as federal security screeners. The provision would not require that these individuals be hired, but give TSA the discretion to hire them if they meet all the other statutory requirements concerning the hiring of screeners. This is a fair and reasonable expansion of the existing provision.

A similar provision was added to the Homeland Security bill. However, the provision in the Homeland Security bill only expands the definition to include U.S. nationals. It would still exclude an important segment of the population-legal permanent residents. LPRs as they are known, can join the military and risk giving up their lives fighting for our country. Yet, to date, they cannot be hired as security screeners. This is wrong, and we should correct it now.

In addition, S. 2949 would reauthorize the National Transportation Safety Board. The NTSB is an independent Federal agency charged with investigating every civil aviation accident in the United States. It also investigates significant accidents in the other modes of transportation—railorad, highway, marine, and pipeline—and issuing safety recommendations intended to prevent future accidents. We are all aware of the important role the NTSB plays in the safety of our transportation system, and it is important that we move ahead with this reauthorizing legislation.

A key element of this bill involves authorization for the NTSB's new Training Academy, which will be the centerpiece of its teaching and training of transportation accident investigators worldwide. It also will provide state-of-the-art classrooms and laboratory space for accident investigation. This is especially important with the advent of new technology that is being used to build, fuel, and more all modes of transportation.

The legislation also would streamline the NTSB's procurement process during accident investigations and allow the Board to transfer its family assistance responsibilities to any Federal agency that takes over an investigation, such as the FBI, provided that the other agency is willing and able to handle those duties. Finally the bill would reauthorize the NTSB's funding for its day to day activities.

The importance of the agency is well known to all. I urge the support of this bill.

THE CONFIRMATION OF MICHAEL McCONNELL TO THE 10TH CIRCUIT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last Friday, the Senate approved the nomination of Michael McConnell to the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. As a professor, first at the University of Chicago, and then at the University of Utah, Mr. McConnell has been a strong voice for reexamining First Amendment jurisprudence of Free Exercise Clause and the Establishment Clause. He has expressed strong personal opposition to abortion to Roe v. Wade, to the clinic access law. He has testified before the Congress against the Violence Against Women Act on the grounds that it was unconstitutional.

Each of these issues was explored to some degree at his hearing before the Judiciary Committee and in follow up written questions. No one doubts that Professor McConnell is personable and intelligent. No one doubts that he is an outstanding and provocative professor. I see why so many of his law professor colleagues like him and have endorsed his nomination. But the Judiciary Committee also received letters from hundreds of law professors reminding us that the burden of persuasion on lifetime judicial appointments should be on the nominee, as well as a recent letter signed by hundreds of law professors opposing confirmation of Professor McConnell.

The question I was left with after his nomination hearing was whether we had witnessed another confirmation conversion. Stated another way, I remain very concerned that Professor McConnell may turn out to be an activist on the 10th Circuit.

For instance, I still have a hard time reading his writing on the actions of Federal District Court Judge John Sprizzo in acquitting abortion protesters as anything other than praise for the extra-legal behavior of both the defendants and the judge. Even though Professor McConnell has now been confirmed, I continue to be concerned that he appeared to commend a judge and regard him as a hero for not following the law.

I find his responses regarding the Violence Against Women Act convenient.

I see his refusal to take responsibility for his harsh criticism of the Supreme Court's decision in the Bob Jones case as an attempt to distance himself from his prior approval of the ability of religious institutions to discriminate on the basis of race, even if they are receiving benefits from the Government.

At his hearing, and in follow-up written questions, Professor McConnell sought to assure us that he understands the difference between his role as a teacher and advocate and his future role as a judge. He assured us that he respects the doctrine of stare decisis, and that as a Federal appeals court judge, he will be bound to follow Supreme Court precedent.

Although many of President Clinton's nominees who assured the Senate of these same things when they were nominated were discredited and not considered, this nomination has moved forward and been approved.

I reluctantly supported this nomination to the 10th Circuit based on Professor McConnell's assurances. I trust that he will not seek to undermine women's reproductive rights derived from the Constitution and articulated in Roe v. Wade. I trust that as an appeals court judge he will divorce his personal views on abortion and on racial discrimination in religious institutions from his decisions as a judge, and that he will act to uphold existing law. I trust that he will not seek to circumvent the doctrine of stare decisis and that he will not work to change the law through activism on the bench.

