

cases of death and serious health consequences for people who thought they were taking an innocent little pill that can be sold over the counter at a convenience store. In fact, many have turned out to be lethal doses that have killed or caused a great deal of harm.

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. TALENT. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, the courts provide the foundation upon which the institutions of government in our free society are built. Their strength and legitimacy are derived from a long tradition of Federal judges whose knowledge, integrity and impartiality are beyond reproach.

The Senate is obligated by the Constitution—and the public interest—to protect this legacy and to ensure that the public's confidence in the court system is justified and continues for many years to come.

As guardians of this trust we must carefully scrutinize the credentials and qualifications of every man and woman nominated by the President to serve on the Federal bench.

The men and women we approve for these lifetime appointments make important decisions each and every day, which impact the American people. Once on the bench they may be called upon to consider the extent of our right to personal privacy, our right to free speech, or even a criminal defendant's right to counsel. The importance of these positions and their influence must not be dismissed.

We all have benefitted from listening to the debate about Miguel Estrada's qualifications to serve on the D.C. Circuit.

I very much respect those Senators who desire to have additional information about Mr. Estrada's personal beliefs. Their efforts reflect a sound commitment to the Senate's constitutional obligation to advise and consent.

At the same time, I am troubled by those who have suggested that some Senators are anti-Hispanic because they seek additional information about this nominee. Poisoning the debate with baseless accusations demeans the nomination process.

After reviewing Mr. Estrada's personal and professional credentials—including personally interviewing the nominee—I believe he is qualified to serve on the D.C. Circuit Court—and, I will vote in favor of his nomination.

A Federal appellate judge's power to decide and pronounce judgment and carry it into effect is immense and comes with a moral and legal obligation to conform to the highest standards of conduct.

Federal judges must possess a high degree of knowledge of established

legal principles and procedures and must also be impartial, even tempered and have a well-defined sense of justice, compassion and fair play.

In addition, a judge must have the integrity to leave legislating to lawmakers. Judges must have the self-restraint to avoid injecting their own personal views or ideas that may be inconsistent with existing decisional or statutory law.

I believe Mr. Estrada possesses the knowledge and skills needed to be a successful court of appeals judge. Few would argue with his academic credentials, litigation experience or intelligence.

And based on my conversation with him, and those who know him well, I believe he respects—and will honor—his moral and legal obligation to uphold the law impartially.

However, should Mr. Estrada someday be considered for a position on the Supreme Court—as some have suggested he could be—I believe further inquiry not only will be justified, but necessary.

While appellate judges are constrained to a great degree by precedent, and by a check on their power by the Supreme Court, justices on the High Court have greater latitude to insert their own ideological viewpoints.

Mr. Estrada agreed wholeheartedly with this point when we discussed his nomination.

Make no mistake; I believe all judicial nominees should be completely forthcoming during the confirmation process.

Mr. Estrada has argued that he's satisfied a minimum threshold of disclosure, and that revealing additional information about his personal ideological beliefs may compromise his image of impartiality—if he eventually is seated on the federal bench.

I disagree with his approach, because it leads to the suspicion and mistrust—like that which now engulfs us.

Furthermore, I do not believe a similar argument reasonably can be made by a nominee to the Supreme Court. Ideology can be central to the High Court's decisions. As a result, absolute disclosure by Supreme Court nominees is necessary to protect the public interest.

In sum, while I believe Mr. Estrada could have been more forthcoming in order to avoid this controversy, my conclusion is that he is qualified to serve on the D.C. Circuit.

Should he come before the Senate as a nominee to the Supreme Court, he must be willing to provide additional information about his personal beliefs.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

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

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL PHILIP G. KILLEY FOR 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I salute a great American and South Dakotan, Major General Philip G. Killey.

General Killey, currently the Adjutant General of the South Dakota National Guard, retires at the end of this week, after 40 years of service. His service includes nearly a quarter-century with the South Dakota National Guard, including two separate appointments as Adjutant General covering more than 6 years.

