that gave voice to the dissenters this administration has tried to muzzle. The redactions prevent us from fully understanding that debate and how Criminal Division lawyers under Judge Chertoff's supervision dealt with the FBI concerns that the torture policies were not only immoral but ineffectual. It prevents us from truly understanding Judge Chertoff's role and whether attorneys under his supervision raised the issue with him directly. He said he does not remember. I accept the judge's statement in that regard. But that does not take away from the necessity of being able to have this information.

In response to Senator LEVIN's request for an unredacted version of the FBI emails, the administration issued its broadest assault against the Senate's duty to evaluate a nominee to get oversight of this administration. The administration claimed it would not turn over the unredacted emails because to do so would violate the Privacy Act, even though, through Senate security, any classified information would be protected. The Privacy Act is designed to prevent the Government from disclosing personal information about private individuals who have not consented to disclosure. It is not a tool to conceal identities of public officials engaged in this Nation's business.

As my colleague from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, has so forcefully stated, the administration's penchant for secrecy threatens each and every Senator's ability to do the people's business and undermines our role in providing advice and consent to the President's nominees and undermines our role in conducting oversight into this administration. In the end, what is most troubling is that the administration's culture of secrecy may breed further abuses, abuses we know of today, not because of but in spite of the administration's effort.

We must overcome these roadblocks put up by the administration because the job of protecting the homeland is too important. Judge Chertoff will have enormous challenges if he assumes his new position, which I am confident he will. Border security, immigration, port security, airport screening, protecting America's critical infrastructure, and so much more will now fall under his purview. He has pledged to work with the Congress in crafting the Department's policies. As much as possible, this must be a nonpartisan exercise. Working together, we can and we must put our country in the strongest possible position to defend itself for the many threats we face.

In short, what I am criticizing and complaining about, we have some emails from the FBI to the Justice Department, saying, in effect, how we conduct our interrogations is appropriate. What the Department of Defense is doing with their brutality and their torture is wrong. I am convinced that is true; the FBI was right. I hope somehow we will be able to get the names of these individuals and pursue it more carefully and also find out what the real words were; I am confident it was torture. One thing we know clearly from these memos is that the FBI says using our methods, the normal methods of interrogation, we are getting more information from the enemy than you are while using your acts of violence.

I close by saying, again, I want this record spread with the fact that Senator LEVIN has done a good thing for this country. He has done good work again in allowing us to look at an issue that should be a simple issue that has been made complicated by this administration by virtue of their hiding what it should not.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the quorum call I am about to invoke be charged equally to both sides.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a few moments we will be voting on the nomination of Judge Michael Chertoff to lead the Department of Homeland Security. I applaud President Bush for his outstanding choice, and I am confident that Judge Chertoff will receive overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle, making this his fourth confirmation by this body, the Senate.

Judge Chertoff has a long and distinguished career in public service and law enforcement.

The Harvard Law magna cum laude first made his name in the mid-1980s putting away five of the biggest Mafia bosses in New York.

His success brought him the job of U.S. attorney in New Jersey where he oversaw high-profile and politically sensitive prosecutions.

In 2001, Judge Chertoff was chosen by President Bush to lead the Justice Department's Criminal Division. It was there that Judge Chertoff would show his full mettle. For the 20 hours following the attacks on 9/11, Judge Chertoff was central in directing our response.

His team in the Criminal Division traced the 9/11 killers back to al-Qaida. And for the next 2 years, Judge Chertoff helped craft our antiterrorism policy.

His experience working directly with law enforcement, his expertise in homeland and national security, and his proven ability to lead in times of national crisis make him overwhelmingly qualified to direct our homeland security.

