only 24.1 percent of the nominees to the circuit courts have received a full Senate vote—only 7 of 29.

This is really unprecedented, shabby treatment of President Bush's circuit court nominees.

The final chart shows comprehensively how poorly we are doing right now at all stages of the process in moving circuit court nominees.

Looking at it in terms of hearings, committee votes, or full Senate votes, during a President's first 2 years in office, the picture tells the story.

Under President Carter, 100 percent received both a hearing, a committee vote, and a full Senate vote during his first 2 years.

During President Reagan, 95 percent of his nominees received a hearing, a committee vote, and a full Senate vote.

The first President Bush, 95.7 percent of his nominees got all three—a hearing, a committee vote, and a full Senate vote.

President Clinton: 91 percent of his nominees in his first 2 years—again, remembering that President Clinton's party controlled the Senate his first 2 years—91 percent received a hearing in committee, and 86.4 percent received a vote both in committee and in the full Senate.

Then, looking at President George W. Bush, only 34.5 percent of his nominees for circuit court—a mere 10 out of 29—have even been given a hearing in committee, only 27.6 percent have been given votes in committee, and only 24 percent—a mere 7 out of 29—have been given votes in the full Senate.

This is a very poor record that I think begins to become a national issue. At the rate this is going, I think it will be discussed all across our country in the course of the Senate elections this fall.

It is pretty clear that we are not doing a very good job of filling vacancies, particularly the 19 percent of vacancies that exist at the circuit court level, and 50 percent of the vacancies that exist in my own State of Kentucky.

We did have a markup for a lone circuit court nominee this morning, and we had a confirmation hearing this afternoon for another lone circuit court nominee. I suppose that is a step in the right direction. Some progress is certainly, of course, better than none. But if we are going to address the major vacancy problem on the appellate courts, we must have more than one circuit court nominee per confirmation hearing, and we must have more than one circuit court nominee at a markup.

Furthermore, we are going to have to have regular hearings and regular markups for circuit court nominees. Before today, for example, it had been 4 weeks since we had a markup. Thus, in the 2 weeks prior to recess, we had only one markup with only one circuit court nominee on the agenda. And that nominee was, in fact, defeated on a party-line vote. When Senator HATCH was chairman, 10 times he held hearings with more than one circuit court nominee on the agenda. With the circuit court vacancy rate approaching 20 percent, this is something we should be doing now as well.

In sum, we need to do a better job in the confirmation process, particularly with respect to circuit court nominees.

These historical precedents give us a reasonable goal to which to aspire, and we need to redouble our efforts to meet past practices.

I might say in closing that we have a particular crisis in the Sixth Judicial Circuit, which includes the States of Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The Sixth Circuit is 50-percent vacant. Eight out of 16 seats are not filled—not because there haven't been nominations. Seven of the eight nominations are before the Senate Judiciary Committee. A couple of them have been there for almost a year. No hearings have been held. We have a judicial emergency in the Sixth Circuit.

I think this needs to be talked about. Regretfully, our record is quite sorry. We have some months left to be in session. Hopefully, this will improve as the weeks roll along.

Madam 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. VOINOVICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be recognized to speak in morning business.

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

PIPELINE AND TRANSMISSION STREAMLINING

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, I would like to spend a few minutes today talking about an amendment that I filed on the energy bill, amendment No. 3116. It is titled the ''Integrated Review of Energy Delivery Systems Act of 2002.''

This amendment, which Senator LANDRIEU has cosponsored, will streamline the siting process for energy pipelines and transmission lines.

As my colleagues know, one of the biggest challenges we face in ensuring that we have a consistent energy policy is ensuring we get energy to where it is needed. One of the problems we have had in previous winters has been the inability of energy supply to meet the demand solely because of bottlenecks in the distribution system.

Unless we address the situation, each winter places such as the northeastern part of the United States will continue to face high spikes in prices because their electric power grid and their pipeline system are both severely overtaxed. Removing this bottleneck will help stem huge potential problems down the road.

The Presiding Officer knows that one of the concerns we had last year was whether or not we would be able to get electricity into New York, into the Presiding Officer's part of the country, because of the issue of transmission lines. We were fortunate last summer was not that hot and the demand was not up, so there were not any brownouts or blackouts. But it is very important we move forward with siting these transmission lines so we can get power into the areas that need them.

The amendment Senator LANDRIEU and I have written would require all Federal agencies to coordinate the environmental reviews of energy pipelines and transmission lines so that the reviews take place simultaneously and a decision can be reached quickly on whether to move forward with the projects.

This amendment does not change underlying environmental statutes, nor does it change the environmental standards used for approving these projects. All current and future environmental laws are not changed by the amendment. Let me repeat that: Current and future environmental laws are not changed.

This amendment is based on a bill I introduced last year, S. 1580, the Environmental Streamlining of Energy Facilities Act of 2001, which would have applied to all energy facilities.

The idea for this amendment is from the environmental streamlining provisions of the highway bill, TEA–21. In that legislation, an amendment offered by Senators WYDEN, GRAHAM, and BOB SMITH required the Transportation Department to coordinate all environmental reviews for highway projects so that the reviews would take place at the same time, saving years on major highway projects.

