

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time from 5 o'clock to 5:30 today be a period of morning business and that that time be under my control or, in my absence, the control of the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER.

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

NOMINATION OF JOHN ROBERTS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I will put on a different hat. I was talking about appropriations. Now I will talk about a drama that is unfolding in the Senate which is the confirmation hearings on Judge John Roberts to go to the Supreme Court and to be the Chief Justice. I rise today to talk about this nomination because this is a decision of enormous consequence. One of the most significant and far-reaching votes a Senator can make relates to the Supreme Court. Why? Because it is irrevocable. When you vote for a Supreme Court Justice, that Justice has a lifetime appointment. Unless there is an impeachment, which is rare, it is forever.

The hearings are incredibly important, they provide the Senate and the American public with the opportunity to know more about where the nominee stands on core constitutional principles. I urge Judge Roberts to answer the questions that the Committee asks of him.

But equally important is completing the picture. The Senate should have access to the full record of the nominee who is going into the hearings. We need to know more about Judge Roberts. We have all met him. We find him personable. We find him smart. We find him capable. But we wonder, what is his judicial philosophy. What will he be like, not only as a member of Court but now as the Chief Justice. Look back to the record, not only the resume but to the record.

This is why I am joining with a group of other Senators to urge the White House to release documents on 16 cases argued by the Solicitor General when Judge Roberts was the Principal Deputy Solicitor General. You might ask: Why do you need to know this? This is when then Mr. Roberts played a very important role in shaping strategy, recommending policy, and it is one of the best insights we have into his judicial philosophy, his views, his legal reasoning. We want to know: Where does he stand on an issue such as the implicit right of privacy, on issues related to civil rights, on religious expression, on title IX, on affirmative action, and voting rights. And we want to know because the record before us now raises serious questions about his commitment to women's and civil rights. Prior to any vote, the American people

need to know where he stands on these issues. We, the Senators, need to know, too, so we can make an informed, rational decision.

The administration has refused to release these documents, even though they did so before. They did it when Mr. Bork was nominated, and they did it when William Rehnquist was nominated. This is particularly compelling since now the Roberts nomination has gone from a replacement of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor to replacing the Chief Justice. These documents matter because they represent the views from later in his career when he held his highest political appointment and was responsible for making policy recommendations. These documents will illuminate his beliefs and his approach to the law, and they will help this Senator and others to know where he stands on the important issues.

It is the constitutional duty of the Senate to conduct a thorough examination of the nominee, and we can only do it if we hear from the nominee himself through the confirmation processes, and have a complete record before us. We have his resume, he has received his rating from the American Bar Association, but we now need the documents on these 16 cases in order for us to do our homework and to do our due diligence. This is probably one of the most important votes I will ever take, along with my 99 colleagues. We need to know:

What type of Justice will John Roberts be?

Before the Senate left for its August break, I joined with six of my Democratic women colleagues to launch a website allowing Americans to have a voice in the confirmation process. The American people have a right to be part of the process and let the Senate know what they want Judge Roberts to answer. And we want them at the table. We want them to feel included and have the chance to participate. The Democratic women launched a Web site to allow them that opportunity. We remember how we were shut out during the judicial proceedings on Clarence Thomas. There were no women on the Judiciary Committee. Now there are. But we know what it is like not to have a seat at the table. We know what it is like not to be able to raise our questions. So we established this Web site so the public could ask about issues that impact them every day.

Guess what. Over the past month alone, 25,000 Americans responded to this Web site—with over 40,000 questions. They wanted to know where Judge Roberts stands on *Roe v. Wade*, privacy rights in light of national security challenges, the right to privacy, such as under the PATRIOT Act, what about so-called religious expression in schools, protecting our environment, protecting our civil rights, protecting our voting rights. And I am standing with them, because the record before us shows that Judge Roberts has ar-

gued against established constitutional protections against sex discrimination. He has argued that disparate treatment of men and women is reasonable when you don't have the resources to provide for both. He supported a very narrow interpretation of title IX. All arguments which the Supreme Court has squarely rejected.