Since September 11, 2001, General Killey's job has become more demanding and complex, but, as ever through his career, he has proven worthy of the challenge. Since September 11, his troops have been performing a broad variety of missions, from bolstering security at our State's airports to enforcing the no-fly zone over Iraq, from fighting forest fires to keeping the peace in Bosnia. All this, while also staying trained and ready for their next assignment.

Now, that next assignment is here. About 1,200 South Dakota Guard personnel have been called to active duty as part of our Nation's buildup on the borders of Iraq. Given the small population of our State, this is a major contribution. In fact, on a per capita basis, South Dakota is contributing more Guard personnel than all but five other States. This is a much larger commitment than the South Dakota Guard was asked to provide during Desert Storm, its other major call-up of the post-Cold War period, and it has come at a time when General Killey is already managing other high-priority commitments.

Managing these tasks and the Iraq call-up turns out to be the capstone event of General Killey's long military career, and it stands as a real testament to his skill and leadership. It is at critical moments like this, when your resources are stretched thin and you are asked to do even more, that gaps in training, leadership or equipment will reveal themselves. But in South Dakota, General Killey's troops have met the test. They are ready, and it shows.

Over the years, General Killey and I have worked together on many fronts to improve the equipment and facilities of the Guard. In the past 2 years, we have been able to secure nearly \$35 million in construction funds to improve 7 Guard facilities at Camp Rapid, Fort Meade, Pierre, Watertown, Mitchell, and Sioux Falls. We were able to

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

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

secure \$97 million to upgrade 2 battalions of the multiple launch rocket system, one in South Dakota and one in Arkansas, making our artillery system one of the most modern and battle-ready in the National Guard.

In these and other endeavors, I have come to appreciate and respect General Killey for his vision, his energy and initiative, and his sophistication in dealing with both military and civilian authorities. It's been a valuable and productive partnership.

We clearly owe a debt of gratitude to General Killey for 40 years of patriotic service to our State and our Nation. I am proud to call him a fellow South Dakotan and wish all the best for him and his wife, Ellen.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, in accordance with Rule XXVI.2 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules of Procedure of the Select Committee on Ethics, which were adopted February 23, 1978, and revised November 1999, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 108th Congress.

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

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS PART I: ORGANIC AUTHORITY

SUBPART A—S. RES. 338 AS AMENDED

S. Res. 338, 88th Cong., 2d Sess. (1964)

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a permanent select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Ethics (referred to hereinafter as the "Select Committee") consisting of six Members of the Senate, of whom three shall be selected from members of the majority party and three shall be selected from members of the minority party. Members thereof shall be appointed by the Senate in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph I of Rule XXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress. For purposes of paragraph 4 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, service of a Senator as a member or chairman of the Select Committee shall not be taken into account.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the Select Committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(c)(1) A majority of the members of the Select Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business involving complaints or allegations of, or information about, misconduct, including resulting preliminary inquiries, adjudicatory reviews, recommendations or reports, and matters relating to Senate Resolution 400, agreed to May 19, 1976.

(2) Three members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business of the Select Committee not covered by the first paragraph of this subparagraph, including requests for opinions and interpretations concerning the Code of Official Conduct or any other statute or regulation under the jurisdiction of the Select Committee, if one member of the quorum is a member of the majority Party and one member of the quorum is a member of the minor-

ity Party. During the transaction of routine business any member of the Select Committee constituting the quorum shall have the right to postpone further discussion of a pending matter until such time as a majority of the members of the Select Committee are present.

(3) The Select Committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(d)(1) A member of the Select Committee shall be ineligible to participate in—

- (A) any preliminary inquiry, or adjudicatory review relating to—
 - (i) the conduct of—
 - (I) such member;
 - (II) any officer or employee the member supervises; or
 - (III) any employee of any officer the member supervises; or
 - (ii) any complaint filed by the member; and
- (B) the determinations and recommendations of the Select Committee with respect to any preliminary inquiry or adjudicatory review described in subparagraph (A).

For purposes of this paragraph, a member of the Select Committee and an officer of the Senate shall be deemed to supervise any officer or employee consistent with the provision of paragraph 12 of Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(2) A member of the Select Committee may, at the discretion of the member, disqualify himself or herself from participating in any preliminary inquiry or adjudicatory review pending before the Select Committee and the determinations and recommendations of the Select Committee with respect to any such preliminary inquiry or adjudicatory review. Notice of such disqualification shall be given in writing to the President of the Senate.

