versus opportunities seized is a clear one. It is long past time we get the politics out of this and put practical, real and, in some cases, visionary solutions on the table so we can strengthen our own economy, strengthen our country, and provide ourselves with alternatives that will make our Nation both healthier and safer at the same time.

I believe we owe the Nation more than staged political events and rhetoric in the effort to move to that future, and I hope we will do so.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the saga of the judiciary continues on Capitol Hill. The Constitution of the United States, which we all keep close at hand, makes it clear that there are three independent branches of Government. Each has an important role in the governance of this democracy. And certainly the independence of the judiciary is something we have valued from the beginning of this Nation, for all the time that we have enjoyed this great country. But it is under attack today from the right wing of the Republican Party in a way that we have not seen in quite some time.

It was reported in this morning's paper that House Majority Leader TOM DELAY, Republican of Texas, was interviewed by Tony Snow on Fox NEWS radio. Mr. DELAY said of the judges whom he has been critical of in the past, when asked if he would include any Supreme Court Justices among those he considered activist and isolated, he said Anthony M. Kennedy, who was named to the Court by President Ronald Reagan.

Mr. DELAY said:

> Absolutely. We've got Justice Kennedy writing decisions based upon international law, not the Constitution of the United States. That's just outrageous.

Mr. DELAY went on to say:

> And not only that, but he—
>
> Justice Kennedy—
>
> said in session that he does his own research on the Internet. That is just incredibly outrageous.

That is a direct quote from TOM DELAY—that a Justice of the Supreme Court who does research on the Internet is one who is a judicial activist.

Has the Internet become the devil's workshop? Is it some infernal machine now that needs to be avoided by all right-thinking Americans? What is Mr. DELAY trying to say as he is stretching to lash out at judges who happen to disagree with his political point of view?

This coming Sunday, this saga will continue at a church in Kentucky with the so-called ''Judge or Justice Sunday'' sponsored by the Family Research Council. They are arguing that any time we question a nominee from the Bush White House we are attacking people of faith.

I can tell you, of the 205 judicial nominees we have approved of this President—and only 10 have not been approved—many of them were undoubtedly people of faith. I have to say ''undoubtedly'' because I can't say for certain. Do you know why? Because this Constitution prohibits anyone from asking a person seeking a job with the Federal Government or a position in the Federal Government what their religious faith happens to be. We cannot under the terms of article VI of the Constitution establish any religious test for office.

So now those who support the rejected nominees are saying they were rejected because of their faith.

You see what they are trying to do. They are trying to draw us into a position where we are going to use religion as some sort of weapon in this debate. That is a mistake.

The Constitution, which has carefully separated church and state throughout our history, says to every American that they have a right of conscience to decide what they want to believe. When we start imposing religious tests, as some in the right would have us do, it is a serious mistake.

As Mr. DELAY lashes out at Supreme Court Justices and others for their outrageous conduct in ''doing research on the Internet,'' and we see these rallies that are attacking those who are upholding Senate rules and traditions of over 200 years based on some flawed interpretation of our Constitution, we understand it is time for Americans who really want to see moderate and balanced and fair judges to speak out.

We have to have the process where the rules are respected, where we have checks and balances in our Government, and where people seeking lifetime appointments must demonstrate not only honesty and competency but the fact that they are in tune with the values and the needs of the American people. Unfortunately, in the case of 10 judges, many of us believe the nominees sent by the White House do not meet that test.

Mr. President, 95 percent of President Bush's nominees have been approved. That is not enough for some, but I think it reflects the fact that the Senate has a constitutional responsibility to look closely at each nominee and decide whether they are worthy of this lifetime appointment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, is it a religious test? Is it an environmental test? Is it a right-to-life test? Is it a racial test? No. Now we say it is TOM DELAY's test.

If it weren't so deadly serious, it would be laughably humorous.

But the other side has reduced what is a tremendously important constitutional responsibility of this Senate into a political game.

