

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Akaka	Dodd	Lott
Alexander	Dole	Lugar
Allard	Domenici	McCain
Allen	Dorgan	Mikulski
Baucus	Durbin	Murkowski
Bayh	Ensign	Murray
Bennett	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Feinstein	Nickles
Boxer	Fitzgerald	Pryor
Breaux	Frist	Reed
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Reid
Bunning	Graham (SC)	Roberts
Burns	Grassley	Rockefeller
Byrd	Gregg	Santorum
Cantwell	Hagel	Sarbanes
Carper	Harkin	Schumer
Chafee	Hatch	Sessions
Chambliss	Hollings	Shelby
Clinton	Inhofe	Smith
Cochran	Inouye	Snowe
Coleman	Jeffords	Specter
Collins	Johnson	Stabenow
Conrad	Kennedy	Stevens
Cornyn	Kohl	Sununu
Corzine	Landrieu	Talent
Craig	Lautenberg	Thomas
Crapo	Leahy	Voivovich
Daschle	Levin	Warner
Dayton	Lieberman	Wyden
DeWine	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—8

Biden	Hutchison	McConnell
Campbell	Kerry	Miller
Edwards	Kyl	

The nomination was confirmed.

THE CONFIRMATION OF DANIEL BREEN TO BE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am in strong support of Judge Daniel Breen to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

For more than a decade Judge Breen has admirably served the state of Tennessee's Western District as a United States Magistrate Judge. Before assuming this position in the Jackson and Memphis area, he practiced law in most of the surrounding West Tennessee counties for sixteen years.

Judge Breen graduated first in his class from Spring Hill College and later graduated from the University of Tennessee College of Law. His list of bar-related and civic activities is long and distinguished: President of the Tennessee Bar Association, Subcommittee Chair in the American Bar Association, Executive Committee member of the West Tennessee Council Boy Scouts of America, and a Lifetime Board Member of the West Tennessee Cerebral Palsy Center. As you can tell, his roots are deep with the people he serves.

In addition to an active civil trial docket, Judge Breen is also recognized as an effective mediator, and an instructor and author on alternative dispute resolution. He has made a broad range of contributions to the bar, as well as the State and Federal courts. This work has earned him the respect of the local legal community. I have

heard from many in the Tennessee bar praising Judge Breen's thoughtfulness and judicial temperament. Judge Breen is a dedicated, hard working and even-handed jurist.

Judge Breen's record has prepared him to be ready for this job beginning on day one. I am honored to support his confirmation, and I know he will serve the Western District of Tennessee as a U.S. District Judge with distinction. I thank my colleagues for voting for his confirmation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased today to support Judge John Breen, who has been nominated to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Tennessee.

Judge Breen has served on both sides of the bench with distinction. Upon graduating from the University of Tennessee Law School in 1975, he entered private practice by joining the Jackson firm of Waldrop & Hall. He is one of the few lawyers these days who spent his entire litigating career with a single firm. His area of expertise was general civil litigation. In addition to representing insurance companies and self-insured businesses, he also represented individual clients in real estate, commercial, corporate and estate planning matters.

Judge Breen has made a broad range of contributions to the bar. He served as the President of the Tennessee Bar Association, which reflects the high esteem in which his colleagues hold him. He also served on the Board of Directors for the Tennessee Bar Foundation. In the course of his career, he has accepted many appointments to represent indigent criminal defendants in State and Federal court. Judge Breen also provided many hours of pro bono service for West Tennessee Legal Services.

Since 1991, Judge Breen has served as a Federal magistrate judge, where he has handled a broad array of evidentiary hearings and issued many reports and recommendations. In addition, Judge Breen is also recognized as an effective mediator, as well as an instructor and author on alternative dispute resolution.

The American Bar Association rated Judge Breen unanimously well qualified, its highest rating. I am confident that he will serve on the bench with integrity, intelligence and fairness.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I support the nomination of John Daniel Breen to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee. I am pleased that the Senate has moved so expeditiously to confirm this exceptional nominee.

Mr. Breen is currently a United States Judge in the Western District of Tennessee. Judge Breen was recommended last year by the current Senate Majority Leader, my colleague, Senator FRIST, and former Senator Thompson. I am pleased to add my voice in support of his nomination. As someone who, as Governor of Tennessee appointed some 50 judges, I am

confident that Judge Breen will continue to be an able Federal judge when he is confirmed as a United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee.

Judge Breen was born and raised in Jackson, TN. He was a summa cum laude graduate of Spring Hill College in Mobile, AL in 1972, and was valedictorian of his class. He received his Juris Doctorate from the University of Tennessee College of Law in 1975, where he served as a member of the law review.

After receiving his law degree, Judge Breen worked for sixteen years with the law firm of Waldrop and Hall, P.A. in Jackson, TN. Judge Breen has been a United States Judge for the Western District of Tennessee since 1991 and has an excellent reputation in this position.

Judge Breen has vast litigation experience. As a practicing attorney, he practiced general civil litigation primarily in the areas of tort law and workers' compensation. Judge Breen was involved in litigating one of the premier lawsuits in Tennessee in the 1990's, which resulted in the adoption of comparative negligence.

Judge Breen has been actively involved and held leadership positions in local, State and national bar associations throughout his legal career. He has also been extremely active in his community by, among other things, providing pro bono legal services to disadvantaged persons and serving as a member on a variety of community organizations.

