

but you know, you just have to live with it. I am not sure we ought to live with anything that doesn't make sense. I am not sure we ought to live with anything that is bad policy. Why do we have to do that? Because this group has met and they said no serious amendments can be changed—adopted that would alter the core of the bill, the basic philosophy of it, I worry about that. We are troubled that a number of things don't quite reach the promised principles that have been floated as part of this discussion.

The trigger is in the bill, but I think it is far too weak. The temporary guest worker program is preferable to last year's, but it is very unsettling to me. I have an odd feeling that this temporary worker program that is in the bill is not going to work. We should not pass anything that won't work. It needs to be done in a better way.

The hoped-for move to a more merit-based system, a point system like Canada does, is troubling because no significant move in that direction appears to be on the horizon for 8 years. It is 8 years before the point system will really take effect. So I am worried about that.

These are fundamental. Will the workplace system be effective? We need to study that language because if it is not done right, it won't work. I will have an opportunity to talk more about this.

I thank my staff and a lot of other staff who have worked their hearts out Saturday, Sunday, and into the night last night and all morning today, trying to read and digest this bill to see what it really means so we can do a better job of serving our constituents.

Finally, the guiding principle, the overarching goal of an immigration bill, must be to serve the national interest. It is not to serve special interests, groups of special interests, businesses, or immigration advocacy groups. It is to serve the national interests, and that means a principled approach that creates a lawful system that serves our economy and our society.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO DEAN RICHARD MORGAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the founding dean of the William S. Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, Richard "Dick" Morgan. Dick came to Nevada to take on the daunting task of

starting Nevada's first law school. When given the timeframe for starting the school, Dick said it could not be done; then he went out and proved himself wrong many times over. Dick's outstanding success with Boyd School of Law now serves as the model on how to create a new law school of exceptional quality.

Under the Dean's steady hand, Boyd Law School has achieved both provisional and full accreditation with the American Bar Association in record time. The school has received special recognition for its work with the Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution, the Nevada Law Journal, client counseling training, Society of Advocates, and legal writing programs. With amazing rapidity, the school has earned an outstanding reputation for scholarship and high-quality graduates. Already, the school's alumnae are having a tremendous impact on the legal profession in Nevada. They serve as judicial clerks, pro bono attorneys, respected members of law firms throughout the State, legal counsel in Federal and State agencies, and even on my own staff.

On June 30, 2007, Dean Morgan is stepping down as the head of the law school. Although he will be sorely missed, his legacy is tremendous. UNLV's law school dean is leaving us with an outstanding institution that will continue to train the minds of many of our best and brightest students. I am confident that the attorneys trained by the school will be instrumental in guiding the future growth and progress of our State.

When he came to Nevada, he had served as a law professor and as dean of both the Wyoming and Arizona State Colleges of Law. Reflecting on his experience in legal education, Dean Morgan recently honored Nevada by characterizing his 10 years with Boyd School of Law as "the best" of his 27 years in legal education. I am grateful he spent his best years with us. He has certainly been invaluable to the Nevada legal community.

Going forward, Dean Morgan plans a community-service semireirement. Based on his dedication to UNLV, I am confident that he will be a tremendous asset to any organization he is associated with. I offer Dean Morgan my sincere thanks for all he has done for Nevada and wish him the best on his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TED STEVENS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, look up Senator STEVENS' name in media reports and you will find a long list of adjectives: tenacious, temperamental, scrappy, gruff, hot-tempered, tireless. And you will come across a long list of nicknames: one of the Senate's "old bulls" for his institutional knowledge, "Uncle Ted" to the people of Alaska who are grateful for his aggressive advocacy for their interests, pioneer for

flying Army Air Corps missions during World War II and migrating to our rugged 49th State after law school, a mentor to up-and-coming elected officials, reportedly by his wife, a nutrition enthusiast for his devoted consumption of greens and whole grains, in the case of his longtime friend, Senator INOUYE of Hawaii, "my brother."

I would like to add a few adjectives of my own.

First, TED STEVENS is an Alaskan. It is impossible to think of Alaska without thinking of its senior Senator. Alaska and TED STEVENS are inseparable. Anyone who knows Senator STEVENS knows he wakes up every morning fighting for the people of Alaska and doesn't stop until he sleeps, which apparently isn't much. Their commercial industry, health care, electricity, water, transportation—even the cost of rural mail delivery—all earn his scrutiny. He has delivered again and again on policy to improve Alaskans' quality of life.

Second, and just as important, TED STEVENS is loyal. He is loyal to the institution of the United States Senate. Bipartisanship is natural for him. He understands that the art of compromise is critical to getting things done. For example, he is known to have helped reach a bipartisan deal on how to conduct the impeachment trial of President Clinton to minimize the partisan bickering that would have sullied the Senate and made a tense time even more tense.

He is more than willing to look across the aisle and find kinship with people of like interests. His friendship with Senator INOUYE, a Democrat, is steadfast and legendary. They have found plenty of common ground in delivering good policy to the people of their uniquely situated States. Despite what seems like a gruff exterior sometimes, Senator STEVENS has a reputation for extending generous kindness to his colleagues, such as flying across country to attend the funeral of a former Senator whose vote had once been helpful.

Senator STEVENS' approach to policymaking is guided by Rotary International's "Four-Way Test," a copy of which is framed on his desk in the Senate Chamber. The test reads: "Is it the truth? Is it fair to all concerned? Will it build goodwill and better friendships? Will it be beneficial to all concerned?"