Clearly, there are reasons people are troubled. Questions that Americans sent us were on the deepest and most heartfelt concerns of their families. A woman in Ohio wanted to ask Judge Roberts where he stands on women's equality. She said not just on choice and reproductive rights, but on wage equality, childcare options, glass ceilings. Where is he in the enforcement of equal opportunity and nondiscrimination.

A man from my home State of Maryland wanted to know did Judge Roberts support title IX. His niece played sports in high school and wanted to be sure that college sports teams would have resources and access to scholarships, as the guy teams do. A mother from Indiana wrote us. A single mom. In the 1950s, she was earning 60 cents for every dollar a man earned. She wanted to know where the judge stands on pay equity. These were the kinds of things they wanted to know. Quite frankly, I would like to know too. How Judge Roberts chooses to respond is his business. But whether we support the nominee based on those responses is our business and how the administration responds to our requests for documents is also our business.

That is why the White House must release those documents to the Senate. We want to have access to the documents relating to those 16 very important cases that were argued by the Solicitor General before the Supreme Court. These documents will help us evaluate the nominee and will enable us to make the kind of decision the American people want us to make.

As Judge Roberts begins his testimony and is asked about his past decisions, judicial philosophy and legal background, Americans will be watching. I urge the nominee to be forthcoming. He should not conceal his views on issues that the majority of Americans care about like reproductive choice, civil rights, congressional power, the environment and separation of church and state.

I also urge the White House to be forthcoming. They should not conceal documents that may illuminate those views. Judge Roberts' past career causes concern about his commitment to core constitutional principles and we need to have, and the American people deserve, a complete picture.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. I ask if the Senator would allow me to propound a unanimous consent request so that I might speak at the conclusion of the speakers she has on her side.

Ms. MIKULSKI. First, in terms of senatorial courtesy, I have no reason to object. But as I understand it, the order of the day is that at 5:30, we must go into consideration of the mercury rule for 1 hour. I ask the Presiding Officer, what is the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is that at 5:30, the Senate will be in morning business for 1 hour with the time controlled by Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma or his designee, and the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, or his designee.

Ms. MIKULSKI. May I ask the Presiding Officer, at 5:30 the Senate will go into morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Who controls that morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is equally divided and controlled by Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma or his designee and the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, or his designee.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I misunderstood. I thought there was a mandate at 5:30 to go to the mercury rule. I have no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed at 5:30 to proceed for 10 minutes in morning business and that I be recognized at that time.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. GREGG. Assuming the speakers on the other side have completed their statements.

Mrs. BOXER. I have absolutely no problem with this. I know Senator CLINTON is trying to make it from an airplane to get to the floor. So as I understand it, Senator MIKULSKI has the time until 5:30; is that correct?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. Hopefully, she will make it. If I could cover us and say 5:35, and then it would go to Senator GREGG, would that be OK?

Mr. GREGG. I amend my request so that I be recognized at 5:35 for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have now concluded my remarks and yield to the Senator from California, Senator BOXER, such time as she may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her leadership in reaching out to the people of this country, asking them to send in their questions for Judge Roberts. As she noted, 25,000 individuals wrote in questions and we received a total of 40,000 questions. It shows the American people have a lot at stake. This is a serious time for our country, and a very important nomination. We certainly know that.

Most Americans understand that the Court plays a huge role in defending

our rights and freedoms, and now Judge Roberts has been nominated to be the Chief Justice of the United States. Although some will say it makes no difference, it makes a big difference. The Chief Justice runs the Court, sets its tone, assigns responsibility for writing its decisions, has a certain amount of cachet to speak for the Court, and so on.

The Judiciary Committee began its hearings today on Judge Roberts. This is a vital part of the advice and consent role of the Senate. Before we vote, it is every Senator's duty to find out if Judge Roberts will uphold or undermine our fundamental freedoms, the freedoms that essentially define us as Americans. It is our duty to find out if Judge Roberts will fulfill the promise etched above the Court itself: Equal justice under the law—not justice only for the powerful, but equal justice for all. And when I say we have a duty, I am talking about our responsibility as Senators to act on behalf of we the American people.