Judge Chertoff has said he will be proud to stand again with the men and women who form our front line against terror. I know I speak for many when I say we are proud to have a man of his caliber and talent serving and protecting the American people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael Chertoff, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Dole	Martinez
Alexander	Domenici	McCain
Allard	Dorgan	McConnell
Allen	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Murray
Biden	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Frist	Obama
Boxer	Graham	Pryor
Brownback	Grassley	Reed
Bunning	Gregg	Reid
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Burr	Harkin	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hatch	Salazar
Cantwell	Hutchison	Santorum
Carper	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Chafee	Inouye	Schumer
Chambliss	Isakson	Sessions
Clinton	Jeffords	Shelby
Coburn	Johnson	Smith
Cochran	Kennedy	Snowe
Coleman	Kerry	Stabenow
Collins	Kohl	Stevens
Conrad	Kyl	Sununu
Cornyn	Landrieu	Talent
Corzine	Lautenberg	Thomas
Craig	Leahy	Thune
Crapo	Levin	Vitter
Dayton	Lieberman	Voinovich
DeMint	Lincoln	Warner
DeWine	Lott	Wyden
Dodd	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Baucus	Specter

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a

period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the exception of Senator HAGEL who will follow my remarks for up to 15 minutes.

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

The Senator from Nebraska.

(The remarks of Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 388 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached statement from the Office of Compliance be printed in the RECORD today pursuant to section 304(b)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384(b)(1)).

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

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and Request for Comments From Interested Parties

NEW PROPOSED REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING CERTAIN SUBSTANTIVE EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS FOR VETERANS, AS REQUIRED BY 2 U.S.C. 1316a, THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995, AS AMENDED (CAA).

Background

The purpose of this Notice is to issue proposed substantive regulations which will implement the 1998 amendment to the CAA which applies certain veterans' employment rights and protections to employing offices and employees covered by the CAA.

What is the authority under the CAA for these proposed substantive regulations? In 1998, the CAA was amended through addition of 2 U.S.C. 1316a, a provision of the Veterans' Employment Opportunities Act of 1998 (VEOA), which states in relevant part: ''The rights and protections established under section 2108, sections 3309 through 3312, and subchapter I of chapter 35 of Title 5, shall apply to covered employees.'' As will be described in greater detail below, these sections of Title 5 accord certain hiring and retention rights to veterans of the uniformed services. Section 1316a(4)(B) states that ''The regulations issued . . . shall be the same as the most relevant substantive regulations (applicable with respect to the Executive Branch) promulgated to implement the statutory provisions . . . except insofar as the Board may determine for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section.''

Will these regulations, if approved, apply to all employees otherwise covered by the CAA? No. Subsection (5) of 2 U.S.C. 1316a, states that, for the purpose of application of these veterans' employment rights, the term ''covered employee'' shall not apply to any employee of an employing office: (A) whose appointment is made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate; (B) whose appointment is made by a Member of Congress or by a committee or subcommittee of either House of Congress; or (C) who is appointed to a position, the duties of which are equivalent to those of a Senior Executive Service position. . . .'' These regulations would apply to all other covered employees.

Do other veterans' employment rights apply via the CAA to Legislative Branch employing offices and covered employees? Yes. Another statutory scheme regarding veterans' and armed forces members' employment rights is incorporated in part through section 206 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA). Section 206 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1316, applies certain provisions of Title 38 of the U.S. Code regarding ''Employment and Reemployment Rights of Members of the Uniformed Services.'' Section 206 of the CAA also requires the Board of Directors to issue substantive regulations patterned upon the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement the Title 38 rights of members of the uniformed services. As of this date, the Secretary of Labor has not finally promulgated any such regulations. Therefore, regulations implementing CAA section 206 rights will not be proposed by the Board until the Labor Department regulations have been promulgated. The proposed regulations in this Notice are not based on section 206 of the CAA, but solely on the other veterans' rights referenced in 2 U.S.C. 1316a.