From the very outset, when the Bush administration came to town, telegraphed across the Nation was a very clear message by our colleagues from the other side. Inside their internal party politics and beyond, it was all about politics and who they would reject, or who they would disallow the right to have a vote on the floor of the Senate when nominated by this President—if that nominee made it through the Judiciary Committee—whether they would be allowed to became a sitting judge in one of the courts of the United States for which the President, the Congress, and the Senate are responsible.

Religious test, environmental test, a right-to-life test, a racial test, now a TOM DELAY test. Doesn't the other side have anything to talk about nowadays? Don't they have a policy they can take to the American people that will grasp the majority of the American people's minds or is it simply targeting around the edges?

It is deadly serious, and it is not humorous at all.

I rise today to discuss what is a most important constitutional conflict that has developed here in the Senate, and the response that I believe the Senate must act clearly and profoundly on this issue.

In the time that I have been in public office, I have watched the Congress and participated in the Congress in conflicts that some would call historic by nature—an impeachment, a contested election, a midsession shift of party control of the Senate, just to name a few.

But no issue, in my opinion, has threatened to alter the fundamental architecture of Government in the way that it is now being threatened today by the conflict over judicial nominees.

Some of our colleagues have attempted to downplay the importance of the issue. I think that is what you heard this morning—a reduction of the issue to a debate about TOM DELAY's wisdom or a quote about the Internet. This is a lot more important than any one individual, including TOM DELAY.

This is really about the Constitution of the United States. They have attempted to call it, Well, it is ''just business as usual'' to oppose nominees. They have tried to portray it as insignificant in terms of the number of judges. You just heard that a few moments ago about their selective filibuster. They say that is fair and full in the process.

They have characterized it as a simple political struggle between the parties. Well, it is political, but it is constitutional.

In reality, this issue has the potential of altering the balance of power established by the Constitution between our two branches of Government.

I say this because the Constitution gives the Senate a role in Presidential appointments—the ability to accept or reject an appointment—and when a filibuster stops the Senate from taking that vote, it is frustrating the ability of all Senators to fulfill their constitutional duty, to exercise their fundamental constitutional power and participate in the essential function of the executive.

A filibuster doesn't just prevent the Senate from acting, it also stops a nominee in midprocess without a final decision as to whether a nominee is confirmed or rejected, in essence giving the minority of Senators the power to prevent the executive branch from performing its constitutional duty.

That is exactly what we have seen by design, by intent, and without question by votes.

Let me talk about a candidate specifically. Let me talk about my own home State of Idaho and the President's nominee to the Ninth Circuit, Bill Myers.

Bill has had a distinguished career as an attorney, particularly in the area of natural resources and the public land laws of our country where he is nationally recognized by both sides as an expert. These are issues of particular importance to public land States in the West, such as Idaho, represented in the Ninth Circuit.

These issues aren't just professional business to him. In his private life, he has also long been an outdoorsman, and he has spent a significant amount of time volunteering for the National Park Service.

Bill Myers is a public lands man. He loves it, he enjoys it, and he has participated in it. He came to this Senate to work for a former Senator, Allen Simpson, Deputy General Counsel at the Department of Energy, and Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. The Senate confirmed him by unanimous consent as the Solicitor to the Department of the Interior in 2001.

The entire Idaho delegation supports him.

So what is wrong with Bill Myers? Is it a partisan issue? No. Democrat Governor of Idaho, Cecil Andrus, Secretary of the Interior for President Carter, said Bill Myers is a man of great ''personal integrity, judicial temperament, and legal experience,'' as well as he has ''the ability to act fairly on matters of law that will come before him on the court.'' Democratic Governor from Wyoming, Mike Sullivan, said the same thing.

So what is wrong with Bill Myers? Why, when last year the Senate Judiciary Committee voted him out, to send him to the Senate floor, did he never get a vote? Why was he refused a vote and filibustered?

Let me tell you why. I know it firsthand. I served on the Judiciary Committee. I watched the vote. And the day the Senate Judiciary Committee voted him to the floor of the Senate, a senior member from the other side of that committee walked out with me and said: You know, LARRY, your nominee is not going to get a vote on the floor.