That is why the Democratic women, under Senator MIKULSKI's leadership, created the AskRoberts Web site. Americans submitted 40,000 questions about a broad range of issues, including privacy, reproductive health, civil rights, women's rights, and the environment. One individual posed this question to Judge Roberts: In your opinion, why would the White House refuse to turn over public records from your time as Deputy Solicitor General? What is there to hide?

What is there to hide? It is a very important question. Senators on both sides of the aisle should be asking that question. Before we confirm Judge Roberts to a lifetime appointment as Chief Justice, we need to know everything possible about his views and philosophy. This isn't because it is interesting, because I am sure it would be interesting. Judge Roberts is a very bright and interesting man. But it is because every American's rights and freedoms hang in the balance. Judge Roberts has a very thin record on the bench. Therefore, his writings and statements, when he worked for the Reagan administration and the first Bush administration, become very important.

We know that in his position working for Kenneth Starr, Mr. ROBERTS played a very important role. He was a top decisionmaker in the Solicitor General's Office. He appeared before the Supreme Court and, by his own admission, made the final determination of which cases to appeal in hundreds of circumstances. It is not as if we haven't gotten information like this before. We did so during the confirmation hearings for Judge Bork and Justice Rehnquist.

That is why Democrats on the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of Senator LEAHY, and the Democratic leadership, under the leadership of Senator REID, and the Democratic women, under the leadership of Senator MIKULSKI, and the entire Democratic caucus

have written letter after letter to Attorney General Gonzales demanding these documents be released.

We are talking about a very narrow request—only 16 cases—not a broad request for all records. What are these cases we are asking about? They include three about reproductive health, five about discrimination and civil rights, and three about the environment. These are the very issues Americans told us they wanted Roberts to answer questions about when they wrote to our Web site.

In poll after poll, the American people are saying that Judge Roberts has to tell us what he believes, and we deserve to have this information. Everyone agrees that Judge Roberts is extremely qualified and very personable. But we need to know about his views and philosophy because, if confirmed, the cases he would decide will impact the daily lives of all Americans.

I believe the American people want transparency and openness in this process. This should not be some hide-and-seek, catch-me-if-you-can deal. This is about someone who could sit on the Court for 30 years, or more. This is someone who is going to influence the lives of our grandchildren and perhaps even our great grandchildren.

In addition to getting the information on these cases, Judge Roberts also must answer questions, and I hope he is going to do that. I know a couple of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle today seemed to be counseling him not to answer questions. One of them cited Judge Ginsburg, and said she drew the line by refusing to answer questions.

Let me tell you what Judge Ginsburg said at her hearing when she was asked about *Roe v. Wade* and a woman's reproduction freedom. She said:

It's a decision she must make for herself.

And when Government controls that decision for her, she is being treated as less than a fully adult human.

That is a quote from Ruth Bader Ginsburg. And it is certainly at odds with all that Senator HATCH and others are saying about how Ruth Bader Ginsburg didn't answer questions about key legal issues. No. 1, her writings on this and other topics were extensive. Then at the hearing, she said clearly that when the Government takes control—I am going to read it again:

When Government controls that decision, a woman is being treated as less than a fully adult human.

I want to know whether Judge Roberts agrees with that. He will have a chance to express that view and also his view about the role of Congress in protecting our families and communities. Take, for example, the violence against women. Part of that act, written by JOE BIDEN and ORRIN HATCH—and I worked with Senator BIDEN for years on that—part of that law was thrown out. We want to know how Judge Roberts feels about whether we in the Senate can protect the women of our country, can protect the families of our country, can protect those who perhaps cannot speak for themselves.

We need to know if Judge Roberts thinks the right to privacy is a fundamental right. We know he wrote about it as the so-called right of privacy.