What are the veterans' employment rights applied to covered employees and employing offices in 2 U.S.C. 1316a? In recognition of their duty to country, sacrifice, and exceptional capabilities and skills, the United States government has accorded veterans a preference in federal employment through a series of statutes and Executive Orders, beginning as the Civil War drew to a close. While interpreting regulations have been modified over time, many of the current core statutory protections have remained largely unchanged since they were first codified in the historic Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, Act of June 27, 1944, ch. 287, 58 Stat. 387, amended and codified in various provisions of Title 5, U.S.C. In 1998, Congress passed the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act (''VEOA''), Pub. L. 105–339, 112 Stat. 3186 (October 31, 1998), which ''strengthen[s] and broadens''(Sen. Rept. 105–340, 105 Cong., 2d Sess. at 19 (Sept. 21, 1998)) the rights and remedies available to military veterans who are entitled to preferred consideration in hiring and in retention during reductions in force (''RIFs''). Among other provisions of the VEOA, Congress clearly stated, in the law itself, that henceforth the ''rights and protections'' of certain veterans' preference law provisions, originally drafted to cover certain Executive Branch employees, ''shall apply'' to certain ''covered employees'' in the Legislative Branch. VEOA §§4(c)(1) and (5) (emphasis added).

The selected statutory sections which Congress determined ''shall apply'' to covered employees in the Legislative Branch include, first, a definitional section describing the categories of military veterans who are entitled to preference (''preference eligibles''). 5 U.S.C. §2108. Generally, a veteran must be disabled or have served on active duty in the Armed Forces during certain specified time periods or in specified military campaigns to be entitled to preference. In addition, certain family members (mainly spouses, widow[er]s, and mothers) of preference eligible veterans are entitled to the same rights and protections.

The VEOA also makes applicable to the Legislative Branch certain statutory preferences in hiring. In the hiring process, a preference eligible individual who is tested or otherwise numerically evaluated for a position is entitled to have either 5 or 10 points added to his/her score, depending on his/her military service, or disabling condition. 5 U.S.C. §3309. Where experience is a qualifying element for a job, a preference eligible individual is entitled to credit for having relevant experience in the military or in various civil activities. 5 U.S.C. §3311. Where physical requirements (age, height, weight) are a qualifying element for a position, preference eligible individuals (including those who are disabled) may obtain a waiver of such requirements in certain circumstances. 5 U.S.C. §3512.

For certain positions (guards, elevator operators, messengers, custodians), only preference eligible individuals may be considered for hiring so long as such individuals are available. 5 U.S.C. §3310. (These statutory provisions on hiring in the Executive Branch apply specifically to the competitive service; this point will be discussed further below.)

Finally, in prescribing retention rights during Reductions In Force for Executive Branch positions (in both the competitive and in the excepted service), the sections in subchapter I of chapter 35 of Title 5, U.S.C., with a slightly modified definition of ''preference eligible,'' require that employing agencies retain an employee with retention preference in preference to other competing employees, provided that the employee's performance has not been rated unacceptable. 5 U.S.C. §3502(c) (emphasis added).

Along with this explicit command to retain qualifying employees with retention preference, agencies are to follow regulations governing the release of competing employees, giving ''due effect'' to the following factors: (a) employment tenure (i.e., type of appointment); (b) veterans' preference; (c) length of service; and, (d) performance ratings. 5 U.S.C. §3502(a). 5 U.S.C. §3502 also requires certain notification procedures, providing, inter alia, that an employing agency must provide an employee with 60 days written notice (the period may be reduced in certain circumstances) prior to being released during a RIF. 5 U.S.C. §3502(d)(1). Certain protections also apply in connection with a transfer of agency functions from one agency to another. 5 U.S.C. §3503. In addition, where physical requirements (age, height, weight) are a qualifying element for retention, preference eligible individuals (including those with disabilities) may obtain a waiver of such requirements in certain circumstances. 5 U.S.C. §3504.

Are there veterans' employment regulations already in force under the CAA? No.

Procedurals Summary

How are substantive regulations proposed and approved under the CAA? Pursuant to section 304 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1384, the procedure for promulgating such substantive regulations requires that: (1) the Board of Directors adopt proposed substantive regulations and publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking in the *Congressional Record*; (2) there be a comment period of at least 30 days after the date of publication of the general notice of proposed rulemaking; (3) after consideration of comments by the Board of Directors, that the Board adopt regulations and transmit notice of such action together with the regulations and a recommendation regarding the method for Congressional approval of the regulations to the