That four-way test was written in 1932, but like Senator STEVENS—and here are more adjectives—it is common sense, inspirational, and timeless.

IDAHO COURTHOUSE AND CHURCH SHOOTINGS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this weekend we witnessed an act of senseless violence in Moscow, ID, the home of the University of Idaho, where someone reportedly laid siege to a courthouse, killing a police officer and

wounding a sheriff's deputy and another person. The gunman then retreated into a church, where he apparently killed a church sexton and then took his own life.

The attack at the courthouse in Idaho is another reminder of the need to provide resources and protections crucial to our Federal and State courts. It was 2 years ago when the mother and husband of Judge Joan Lefkow of Chicago were murdered in their home. Judge Lefkow's courageous testimony in our committee hearing in May 2005 is something none of us will forget. Later that year a Georgia State court judge was killed at a courthouse in Atlanta and there was an attack on a State judge in Nevada.

Last month, by a vote of 97-0, the Senate passed S. 378, the bipartisan Court Security Improvement Act of 2007. I introduced this measure in January along with Senator SPECTER, the majority leader, Senator DURBIN, Senator CORNYN and others. House Judiciary chairman JOHN CONYERS introduced an identical measure in the House also with bipartisan support.

Among the bill's many protections are provisions expanding the access of State courts to grant programs for their security. The additional resources provided by this bill may not have prevented what occurred this weekend, but we must do what we can. I wish this legislation had been enacted last year. Despite our efforts, despite Senate passage of this measure twice last year, the House last Congress did not take up and pass these measures to improve court security. I expect that the new House soon will take up and pass S. 378 in this Congress. It should not be a struggle to enact these measures to improve court security.

Our Nation's Founders knew that without an independent judiciary to protect individual rights from the political branches of Government, those rights and privileges would not be preserved. The courts are the ultimate check and balance in our system. We need to do our part to ensure that the dedicated women and men of the Federal and State judiciary have the resources, security, and independence necessary to fulfill their crucial responsibilities. This weekend serves as another tragic reminder that we owe it to our judges and those protecting our courthouses to better protect them and their families from violence and to ensure that they have the peace of mind necessary to do their vital and difficult jobs.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I regret that I was unable to vote the afternoon of May 9 on the confirmation of the nomination of Debra Ann Livingston, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Second Circuit of New York. I wish to address this confirmation so that the people of the great State of Kansas, who elected me to

serve them as U.S. Senator, may know my position.

Regarding vote No. 158, I support the confirmation of Debra Ann Livingston. My vote would not have altered the outcome of this confirmation.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I regret that on May 2, 3, 7, and 9 I was unable to vote on certain provisions and passage of S. 1082, the prescription drug user fee amendments of 2007. I wish to address these votes, so that the people of the great State of Kansas, who elected me to serve them as U.S. Senator, may know my position.

Regarding vote No. 148, on amendment No. 982, I would have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 149, on amendment No. 1022, I would have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 150, on amendment No. 990, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 151, on amendment No. 1010, I would have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 152, on the motion to invoke cloture on the committee substitute as modified and amended to S. 1082, I would have voted in favor of this motion. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

Regarding vote No. 154, on amendment No. 1039, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 155 on amendment No. 998, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 156 on amendment No. 1034, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 157, on passage of S. 1082, the prescription drug user fee amendments of 2007, I would have voted in favor of passage of this bill. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

• Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, the struggle to protect the civil rights of all Americans remains an unfinished project, but we have come a long way. I am proud of our country's progress, and I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Commemorative Coin Act, which marks the 50th anniversary of one of the most significant civil rights victories in American history.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 provided affirmation to Americans who knew this country could do better. This legislation outlawed discrimination based on sex, national origin, color, race, and religion. Access to offices, schools, housing, the voting booth, and public spaces would no longer depend on the color of one's skin or the country of one's birth. Heeding President Kennedy's call for "the kind of equality of treatment which we would want for ourselves," this historic legislation affirmed that all Americans were equal under before law. Years passed before the Civil Rights Act was enforced fully, but its passage represented a necessary step in the advancement of civil rights.

Passage of the Civil Rights Act was possible because of the persistent, non-violent efforts of countless Americans. Heroes like Dr. Martin Luther King, Rosa Parks, and JOHN LEWIS inspired a generation, and the marches, sit-ins, freedom rides, and individual acts of civil disobedience reminded our country's leaders that the time to act had arrived. All Americans are indebted to these patriots for their courage and success, and we honor them with this legislation.

In addition to marking the Civil Rights Act in word, this bill also commemorates the act in deed. Proceeds from the sale of these coins will go to the United Negro College Fund, UNCF, an organization that embodies the spirit of the Civil Rights Act. The United Negro College Fund works to uproot the core causes of discrimination by providing minorities with opportunities that discrimination stole from them. Education provides students the opportunity to fulfill their potential and overcome stereotypes and, indeed, discrimination. Frederick Douglass described education as "the pathway from slavery to freedom." The days of slavery have passed, but education still enables young people to take advantage of their faculties and their freedom.

The United Negro College Fund achieves this aim by providing support to more minority students and higher institutions than any other organization in the country. Since its founding in 1944, UNCF has helped hundreds of thousands of students attend college. It includes in its alumni some of the foremost leaders in American history, including Dr. King and Congressman LEWIS. Today, the United Negro College Fund raises money for operating funds for member colleges and universities, provides access to new technology to historically Black colleges and universities, and provides assistance to young people who hope to further their careers and their lives by going to college.

This legislation commemorates historic sacrifices and victories and reminds us that we must continue to work for a more equal America.●