERICAN MEMORIAL

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, a few short blocks from this Chamber and in the shadow of the Capitol, hundreds of people gathered to celebrate the formal opening of the National Japanese American Memorial honoring the loyalty and courage of Japanese Americans during the Second World War.

As a World War II veteran and a native of Hawaii, I am well-acquainted with the exceptional contributions of Japanese Americans to the war effort, both at home and abroad. The battlefield exploits of the 442nd, 100th, and the MIS immediately come to mind. Less known but equally deserving of