

President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Until President Bush was elected, no one has ever interpreted this requirement to mean anything other than a simple majority vote. The Senate has never denied an up-or-down vote to any appellate court nominee who had majority support. But the Democrats have rejected this 200-year-old Senate tradition and, with it, the very will of the American people.

The Democrats lost the election, and they seem unwilling to accept the fact. Instead, they unilaterally change the rules and politicize the judicial confirmation process. This is extreme behavior and extreme tactics—threatening to shut down the Senate if we should dare to confirm a well-qualified nominee with bipartisan majority support. This is an epitome of arrogance—assuming they know better than the majority of their colleagues and the President. The people back home want to see these nominees treated fairly and given an up-or-down vote.

Is it fair to say to nominees that they are out of the mainstream when they have the support of the Democrats and the Republicans making up the majority of the Senate? I submit it is the obstructionists who are out of the mainstream when they block an up-or-down vote on nominations of justices such as Janice Rogers Brown for years.

Extreme, arrogant, out of the mainstream—this is the anything-goes Senate Democrats who are willing to go to any length to deny exemplary judges the opportunity to dedicate their lives to service to the American people.

By trying to shred the reputation of some of the most respected and admired judges in public service in this country, a few Senators are sending a very powerful message to any others who may aspire to the bench. They are telling us, don't bother. It appears to be increasingly likely that such talent, dedication, and personal sacrifice will be rewarded with attacks on the floor of the Senate and years of uncertainty while a bipartisan majority waits powerless to confirm these nominees.

I call for a return to tradition. The American people have done their jobs and expect us to do the same. We in the Senate need to do our jobs and confirm fair judges through a fair process.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLIO VACCINE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today we celebrate the 50th anniversary

of the polio vaccine. The people of my generation, who were youngsters at that time, remember full well the exciting development. Now polio is virtually eradicated.

The Committee on Foreign Operations, which I have had the privilege to either chair or be ranking member for the last decade or so, has appropriated about \$160 million toward that fight over the last 6 years.

Of course, the Rotary International, a private organization, deserves the lion's share of the credit for almost total eradication of polio. This private civic group with international chapters made this a project some 20 years ago and have collected and spent about \$600 million and delivered the vaccine in all parts of the world. So because of this, today we can celebrate, essentially, the complete eradication of this disease from the Earth. Rotary deserves a big part of the credit for that.

I rise to talk about this for another reason. It had an enormous impact on me personally. I was struck with polio when I was 2 years old. My dad was overseas fighting in World War II. Polio was similar to having the flu—you felt sick all over. Except when polio went away there were residual effects. In my case, when my flu-like symptoms went away, I had a quadriceps in my left leg that was dramatically affected.

My mother was, of course, like many mothers of young polio victims, perplexed about what to do, anxious about whether I would be disabled for the rest of my life. But we were fortunate. While my dad was overseas my mother was living with her sister in east central Alabama, only about 40 or 50 miles from Warm Springs. As everyone knows, President Roosevelt established Warm Springs, where he went to engage in his own physical therapy, as a center to treat other polio victims. So my mother was able to put me in the car, go over to Warm Springs, and actually learn, from those marvelous physical therapists who were there, what to do.

They told my mother she needed to keep me from walking. Now, imagine this. You are the mother of a 2-year-old boy. And we all know how anxious little boys are to get up and get around and get into trouble. So my mother convinced me that I could walk, but I couldn't walk—a pretty subtle concept to try to convey to a 2-year-old. In other words, she wanted me to think I could walk, but she wanted me to also understand I should not walk.

Now, obviously, the only way to enforce that with a 2-year-old is to watch them like a hawk all the time. So I was under intense observation by my mother for 2 years. She administered this physical therapy regiment at least three times a day—all of this really before my recollection. But we now know the things that happened to us in the first 5 years of our lives have an enormous impact on us for the rest of our lives.

So this example of incredible discipline that she was teaching me during this period I always felt had an impact on the rest of my life in terms of whatever discipline I may have been able to bring to bear on things I have been involved in. I really have felt my mother taught me that before I was even old enough to remember.

So this went on for 2 years. My first memory in life was stopping at a shoe store in LaGrange, GA. We had left Warm Springs for the last time, and the physical therapist there had told my mother: Your son can walk now. We think he is going to have a normal childhood and a normal life. We stopped at a shoe store in LaGrange, GA, and bought a pair of saddle oxfords, which are low-top shoes—my first recollection in life.

Thanks to my mother, I had a normal childhood. I was not able to run all that well, but I played baseball and have had a normal life. The only impact of that early childhood experience with polio is that I have a little difficulty going down stairs. Most people do not want to go up stairs and do not mind walking down stairs. I like to walk up stairs and take an elevator down because an effected quadriceps impacts your ability to descend stairs.

So I am particularly moved by the fact that we can stand here today and say that polio is essentially eradicated from the face of the Earth. When I was a youngster, the fear of polio was enormous. Mothers, every summer, lived in fear that their children would come down with polio, and many did, many died. Many had much more serious aftereffects than I did, certainly.

But it is with great gratitude that I commend Rotary International today for this extraordinary accomplishment of getting this vaccine out all over the world so that we can essentially say, in 2005, that polio has been eradicated from the face of the Earth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Polio and Rotary" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 12, 2005]

POLIO AND ROTARY

Today marks the 50th anniversary of the Salk polio vaccine. Poliomyelitis, also known as infantile paralysis, used to be one of childhood's most feared diseases. A few years after Dr. Jonas Salk announced his vaccine on April 12, 1955, nearly every child in the U.S. was protected. Today polio has disappeared from the Americas, Europe and the Western Pacific and is nearly gone from the rest of the world.