There are already admirers who predict that Professor McConnell is destined for a short stop at the 10th Circuit on the way to a Supreme Court nomination. I do not speculate about such things. Professor McConnell has yet to create a record on the 10th Circuit. I mention it only to note that no one should confuse my support of Professor McConnell's nomination to the 10th Circuit as an endorsement or approval for any other position.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF PAUL WELLSTONE

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, like all of my colleagues, I was shocked and deeply saddened by the tragic accident that claimed the life of Senator Wellstone, his wife Sheila, their daughter Marcia, two pilots, and three members of Paul's staff. My heart goes out to the families and they will remain in my thoughts and prayers.

It was always a privilege working with Senator Wellstone. In fact, one of the last images I have of him was in the final days of the session, when I encountered him coming up the aisle in the Senate Chamber after a vote with his typical boundless energy, warm smile, and friendly greeting. He was a compassionate, honorable man—and it was obvious to all of us that, together, Paul and Sheila made an extraordinary and loving team.

As a public servant, Senator Wellstone's most enduring legacy will surely be his career of conscience in elective office. With his unwavering passion and integrity, he was highly respected and will be long remembered.

With both of us hailing from northern border States, we shared the same perspective on a number of issues such as the reimportation of prescription drugs, and we worked together over the years to ensure the critical low-income energy program, LIHEAP, would be there for the people of Maine and Minnesota.

I was proud to serve with him on the Small Business Committee where I saw his diligence and tenaciousness firsthand, and to work with him on issues of importance to our veterans such as a bill establishing July 16 as a National Day of Remembrance for Atomic Veterans, as well as a measure providing for increases in veterans spending. I was also pleased to help champion his and Senator DOMENICI's legislation to create mental health parity—a perfect illustration of his compassion and the causes for which he felt duty-bound to fight.

Indeed, all of us and, most importantly, the people of Minnesota could count on Paul to stand up for his deeply held beliefs, speaking always from

the courage of his convictions. He personified the notion of being able to disagree—even vehemently—without being disagreeable.

In fact, I cannot help but recall that when Senators were offering their appreciation to Senator HELMS upon the occasion of his retirement, Senator Wellstone offered very heartfelt and touching words. He acknowledged that he and Senator HELMS often differed on the issues. But Paul respected the purity of the convictions of his colleague across the aisle—and he wished him well.

Now, it is Paul Wellstone who has left our midst, and the entire Senate family shares in the sense of loss. We have a desk that was once filled with Paul's irrepressible spirit, and it strikes me that Paul Wellstone perished in pursuit of the very ideal he held to be so noble and worthy—public service.

This institution is always at its strongest when it is populated with men and women of Paul Wellstone's authenticity. We are diminished by his passing, and he will be missed.

CONFIRMATION OF JOHN ROGERS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week the Senate voted to confirm the nomination of John Rogers who is nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. By confirming this nomination, we are trying to move forward in providing help to the Sixth Circuit. Earlier this year, we held a hearing for Judge Julia Gibbons to a seat on the Sixth Circuit, who was confirmed by the Senate on July 29, 2002 by a vote of 95 to 0. With last night's vote, the Democratic-led Senate confirmed the 15th judge to our federal Courts of Appeal and our 98th judicial nominee since the change in Senate majority in July 2001. I have placed a separate statement in the RECORD on the occasion of confirming that many of this President's judicial nominees in just 16 months.

Republicans often say that almost half of the seats on the Sixth Circuit are vacant but what they fail to acknowledge is that most of those vacancies arose during the Clinton administration and before the change in majority last summer. None, zero, not one of the Clinton nominees to those current vacancies on the Sixth Circuit received a hearing by the Judiciary Committee under Republican leadership. With the confirmation of Professor Rogers, we have reduced the number of vacancies on that court to six, but four of those remaining lack home-State consent due to the President's failure to address the legitimate concerns of Senators in that circuit whose nominees were blocked by Republicans during the period of Republican control of the Senate.

The Sixth Circuit vacancies are a prime and unfortunate legacy of the past partisan obstructionist practices under Republican leadership. Vacancies on the Sixth Circuit were perpetuated during the last several years of the Clinton administration when the Republican majority refused to hold hearings on the nominations of Judge Helene White, Kathleen McCree Lewis and Professor Kent Markus to vacancies in the Sixth Circuit.