If I referred to your spouse as your "so-called spouse," that would be an insult, wouldn't it? If I referred to your right to vote as your "so-called right to vote," my constituency would be very upset with me because the right to vote is not a so-called right. So when you say something is a so-called right, it raises a lot of questions about how you feel about it.

We also need to know why Judge Roberts argued before the Supreme Court and on national TV that our Federal courts and marshals had no role in stopping clinic violence when women were being threatened and intimidated at family planning clinics all over the country.

It is time for Judge Roberts to say what he really thinks—on privacy, on gender discrimination, on civil rights, on the environment. On the appellate court, he wrote an opinion that raises questions about whether he would find the endangered species act constitutional. Does he think it is our right in the Congress to pass environmental laws that protect all Americans?

As Senator MIKULSKI said, the role of the women Senators is very important. Women across America are counting on us to stand up, to ask the questions, and to get the answers. When we vote on this nomination, it must be an informed vote either yes because we believe he will protect our rights and freedoms or no because we have not been convinced.

I thank the Chair. I yield back my time to Senator MIKULSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the senior Senator from the State of Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, for such time as she may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for organizing the AskRoberts.com in which we are all participating to allow people across this country to be a part of this very important process that is occurring in the Senate today.

Today, our country faces many challenges. We look at the suffering along the gulf coast, we face ongoing military operations in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and we face the solemn and significant task of not only filling two Court vacancies but confirming a new Chief Justice. While the confirmation of a new Justice may not be the topic of dinner table conversations across the country tonight, the actions of the next Supreme Court Justice will impact the lives of every American family for generations to come.

Last week, this Chamber mourned the passing of Chief Justice Rehnquist who served on our Nation's highest Court for over three decades. The great

range of issues on which the Supreme Court ruled during Justice Rehnquist's tenure—from *Roe v. Wade* to capital punishment to Miranda rights to the conclusion of a Presidential election—shows the American public just how closely the Court touches each of our daily lives. My home State of Washington is 3,000 miles away from the Nation's Capital, but the issues the Supreme Court takes up, whether it be title IX or eminent domain or a woman's right to choose, hits home for them as well.

Back in 1991, when I was a State Senator and a former school board member and a mother, I watched the Clarence Thomas confirmation hearings that came before the Senate Judiciary Committee. For days and days, I sat in frustration at home. I simply could not believe that this nominee was not asked about the issues about which I cared. I did not believe the Senators in that room were representing me or asking the questions I wanted answered. So I did something about it: I ran for the U.S. Senate. Now, thankfully, I am here and I can get my questions answered. But I remain very concerned for the women and the men in my State and around the country. Certainly they have issues that are important to them that will come before the Supreme Court. Certainly they have questions they want answered. Not everyone is going to be able to run for the Senate, but everyone should be able to have their voice heard.

This is a process in which the American public deserves to be involved. Judge Roberts is being considered for a lifetime appointment, and the American people deserve to know where he stands on a number of issues that affect our Nation's future. That desire to give Americans around the country a voice in this process is what inspired me and my colleagues from California and Maryland to set up a Web site: AskRoberts.com. Through our Web site, we have collected tens of thousands of questions over the past several months that have now been delivered to the Senate Judiciary Committee in hopes that they will be asked of Judge Roberts during his confirmation hearing.

This is not an inside-the-beltway debate. Judge Roberts has been nominated to a lifetime appointment on the highest Court in the land, and he will influence our path on issues ranging across the spectrum.

Many Americans must be wondering what this all means to them, how it will affect them. Let me make it clear: This debate we are now having is about whether we want to protect essential rights and liberties, including the right to privacy about which the Senator from California talked. This debate is about whether we want free and open government. This debate is about whether we want a clean, healthy environment and the ability to enforce laws to protect it fairly. And this debate is about preserving equal protection under the law.