They had planned it well in advance. They had picked Bill Myers like they have picked other judicial nominees for their political pawn. The conversation went on, but it was private and I don't divulge it.

But I will say this: From the conversation, I understood very clearly why Bill Myers would not get a vote and why they would filibuster him. It was just prior to the election, a very important election, a Presidential election. They had already picked the candidate they could argue had racial undertones. They had already picked the candidate they believed might be prolife. They had already picked other candidates who didn't fit their political demographics. They picked Bill Myers because of his environmental record, and they told me so.

Is that picking a person because of their talent, because of their experience, because of their judicial temperament, or is it simply playing what I call the ''nominee process of political roulette''? Pick the candidate who serves your political purpose and prove to your constituent base that you are out there for them.

If that is what the nominating process has reduced itself to, then we are not only in a constitutional crisis—we are without question in a political constitutional crisis. No. What we do is important in the Senate. We affect the lives of all Americans in one way or another. But we have a constitutional responsibility when it comes to judges who are nominated by our President who are sent forth by the Judiciary Committee of this Senate once fully vetted and interviewed and questioned.

Once the majority of that committee has spoken, and that nominee comes to the floor of the Senate, I firmly believe that nominee deserves an up-or-down vote. That is the history of the Senate. That is the responsibility of advice and consent. That is what this Senate has done down through the decades.

But not now. Not in the politics of the other side. It does not serve their purpose anymore. So they have reduced it to the rhetoric of saying this is normal; this is usual; this is the politics of the day. Those Republicans are being terribly political at this moment.

I don't agree with that. I have watched this much too long. It is now time the Senate act to establish once again our constitutional role in the advice and consent with the executive branch of Government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to urge our leadership and the rest of my colleagues in the Senate to preserve the significance of our responsibility, enumerated in the Constitution, and to work together to address the judicial crisis that threatens to severely damage our system.

As Members of the Senate, we each bring our own unique background and experience to this institution. And our progress as a body often requires us to make difficult decisions as individuals. While our individual positions on various issues will certainly differ, we must stand together to repair the judicial confirmation process in this body.

Several judicial vacancies have been lingering in our courts for years, causing many jurisdictions, including one in my home State of North Carolina, to be declared ''judicial emergencies.'' It is our responsibility as Senators to respond to these judicial emergencies with action and determination.

It is inexcusable that we allow judicial vacancies to linger for 6 years or, in some cases, longer. Such is the case for the people of my State in the Eastern District of North Carolina. The North Carolina Eastern District post is the longest district court vacancy in the Nation—a seat vacant since 1997. In 1999, the administrative office of the courts declared the district a ''judicial emergency'' and it has been categorized this way for the last 6 years.

In North Carolina we face challenges on the appellate level as well. There are 15 circuit court judgeships in the Fourth Circuit but only one of these is occupied by a North Carolina judge. North Carolina is significantly underrepresented at the circuit court level. A great deal of this can, of course, be attributed to the political nature of the debate surrounding nominations to the Fourth Circuit. All North Carolinians deserve another voice on the Fourth Circuit.

Judge Boyle, currently serving as a District Court judge for the Eastern District of North Carolina, was nominated in May, 2001, by the President to serve on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. The American Bar Association has unanimously rated Judge Boyle as ''well-qualified,'' and has stated he would make an outstanding appellate judge.

The act of merely considering Judge Boyle's nomination should not be a political issue for this distinguished body. Unfortunately, over the past few years it has become one. Before the 108th Congress, when Judge Boyle was first nominated, no judicial nomination which had a clear majority of Senators supporting the nomination was ever prevented from receiving an up-or-down vote. This current judicial confirmation situation is unprecedented.

We should put aside the grievances that have prevented the consideration of judges through the past three Presidential administrations and work together to find a solution. As Senators we must face this crisis with optimism and confidence. Working together we must address this situation directly because I believe that our constituents do

not hope for, nor do they expect, inaction from us on such an important part of our system of government. Partisan bickering or avoidance of our procedural challenges is not a responsible course of action.