(3) Whenever any member of the Select Committee is ineligible under paragraph (1) to participate in any preliminary inquiry or adjudicatory review or disqualifies himself or herself under paragraph (2) from participating in any preliminary inquiry or adjudicatory review, another Senator shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (d), be appointed to serve as a member of the Select Committee solely for purposes of such preliminary inquiry or adjudicatory review and the determinations and recommendations of the Select Committee with respect to such preliminary inquiry or adjudicatory review. Any Member of the Senate appointed for such purposes shall be of the same party as the Member who is ineligible or disqualifies himself or herself.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee to—

(1) receive complaints and investigate allegations of improper conduct which may reflect upon the Senate, violations of law, violations of the Senate Code of Official Conduct and violations of rules and regulations of the Senate, relating to the conduct of individuals in the performance of their duties as Members of the Senate, or as officers or employees of the Senate, and to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto;

(2)(A) recommend to the Senate by report or resolution by a majority vote of the full committee disciplinary action to be taken with respect to such violations which the Select Committee shall determine, after according to the individual concerned due notice and opportunity for a hearing, to have occurred;

(B) pursuant to subparagraph (A) recommend discipline, including—

(i) in the case of a Member, a recommendation to the Senate for expulsion, censure, payment of restitution, recommendation to a Member's party conference regarding the

Member's seniority or positions of responsibility, or a combination of these; and

(ii) in the case of an officer or employee, dismissal, suspension, payment of restitution, or a combination of these;

(3) subject to the provisions of subsection (e), by a unanimous vote of 6 members, order that a Member, officer, or employee be reprimanded or pay restitution, or both, if the Select Committee determines, after according to the Member, officer, or employee due notice and opportunity for a hearing, that misconduct occurred warranting discipline less serious than discipline by the full Senate;

(4) in the circumstances described in subsection (d)(3), issue a public or private letter of admonition to a Member, officer, or employee, which shall not be subject to appeal to the Senate;

(5) recommend to the Senate, by report or resolution, such additional rules or regulations as the Select Committee shall determine to be necessary or desirable to insure proper standards of conduct by Members of the Senate, and by officers or employees of the Senate, in the performance of their duties and the discharge of their responsibilities;

(6) by a majority vote of the full committee, report violations of any law, including the provision of false information to the Select Committee, to the proper Federal and State authorities; and

(7) develop and implement programs and materials designed to educate Members, officers, and employees about the laws, rules, regulations, and standards of conduct applicable to such individuals in the performance of their duties.

(b) For the purposes of this resolution—

(1) the term "sworn compliant" means a written statement of facts, submitted under penalty of perjury, within the personal knowledge of the complainant alleging a violation of law, the Senate Code of Official Conduct, or any other rule or regulation of the Senate relating to the conduct of individuals in the performance of their duties as Members, officers, or employees of the Senate;

(2) the term "preliminary inquiry" means a proceeding undertaken by the Select Committee following the receipt of a complaint or allegation of, or information about, misconduct by a Member, officer, or employee of the Senate to determine whether there is substantial credible evidence which provides substantial cause for the Select Committee to conclude that a violation within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee has occurred; and

(3) the term "adjudicatory review" means a proceeding undertaken by the Select Committee after a finding, on the basis of a preliminary inquiry, that there is substantial credible evidence which provides substantial cause for the Select Committee to conclude that a violation within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee has occurred.

(c)(1) No—

(A) adjudicatory review of conduct of a Member or officer of the Senate may be conducted;

(B) report, resolution, or recommendation relating to such an adjudicatory review of conduct may be made; and

(C) letter of admonition pursuant to subsection (d)(3) may be issued, unless approved by the affirmative recorded vote of no fewer than 4 members of the Select Committee.

(2) No other resolution, report, recommendation, interpretative ruling, or advisory opinion may be made without an affirmative vote of a majority of the Members of the Select Committee voting.