Judge Roberts has an obligation—not to the Senate but to the American people—to make his views known on these basic values. Only then can we make a reasoned judgment on his nomination. That is why I have joined with a number of my colleagues in calling on the Attorney General to fulfill the request that was made by our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee for documents related to 16 key cases on which Judge Roberts played a leadership role during his service as Solicitor General. Not only is there precedent for the disclosure of those documents—similar information was provided to the Senate when it considered the nomination of Justice Rehnquist—but there is also clear imperative. If we are going to fulfill our constitutional duty to provide meaningful advice and consent on this nomination, that consent must be informed and this process must be opened, not only to the Members of this body but to the American people.

With the questions and concerns of Americans from coast to coast in mind, I will work with my colleagues to ensure that the President's nominee to fill this position will be fair and impartial, evenhanded in administering justice, and will protect the rights and liberties of all Americans.

Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as I understand it, we have 5 minutes before Senator GREGG has the floor; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senator MURRAY because she has a way of putting things quite succinctly and clearly and I appreciate her coming to the floor.

There is a very interesting editorial today in USA Today, and I want to quote from it. The first part says there is no question that the President has chosen someone with similar views to Judge Rehnquist. This is what they say:

But, if the men are similar, the nation is different now from what it was when Rehnquist joined the Court 33 years ago, and that difference raises provocative questions for Roberts as Senate confirmation hearings begin today.

This is how they say it has changed since Judge Rehnquist's hearings:

In particular, the United States has become a far more tolerant society. In 1972, racial segregation was still being dismantled. Women, like African-Americans, were routinely deprived of equal opportunity. The notion that Americans possess a right to privacy, established by the landmark 1965 Supreme Court case that overturned state laws against birth control, was still taking root.

This editorial goes on to ask if Roberts would make it difficult for Congress to extend those gains or even turn back the clock, concluding:

His record leaves plenty of room for doubt.

Now, this is USA Today. It is not considered a liberal newspaper. It is a pretty mainstream paper and it raises the issue of privacy, writing:

In memos written when he was in the Reagan administration, Roberts disparaged the notion that there is a constitutional right to privacy that prevents the government from criminalizing contraception, abortion and gay sex.

And then it talks about race:

Roberts has belittled affirmative action as "recruiting of inadequately prepared candidates" and has argued for standards that would make it easier for school districts to evade desegregation orders.

On women's rights, it is also troubling:

Roberts ridiculed the concept that women are subject to workplace discrimination, and he argued for narrowing the government's ability to enforce the ban on gender discrimination in education.

They close by saying:

His record bears close scrutiny and his answers should go a long way toward determining whether he should be confirmed for a lifetime appointment as the Nation's most powerful jurist, deciding issues barely imaginable today and influencing the lives of generations to come.

As I say, this editorial is quite mainstream. It raises legitimate concerns about Judge Roberts. It basically says to the Senate, it is your job to find out how he is going to rule on cases we cannot even envision at this time.

I think that the committee is off to a good start. I received a briefing while I was on a plane today about the Senators' comments on both sides of the aisle. It clearly seems to be a confirmation that both sides are taking extremely seriously.

I say to those friends and colleagues on the other side who are counseling Judge Roberts that he does not have to answer questions, that would be a big mistake. The American people in poll after poll are saying to us, we have a right to know. We want to have answers to very important questions that will shed light on if Judge Roberts is going to make sure this Congress and this Federal Government can protect them; that we can protect the environment; equal rights for women and for minorities; that we have the ability to make life better for the American people; and that we, in fact, will be able to respect the dignity of our people by making sure there is not a "so-called" right to privacy but a fundamental right to privacy that has been articulated by the Court and that we hope Judge Roberts will uphold.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to speak a little bit about the schedule of the reconciliation bill which this Congress was supposed to actually take up this week. As we all know, reconciliation is one of the key procedures by which the Congress addresses spending, specifically spending in mandatory programs and tax policy. In the budget which we passed about 5 months ago, we included reconciliation instructions

which essentially say to committees within the Senate and within the House that they are to change the entitlement programs they have jurisdiction over in order to slow the rate of growth of a number of those programs or in order to generate revenues from those programs which might not otherwise be coming in in order to reduce the size of the deficit and in order to make the Government more affordable.