A too-little known part of this feat is the role played by Rotary, the international businessman's club, which 20 years ago adopted the goal of wiping out the disease. Rotary understood that medical breakthroughs are worthless unless people aren't afraid to immunize their children and efficient delivery systems exist to get the vaccine to them. And so it mobilized its members in 30,100 clubs in 166 countries to make it happen.

In 1985, when Rotary launched its eradication program, there were an estimated 350,000 new cases of polio in 125 countries. Last year, 1,263 cases were reported. More than one million Rotary members have volunteered their time or donated money to immunize two billion children in 122 countries. In 1988, Rotary money and its example were the catalyst for a global eradication drive joined by the World Health Organization, Unicef and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control. In 2000 Rotary teamed up with the United Nations Foundation to raise \$100 million in private money for the program. By the time the world is certified as polio-free—probably in 2008—Rotary will have contributed \$600 million to its eradication effort.

An economist of our acquaintance calls Rotary's effort the most successful private health-care initiative ever. A vaccine-company CEO recently volunteered to us that the work of Rotary and the Gates Foundation, both private groups, has been more effective than any government in promoting vaccines to save lives. It's become fashionable in some quarters to deride civic volunteerism, but Rotary's unsung polio effort deserves the Nobel Peace Prize.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1268, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, as was just indicated, we are now back on the supplemental appropriations bill, which is critical to the funding of our effort to continue our activities in Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere around the world.

One of the reasons Senator CORNYN and I want to speak for a few minutes this morning is to make the point that we very much hope our colleagues will join with us in ensuring the quick passage of this bill so we can get on with that effort and then move to other business.

There has been a suggestion that amendments might be offered to the bill that do not relate to the funding of the war effort. For example, some of our colleagues have talked about offering amendments that relate to the subject of immigration. Now, that subject

is one we are going to have to debate this year, and we are going to have to consider legislation very seriously later on this year, but our view is that it would be inappropriate to consider that legislation in the context of this supplemental appropriations bill.

We are aware of the fact there was a provision in the House bill that related to driver's license standards and asylum, but those are matters that relate more to terrorist activities than our immigration laws, as they pertain to illegal immigration. Therefore, our view is that we would refrain from offering amendments of that kind and would hope our colleagues would as well.

We would hope, by indicating what we plan to do, that our colleagues would appreciate our commitment—that is to say, Senator CORNYN and myself—to seeing that the issue of illegal immigration generally and immigration reform specifically will, in fact, be considered by the Senate a little bit later on this year.

It is our intention to introduce legislation and to work through the amendment process, perhaps before that, to ensure that we are doing everything we can in the Congress to ensure our borders are secure, that we have adequate law enforcement both at the borders and in the interior of the country, and that we, therefore, create the precondition for the consideration of immigration reform, which is that we do have a commitment to enforce the law and abide by the rule of law in this country.

There is one thing I think almost everybody interested in the immigration debate will agree on, and that is that we have a broken legal system right now. Employers pretend they are not employing illegal immigrants, but they know they are, and they have documents the Government has called for. The Government pretends to enforce the law, but it knows the documents, in many cases, are counterfeit.

The industry will very candidly tell you they do not know what they would do without the illegal employment they have today. So they are putting pressure on some of our Members to come forward with legislation to create a legal regime for these employees and, indeed, there should be.

We should get to the point where nobody in this country hires illegal immigrants anymore. To do that, we are going to have to demonstrate a couple things. The first is that we are committed to enforcing such a law, because our constituents rightly tell us: Why should we consider immigration reform—temporary worker reform, for example—if we don't think it is going to be enforced? You are not enforcing the law today. What makes us think you are going to enforce the law in the future?

It is a good question. We have to be able to answer that question in the affirmative and say we are committed to enforcing the law. It begins with en-

forcement at the border, and it goes right on through with the rest of the law that makes it illegal to hire illegal immigrants. Those laws do need to be adequately enforced.

If we could commit ourselves to do that, then I believe we could lay the foundation for successfully getting legislation to provide some kind of guest worker or temporary worker program that will both liberalize the ability of employers to bring legal immigrants into this country to work for them on a temporary basis and also deal with the 10 to 15 million—nobody knows exactly how many for sure—illegal immigrants who exist in the country today. Many of those people work hard. They come to work here. They intend only to send money back to their relatives in Central America or Mexico or wherever they came from. Many of them are, indeed, needed in our workforce. But we cannot condone a situation in which they are working illegally. So we have to come up with a structure that would permit us to take advantage of their desire to work here, but to do so in a legal construct and not to reward them with any kind of amnesty.

The specifics of doing that have been discussed a little bit by the President of the United States, who laid out some principles for a guest worker program, as he calls it. What Senator CORNYN and I are here to talk about today is the fact that we are working on legislation to try to embody many of the principles the President has laid out to create a legal mechanism by which we can meet our workforce needs in this country but to do so all within the rule of law, where the law will be strictly enforced, there will be no more hiring of illegal immigrants, and therefore we remove the magnet which currently exists which draws illegal immigrants into our country because they can be employed easily.

So we remove that magnet, but we do so in a way that does not reward the lawbreakers, the people who come here illegally and use illegal documentation to obtain employment and, in many cases, are creating a drain on society, and ensure they are not rewarded for their illegal behavior by amnesty, which I think most people would agree, at a minimum, means they would not be granted a path to citizenship or be able to chain migrate their family into the country ahead of those who want to do so legally; meaning, specifically, that, of course, anyone who wanted to do that could get in line in their country of origin with a worker sponsor for legal, permanent residency or green card status. If they acquired that status, then there are other things that flow from that, such as the ability to apply for citizenship. But that should only come as a result of going home, being there, and getting in line with everybody else. It certainly should not be granted to people who came here illegally and would be permitted to stay here while that status was pending. That is the kind of thing we mean by saying no amnesty.