Let me be clear. I believe if one of my colleagues objects to a particular judicial nominee, it is certainly appropriate and fair for my colleague to vote against that nominee on the Senate floor. But denying these patriotic Americans, of both parties, who seek to serve this country an up-or-down vote is simply not fair, and it certainly was not the intention of our Founding Fathers when they designed and created this very institution.

As our country plants the seeds of democracy across the world, we have the essential obligation to continue to operate as the model. The integrity of the judicial system is vital and will certainly suffer as a result of inaction. Maintaining our Nation's long-standing distinction requires that its legislature act to ensure harmony and balance among its citizens and its branches of government.

We need to fix this broken process. We need to end the judicial crisis. And we need to vote on our judges.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is approximately 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to finish my statement if it goes a little bit longer.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in Lewis Carroll's book ''Through the Looking Glass,'' Humpty Dumpty has a famous exchange with Alice in which he says:

> When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.

Many partisans in the debate over judicial nominations or appointments in the Senate and among interest groups, particularly, have the same attitude. Let me offer two examples. One is, they play games with the word ''filibuster.'' The current filibusters against judicial nominations have four features: First, they involve defeating attempts to end debate such as defeating a motion to invoke cloture under rule XXII; second, they target nominations with clear bipartisan majority support that would be approved if there were a confirmation vote; three, they are not about debating these nominations but about defeating them; and fourth, these filibusters are completely partisan, organized, and driven by party leaders.

For 2 years, Democrats have claimed these filibusters are nothing new, that they happened before the 108th Congress. Last Friday, the distinguished assistant minority leader Senator DURBIN offered his evidence. He printed in the RECORD a document titled ''History of Filibusters and Judges.'' It was a list of 12 judicial nominations which it said ''needed 60 (or more) votes—cloture—in order to end a filibuster.''

Yet these are filibusters only if, as Humpty Dumpty put it, the word filibuster means whatever you choose it to mean.

Listed first is the 1881 nomination of Stanley Matthews to the Supreme Court. President Rutherford B. Hayes nominated Matthews shortly before leaving office and the Judiciary Committee postponed consideration. Hayes' successor, President James Garfield, renominated Matthews on March 14, 1881, and the Senate confirmed him on May 12. That is hardly a filibuster, yet that is the big news. They have looked so hard to try to find some justification for the inappropriate actions they have taken in the Senate.

Two days ago, Senator NELSON of Florida repeated Senator DURBIN's claim that this was the first judicial nomination filibuster in American history. That claim also appears on the Web site of the leftwing Alliance for Justice whose president is shopping it around on the talk radio circuit.

This claim is incomprehensible. There was no cloture vote on the Matthews nomination for a very simple reason: Our cloture rule would not exist, would not even come into existence, for another 36 years. Nor were 60 votes needed even for confirmation since the Senate contained only 76 Members.

If, as Senator DURBIN apparently urges, we today use the Matthews nomination as a model, we would debate judicial nominations, including those resubmitted after a Presidential election, and then vote them up or down because that is what happened in the Matthews case they used as an example of a filibuster. Humpty Dumpty would be proud of them.

The other nominations on Senator DURBIN's list fare no better. Appeals court nominees Rosemary Barkett and Daniel Manion are on the filibuster list even though we did not take a cloture vote on them. Both of them were confirmed and currently sit on the bench.

Eight others, including Republican nominee Edward Carnes and Democratic nominee Stephen Breyer, are on the list even though the Senate voted to invoke cloture on their nominations. The purpose was to get to the vote up and down.

Abe Fortas is on the list even though his nomination was withdrawn after a failed cloture vote showed he did not have majority support and the opposition was solidly bipartisan—almost as many Democrats as there were Republicans. It was not an all-Democrat filibuster such as these have been.