What we are trying to do today is apply this same concept to the building of pipelines and transmission lines. Today we are facing a shortage of pipelines, and it is becoming more difficult every day to site transmission lines. While this amendment would not change the laws of eminent domain or the environmental standards, what it will do is help expedite the review process.

I would like to briefly outline the provisions of my amendment.

First, we designate one lead agency to coordinate the review process. To eliminate the duplication efforts by agencies with oversight for the construction, operation, and maintenance of pipelines and transmission lines, a single Federal agency would be identified to coordinate all required paperwork and research for the environmental review of a proposed pipeline or transmission system.

The agencies involved in this process would include the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Energy, FERC, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Transportation's Office of Pipeline Safety.

Agencies with partial oversight for a project would provide information from their area of expertise, while the

lead agency would be responsible for establishing the deadlines, facilitating communication between the agencies, and defining the role of participating agencies during the environmental review process.

The lead agency, along with the Governor of the State where the application for the facility has been made, would work together to provide early notification to the public in order to identify and address any environmental concerns associated with the proposed system.

If there appears to be an environmental concern related to the permitting, the Council on Environmental Quality, in conjunction with the heads of the lead agency and participating agencies, would work together to resolve the matter within 30 days.

The problem is, when differences of opinion arise, it can take forever for these differences to be resolved. What we are suggesting in this legislation is that they would be brought to the Council on Environmental Quality, and they would sit down with the lead agency and participating agencies, and they would work together to get a resolution within 30 days.

The amendment directs coordination between the Federal, State, and local governments on particular projects. After a lead agency is appointed, it would be required to coordinate the environmental review process with input from Federal, State, and local governments. This includes the preparation of environmental impact statements, review analysis, opinions, determinations, or authorizations required under Federal law.

The amendment also allows for Federal delegation to the States. At the request of a Governor, and with the agreement of the applicant, a State agency may assume the role of lead agency. The Federal agency would delegate to the State agency the authority to prepare the Federal environmental impact statement or other environmental assessment following the procedures for a Federal lead agency.

Where there is a delegation of authority to the State, the lead agency continues to provide guidance and participation in preparing the final version of the environmental impact statement or environmental assessment. The lead Federal agency must also provide an independent evaluation of the statement or assessment prior to its approval.

Finally, the standard of review under State and Federal laws relating to the siting or construction or operation of a pipeline or transmission line would not be preempted, and the lead Federal agency is authorized to provide funding to the State when they assume the Federal responsibility.

It is vital that we act on the problem of expediting the siting of pipelines and transmission lines. This is a problem that plagues the entire country, including my home State of Ohio. However, in my view, the region which probably needs this provision the most is the Northeast.

According to a study by ISO New England Corporation, the nonprofit operator of New England's power grid has said that New England is increasing its natural gas demand from 16 percent in 1999, to a projected 45-percent demand in 2005. Unfortunately, they lack the local pipelines to distribute that gas to their markets.

The study says that there is no worry about any blackouts, unless nothing has changed one year from now. Three of the changes they need are: New gas-fired plants should be allowed to develop the ability to burn oil as a backup. The second is the regional pipeline system has to be expanded. And third, new compressors need to be added to existing pipelines to increase delivery capacity. So there is a genuine need there to move forward with providing pipelines so they can get gas into the Northeast, s ISO stated in its report issued in January of last year.

The chairman of the ISO New England, Mr. William Berry, said:

The long and complicated federal permitting process for building new interstate pipelines is a greater obstacle than the technical construction work.

The amendment Senator LANDRIEU and I introduced will help speed up, as Mr. Berry calls it, ''the long and complicated federal permitting process,'' and it will do so without jeopardizing any environmental protections and without changing any of our current environmental laws.

This amendment is supported by the American Gas Association, the American Chemistry Council, the Edison Electric Institute, the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, the Association of Oil Pipelines, and the National Association of Manufacturers.

This is a commonsense approach to requiring our Federal agencies to work together to get the permitting decisions considered at the same time. According to the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, the United States will need 49,500 miles of new natural gas transmission lines between now and 2015. That is just to keep up with the large projected increase in demand for natural gas. It is also projected that our demand for natural gas will increase by 50 percent by the year 2020.

We need to act today to ensure that our energy can be delivered to American homes tomorrow. I hope this amendment will be accepted and we can move forward with providing both industry and American consumers the confidence that the Federal Government will not be an obstacle to the delivery of energy and that this can be done without changing or undermining our environmental laws.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Friday, April 12, 2002.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:32 p.m., adjourned until Friday, April 12, 2002, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11, 2002:

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

TONY HAMMOND, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A COMMISSIONER OF THE POSTAL RATE COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 14, 2004, VICE EDWARD JAY GLEIMAN, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STEVEN M. BISKUPIC, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE THOMAS PAUL SCHNEIDER, RESIGNED.

JAN PAUL MILLER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE FRANCES CUTHBERT HULIN, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. LEON J. LAPORTE, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GARY H. HUGHEY, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL J. BISSONNETTE, 0000
MARK A. CLESTER, 0000
DANIEL J. MCLEAN, 0000

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 11, 2002:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

ROBERT WATSON COBB, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.