This reconciliation proposal which came forward requested approximately \$34 billion in savings on the entitlement side, \$70 billion in tax policy changes. It was to be executed on or preceded with this week with a reconciliation bill on the spending side of the ledger. In consultation with the leadership, who obviously makes the final decisions, and with the House, we have decided to move the date of reconciliation so the Budget Committee will report a reconciliation bill on October 26. This will essentially allow committees, especially the authorizing committees, which are now heavily engaged in the issue of trying to address the catastrophe brought on by Katrina, the opportunity to have time to order their reconciliation changes so they can bring forward effective bills which will accomplish the instructions as proposed.

Some have asked, why go forward with reconciliation at all in light of the Katrina situation? I think it is important to recognize what reconciliation is in relationship to a disaster, a catastrophe of the size of Katrina. Obviously, the impact on the Gulf States has been enormous and we have to do whatever we can to help the people of the Gulf States rebuild and reestablish their lives in some semblance of order and give them some opportunity for hope. And we are doing that as a Congress. The administration is trying to do that and obviously the States and local governments are trying to pursue that activity.

We will get past the Katrina problem. The people of the Gulf States are energetic, enthusiastic, and productive people, as are all Americans, and America has come to their aid as a nation, which we should. Obviously it is going to take time, but this is a one-time event—hopefully never will happen again, and has never happened before—of this magnitude, and we should be able as a nation to manage and correct the situation and give relief to the people of that region and do the reconstruction that is necessary. That is a one-time spending event.

What the reconciliation instructions address are the long-term implications especially of entitlement spending. We know that over the next 10, 20, 30, 40 years we are looking at massive increases in spending on mandatory programs, especially the health programs of the Federal Government, primarily because of the aging of the baby boom generation. As a nation, we need to set policies in place today which will allow us to be able to afford the costs which

this huge generation is going to incur in order to maintain its health and also its retirement.

Reconciliation is a very small step down that road of trying to improve the policy so we can better deliver services to seniors who get Medicaid and other people who get Medicaid—obviously children—and at the same time make it affordable. The reconciliation instructions cover 5 years. In fact, the Medicaid instruction, which has been the most contentious, anticipates no savings in the next year. So clearly it has no impact on the Katrina event, most of which money for that restoration will occur within the next year.

Over the next 5 years, what we proposed is slowing the rate of growth of Medicaid under the reconciliation instructions from 41 percent back to 40 percent. I had hoped we would go from 41 percent to 39 percent. I thought 39 percent was a pretty good rate of growth, but that was not acceptable so we are going to a 40-percent rate of growth over the next 5 years, on a \$1.1 trillion spending program. That is what Medicaid will be over the next 5 years. We are suggesting that we will save \$10 billion—\$34 billion over the whole reconciliation instruction—on a \$1.1 trillion spending program over 5 years, with none of it occurring next year.

How can we do that? We can actually do it by delivering more services to more people. If we give Governors greater flexibility with their Medicaid funds, Governors have told us with more flexibility they can cover more people and do it at lower cost. That is called good management. It does not take a lot of good management to shave 1 percent off the rate of growth, which will be around 40 percent. So it is a very doable event, and we need to proceed with it.

There are other committees that have received reconciliation instructions that actually want those instructions, that want to be able to proceed forward because they see opportunities to improve Government and to generate a better return for taxpayers. One, of course, is the Commerce Committee. Another is the HELP Committee which has reported out an incredibly strong higher education bill where they are basically going to expand rather significantly the dollars available to people who go to college through Pell programs and other programs, under the leadership of Chairman ENZI. That bill has been reported out, has saved about \$7 billion, but has also generated about \$6.5 billion which will go back into student loans. It has done it without impacting student loans but actually expanded student loans by taking action in the area of lenders accounts. Chairman ENZI deserves lot of credit for it and we should proceed with that.

Chairman ENZI also reported out a bill, along with the Finance Committee, to address the pension reform issue. We need to address pension reform. We are not going to be able to do