Here is the kicker: Eleven of the 112 nominees on Senator DURBIN's filibuster list were confirmed by the Senate—all 11 of them—with 9 of them sitting on the Federal bench today. And as for Fortas, President Lyndon Johnson withdrew his nomination, not because there was a filibuster, because no less an authority than Robert Griffin, former Senator from Michigan, who had a reputation of impeccable honesty, has said that there was no filibuster. They had the votes to defeat Fortas up and down. They wanted 2 more days of debate so they could make the case better, but Fortas was going to be defeated up and down. So there was no filibuster there either.

But even if there were, and even if you could stretch it and say there were, it was a bipartisan filibuster, if you could use the term filibuster, with almost as many Democrats as Republicans voting against Fortas. But I would take Senator Griffin's word on that, a man of impeccable honesty, who said there was no intent to filibuster by any Republican or Democrat on that nomination.

None of these situations bears any resemblance to the filibuster of majority-supported judicial nominations underway today.

Let me put this as clearly as I can. Not taking a cloture vote is no precedent for taking a cloture vote. Ending debate is no precedent for not ending debate. Confirming judicial nominations is no precedent for not confirming judicial nominations. And withdrawing nominations lacking majority support is no precedent for refusing to vote on nominations that have majority support.

The second word they play on is ''extremists.'' Democrats and their leftwing interest group allies tell us they only use the filibuster against what they call extremist nominees. Trying to define this label, however, is like trying to nail Jell-O to a cactus in the Utah desert. Like the Constitution in the hand of an activist judge, it means whatever you want it to mean.

No matter what the word means, this word extremist, Senators who truly believe a judicial nominee is an extremist may vote against him. They have a right to vote against anybody they think is an extremist. But this is no argument for refusing to vote in the first place.

As our colleague Senator KENNEDY said in February, 1998:

> We owe it to Americans across the country to give these nominees a vote. If our . . . colleagues don't like them, vote against them. But give them the vote.

I wonder why the change today? I think he meant that statement back then. Why doesn't he mean it today?

In September, 1999, the Judiciary Committee ranking member Senator LEAHY similarly said our oath of office requires us to vote up or down on judicial nominations. Why the change today? It seems to me he meant it back then.

Priscilla Owen, nominated by President Bush to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, was reelected to the Texas Supreme Court in 2000, with 84 percent of the vote. There was no major party opposition, and the endorsement of every major newspaper in the State of Texas. Yet her opponents on the other side call her an extremist.

No fewer than 15 presidents of the State bar of Texas, Democrats and Republicans, strongly endorse her nomination. Yet these opponents call her an extremist.

She has been praised by groups such as the Texas Association of Defense Counsel and Legal Aid of Central Texas. Yet her opponents call her an extremist.

The American Bar Association, often referred to by our friends on the other side as the ''gold standard'' to determine whether a person can sit on the bench, unanimously gave Justice Owen its highest rating of ''well qualified.'' This means she has outstanding legal ability and breadth of experience, the highest reputation for integrity, and such qualities as compassion, open-mindedness, freedom from bias, and commitment to equal justice under law. Yet some of the very Democrats who once said the ABA rating was the gold standard for evaluating judicial nominees now call Justice Owen an extremist.

Another nominee branded an extremist is California Supreme Court Justice Janice Rogers Brown, nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. She is the daughter of Alabama sharecroppers. She attended segregated schools before receiving her law degree from the University of California at Los Angeles—in other words, UCLA. She has spent a quarter century in public service, serving in all three branches of State government.

Off the bench, she has given speeches in which she expressed certain ideas through vivid images, strong rhetoric, and provocative argument. Yet it is what she does on the bench that matters most, and there she has been an evenhanded, judicious, and impartial justice on the California Supreme Court.

George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley knows the difference and recently wrote in the Los Angeles Times:

> But however inflammatory her remarks outside the courtroom, Brown's legal opinions show a willingness to vote against conservative views, particularly in criminal cases, when justice demands it.

In recent terms, Justice Brown has written more majority opinions than any of her colleagues on the California Supreme Court. Yet some in this body brand her an extremist. How can that be? Again, Humpty Dumpty would be proud of this type of misuse of words.