I am confident that Judge Breen will be a fine United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, and I thank all my colleagues who supported this nomination.

NOMINATION OF MIGUEL A. ESTRADA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now continue in executive session with the consideration of the Estrada nomination.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Miguel A. Estrada, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the

standing rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 21, the nomination of Miguel A. Estrada to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Bill Frist, Orrin G. Hatch, Robert F. Bennett, James M. Inhofe, John Ensign, Sam Brownback, Michael B. Enzi, Wayne Allard, Michael D. Crapo, Susan M. Collins, Pete V. Domenici, Conrad R. Burns, Kay Bailey Hutchison, John E. Sununu, Norm Coleman, Charles E. Grassley.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the live quorum as provided for under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. FRIST. For the information of all Senators, this cloture motion, which will be the third vote in relation to the Estrada nomination, will occur on Tuesday. I regret that it has been necessary for me to file this motion once again. With Tuesday's vote, the Senate will have matched the most cloture votes relative to executive nominations. That is certainly not a record or milestone I think this Senate should be proud of achieving.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m., on Monday, March 17, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the first concurrent budget resolution, if it has been properly reported by that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be no further votes during today's session.

We have had a productive, full week. I thank the managers on both sides of the aisle for today's work and the previous days' work.

Earlier today, by a vote of 64 to 33, the Senate passed S. 3, the partial-birth abortion ban bill. I thank all Members on both sides of the aisle for their debate and their courtesies throughout the consideration of that bill.

In addition, this week, we have been able to confirm five district judges and one circuit judge. Unfortunately, we were unable to reach a conclusion with respect to the Estrada nomination and, therefore, we will have the cloture vote, once again, on Tuesday.

Next week, the Senate will proceed to the budget resolution. The Budget Act provides for 50 hours of consider-

ation and, therefore, all Members should expect late sessions next week. Although we will begin the budget resolution on Monday, no votes will occur that day. Therefore, the next vote, on cloture, will occur Tuesday morning.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, just a unanimous consent request: Senator LEAHY wishes to speak for 20 minutes, and Senator KENNEDY for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what was the previous unanimous consent agreement of the time for the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The previous order had Senator KENNEDY receiving 30 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. But prior to the votes, wasn't there—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont already had 20 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

Does the distinguished majority leader have other matters?

Mr. FRIST. No.

THE COUNTDOWN TO WAR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last Thursday, at his press conference, the President of the United States gave his reasons to justify the use of military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

The President said again that he has not made up his mind to go to war, but his own advisers are saying that even if Iraq fully complies with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441, Saddam Hussein must be removed from power.

The President said his goal is protecting the American people from terrorism. That is a goal we all share. But he offered no evidence that Iraq had anything to do with the September 11 attacks or any details of Iraq's links to al-Qaida.

He offered no new information about the potential costs of a war, either in American and Iraqi lives, or in dollars. Both Republicans and Democrats have urged the President to be more forthcoming with the American people, to tell us what sacrifices may be involved—not to have Cabinet members come to the Senate and the House, and when asked how much they estimate a war and its aftermath may cost, say: We have no idea.

We know the administration has estimated the costs, yet the President dismissively says "ask the spenders" in

Congress, knowing full well that Congress appropriates funds, it is the President who spends them.

It is disingenuous, at best, to refuse to level with the American people at a time of rapidly escalating deficits. We know it has already cost billions of dollars just to send our troops over there, but how many more tens or hundreds of billions of dollars, may be added to the deficit? The President is apparently ready to send hundreds of thousands of America's sons and daughters into battle without saying anything about the costs and risks.

The President repeatedly spoke of the danger of "doing nothing," as if doing nothing is what those who urge patience and caution—with war only as a last resort—are recommending. In fact, virtually no one is saying we should do nothing about Saddam Hussein.

Even most of the millions of people who have joined protests and demonstrations against the use of force without U.N. Security Council authorization are not saying the world should ignore Saddam Hussein.

Yet that is the President's answer to those who oppose a preemptive U.S. invasion, and who, contrary to wanting to do nothing, want to give the United Nations more time to try to solve this crisis without war.

The President also failed to address a key concern that divides Americans, that divides us from many of our closest European allies, that divides our allies from each other, and that divides the U.N. Security Council. That issue is not whether or not Saddam Hussein is a deceptive, despicable, dangerous despot who should be disarmed. There is little, if any, disagreement about that.

Nor is it whether or not force should ever be used. Most people accept that the United States, like any country, has a right of self-defense if it is faced with an imminent threat. If the U.N. inspectors fail to disarm Iraq, force may become the only option.

Most people also agree that a United States-led invasion would quickly overwhelm and defeat Iraq's ill-equipped, demoralized army.

Rather, the President said almost nothing about the concern shared by so many people, that by attacking Iraq to enforce Security Council Resolution 1441 without the support of key allies on the U.N. Security Council, we risk weakening the Security Council's future effectiveness and our own ability to rally international support not only to prevent this war and future wars, but to deal with other global threats like terrorism. This concern is exacerbated by the increasing resentment throughout the world of the administration's domineering and simplistic "you are either with us or against us" approach. It has damaged longstanding relationships, relationships that have taken decades of trust and diplomacy to build, both with our neighbors in this hemisphere and our friends across the Atlantic.