One of those seats has been vacant since 1995, the first term of President Clinton. Judge Helene White of the Michigan Court of Appeals was nominated in January 1997 and did not receive a hearing on her nomination during the more than 1,500 days before her nomination was withdrawn by President Bush in March of last year. Judge White's nomination may have set an unfortunate record.

Her nomination was pending without a hearing for over four years—51 months. She was first nominated in January 1997 and renominated and renominated through March of last year when President Bush chose to withdraw her nomination. Under Republican control, the Committee averaged hearings on only about eight Courts of Appeals nominees a year and, in 2000, held only five hearings on Courts of Appeals nominees all year.

In contrast, Professor Rogers was the fifteenth Court of Appeals nominee of President Bush to receive a hearing by the Committee in less than a year since the reorganization of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In 16 months we held hearings on 20 circuit court nominations. Professor Rogers was being treated much better than Kathleen McCree Lewis, a distinguished African American lawyer from a prestigious Michigan law firm. She never had a hearing on her 1999 nomination to the Sixth Circuit during the years it was pending before it was withdrawn by President Bush in March 2001.

Professor Kent Markus, another outstanding nominee to a vacancy on the Sixth Circuit that arose in 1999, never received a hearing on his nomination before his nomination was returned to President Clinton without action in December 2000. While Professor Markus' nomination was pending, his confirmation was supported by individuals of every political stripe, including 14 past presidents of the Ohio State Bar Association and more than 80 Ohio law school deans and professors.

Others who supported Professor Markus include prominent Ohio Republicans, including Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice Thomas Moyer, Ohio Supreme Court Justice Evelyn Stratton, Congresswoman DEBORAH PRYCE, and Congressman DAVID HOBSON, the National District Attorneys Association, and virtually every major newspaper in the state.

In his testimony to the Senate in May, Professor Markus summarized his experience as a Federal judicial nominee, demonstrating how the ''history regarding the current vacancy backlog is being obscured by some.'' Here are some of things he said:

On February 9, 2000, I was the President's first judicial nominee in that calendar year. And then the waiting began. . . .

At the time my nomination was pending, despite lower vacancy rates than the 6th Circuit, in calendar year 2000, the Senate confirmed circuit nominees to the 3rd, 9th and Federal Circuits. . . . No 6th circuit nominee had been afforded a hearing in the prior two years. Of the nominees awaiting a Judiciary Committee hearing, there was no circuit with more nominees than the 6th Circuit.

With high vacancies already impacting the 6th Circuit's performance, and more vacancies on the way, why, then, did my nomination expire without even a hearing? To their credit, Senator DEWINE and his staff and Senator HATCH's staff and others close to him were straight with me.

Over and over again they told me two things: 1. There will be no more confirmations to the 6th Circuit during the Clinton administration[.] 2. This has nothing to do with you; don't take it personally—it doesn't matter who the nominee is, what credentials they may have or what support they may have—see item number 1. . . .

The fact was, a decision had been made to hold the vacancies and see who won the presidential election. With a Bush win, all those seats could go to Bush rather than Clinton nominees.

As Professor Markus identified, some on the other side of the aisle held these seats open for years for another President to fill, instead of proceeding fairly on the consensus nominees pending before the Senate. Some were unwilling to move forward, knowing that retirements and attrition would create four additional seats that would arise naturally for the next President. That is why there are now so many vacancies on the Sixth Circuit.

Had Republicans not blocked President Clinton's nominees to this court, if the three Democratic nominees had been confirmed and President Bush appointed the judges to the other vacancies on the Sixth Circuit, that court would be almost evenly balanced between judges appointed by Republicans and Democrats. That is what Republican obstruction was designed to avoid, balance. The same is true of a number of other circuits, with Republicans benefitting from their obstructionist practices of the preceding six and a half years. This combined with President Bush's refusal to consult with Democratic Senators about these matters is particularly troubling.

Long before some of the recent voices of concern were raised about the vacancies on that court, Democratic Senators in 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000 implored the Republican majority to give the Sixth Circuit nominees hearings. Those requests, made not just for the sake of the nominees but for the sake of the public's business before the court, were ignored. Numerous articles and editorials urged the Republican leadership to act on those nominations.

Fourteen former presidents of the Michigan State Bar pleaded for hearings on those nominations. The former Chief Judge of the Sixth Circuit, Judge Gilbert Merritt, wrote to the Judiciary Committee Chairman years ago to ask that the nominees get hearings and