A group of California law professors, including Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, wrote to our Judiciary Committee to say that Justice Brown's strongest credential is her open-mindedness and thorough appraisal of legal argumentation ''even when her personal views conflict with those arguments.'' Yet some leftwing extremist groups call her an extremist.

A diverse group of her current and former judicial colleagues wrote us that Justice Brown is ''a jurist who applies the law without favor, without bias, and with an even hand.'' It is no wonder that 76 percent of her fellow Californians voted to retain her in her State's highest court. Yet her opponents call her an extremist.

If words mean anything, if we in the Senate really want to have a meaningful and responsible debate about such important things, then we should stop playing games with words such as ''filibuster'' or ''extremist.'' There is no precedent whatsoever for these partisan, organized filibusters intended to defeat majority supported judicial nominations and, I might add, bipartisan majority supported judicial nominations.

If Senators believe such highly qualified nominees, who know the difference between personal and judicial opinions and are widely praised for their integrity and impartiality, are extremists, then they should vote against them. But these people should be given an opportunity by having an up-and-down vote. Let's have a full and fair debate. Perhaps the critics will win the day against one or more of these nominees. I doubt it. But we must vote. That is what advise and consent means.

Mr. President, as I close, let me return to the 1881 Matthews nomination for a moment, the one they have had to stretch to try to claim was a filibuster.

In the 47th Congress, a Senate equally divided between Republicans and Democrats confirmed Justice Matthews by a single vote. No doubt, some opponents called him many things, perhaps even an extremist. Well, I doubt that because that has not happened until President Bush became President, as far as I can see in the way it has happened here. But we settled the controversy surrounding the Matthews nomination the old-fashioned way—not by filibustering but by debating and voting up and down. There is no question we should return to that standard.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1268, which the clerk will report.

The journal 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 licenses 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.

Pending:

Feinstein amendment No. 395, to express the sense of the Senate that the text of the REAL ID Act of 2005 should not be included in the conference report.

Bayh amendment No. 406, to protect the financial condition of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are ordered to long-term active duty in support of a contingency operation.

Salazar amendment No. 351, to express the sense of the Senate that the earned income tax credit provides critical support to many military and civilian families.

Reid amendment No. 445, to achieve an acceleration and expansion of efforts to reconstruct and rehabilitate Iraq and to reduce the future risks to United States Armed Forces personnel and future costs to United States taxpayers, by ensuring that the people of Iraq and other nations do their fair share to secure and rebuild Iraq.

Frist (for Chambliss/Kyl) amendment No. 432, to simplify the process for admitting temporary alien agricultural workers under section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to increase access to such workers.

Frist (for Craig/Kennedy) modified amendment No. 375, to provide for the adjustment of status of certain foreign agricultural workers, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the H–2A worker program under that Act, to provide a stable, legal agricultural workforce, to extend basic legal protections and better working conditions to more workers.

DeWine amendment No. 340, to increase the period of continued TRICARE coverage of children of members of the uniformed services who die while serving on active duty for a period of more than 30 days.

DeWine amendment No. 342, to appropriate $10,000,000 to provide assistance to Haiti using Child Survival and Health Programs funds, $21,000,000 to provide assistance to Haiti using Economic Support Fund funds, and $10,000,000 to provide assistance to Haiti using International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement funds, to be designated as an emergency requirement.

Schumer amendment No. 451, to lower the burden of gasoline prices on the economy of the United States and circumvent the efforts of OPEC to reap windfall oil profits.

Reid (for Reed/Chafee) amendment No. 452, to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residence.

Chambliss further modified amendment No. 418, to prohibit the termination of the existing joint-service multiyear procurement contract for C/KC–130J aircraft.

Bingaman amendment No. 483, to increase the appropriation to Federal courts by $5,000,000 to cover increased immigration-related filings in the southwestern United States.

Bingaman (for Grassley) amendment No. 417, to provide emergency funding to the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

Isakson amendment No. 429, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists