

He is right. I think that letter was entirely inappropriate, and the fact that it was leaked to the press—and I do not know whether it was leaked at Justice or at Treasury—is something that should be investigated. I do not want to read too much into this, but someone who understood the impact of the market and decided to short the stock could have made a lot of money yesterday. I am not saying that occurred, but that is how serious it is, that the stock would go down \$100 in 1 day because of this action. Today, the stock has started to recover. I am glad. But still we have to answer, at the Federal level, why this ever occurred.

These markets are ready to be regulated and examined, and they should be. We want transparency and public trust at every single level. And we know that competition in this market goes far beyond the United States. These are now international and global markets, and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange is the one of the leaders in these markets. They should be closely regulated, closely watched, and should be subject to all of the laws and regulations concerning transparency. But when some staffer at the Department of Justice can take a potshot at this global market and cost them almost \$6 billion in market capitalization in 1 day, I think we have a right to demand accountability.

I am joining with my colleagues in the Senate and in the House in calling on this administration to look into this matter as quickly as possible. I hope to find out why this comment letter was filed 2 months after the Treasury Department deadline if the memo was meant to be related to that effort. I hope to find out if the Department of Justice considered its influence on the markets prior to drafting this letter or leaking this letter, whatever was done.

I hope there is not more to this story than the Justice Department staffers are claiming, but I wonder. That is the reason I have written to these two leaders in the administration asking for a timely response.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I understand that the bill is to be called back up, the FISA bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be the regular order.

Mr. BOND. If the proponent of the amendment is ready, I would suggest that we begin the final lap on these amendments.

FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2007— Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2248) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Rockefeller-Bond amendment No. 3911, in the nature of a substitute.

Whitehouse amendment No. 3920 (to amendment No. 3911), to provide procedures for compliance reviews.

Feingold amendment No. 3979 (to amendment No. 3911), to provide safeguards for communications involving persons inside the United States.

Feingold-Dodd amendment No. 3915 (to amendment No. 3911), to place flexible limits on the use of information obtained using unlawful procedures.

Feingold amendment No. 3913 (to amendment No. 3911), to prohibit reverse targeting and protect the rights of Americans who are communicating with people abroad.

Feingold-Dodd amendment No. 3912 (to amendment No. 3911), to modify the requirements for certifications made prior to the initiation of certain acquisitions.

Dodd amendment No. 3907 (to amendment No. 3911), to strike the provisions providing immunity from civil liability to electronic communication service providers for certain assistance provided to the Government.

Bond-Rockefeller modified amendment No. 3938 (to amendment No. 3911), to include prohibitions on the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

Bond-Rockefeller modified amendment No. 3941 (to amendment No. 3911), to expedite the review of challenges to directives under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

Feinstein amendment No. 3910 (to amendment No. 3911), to provide a statement of the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance and interception of certain communications may be conducted.

Feinstein amendment No. 3919 (to amendment No. 3911), to provide for the review of certifications by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

Specter-Whitehouse amendment No. 3927 (to amendment No. 3911), to provide for the substitution of the United States in certain civil actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3915

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, this is the amendment we call Use Limits Amendment, amendment No. 3915.

This amendment gives the FISA Court the option of preventing the Government from using information on U.S. persons that it has collected using targeting or minimization procedures that are later found to be illegal.

As the legislation now stands, if the Government uses procedures that are later declared unlawful, there is nothing to stop it from using the information it collected illegally. This does not make any sense, and it takes away any incentive for the Government to develop lawful procedures the first time around. It is also not consistent with the approach FISA takes with other illegally collected information.

If the Government conducts emergency surveillance that is later found to be improper, FISA already prohibits the Government from using that information. Importantly, under my amendment, information about foreigners or information that indicates a threat of death or bodily harm could always be used by the Government, even if it were collected under illegal procedures. The FISA Court also has the discretion to allow the Government to use illegally collected information about U.S. persons.

So it is an extremely modest safeguard, a very reasonable amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat amendment 3915. It creates a superexclusionary rule on the intelligence community. The Attorney General and the DNI have advised they will recommend a veto.

It says: By requiring analysts to go back through relevant databases and exact certain information as well as to determine what other information is derived, this requirement places a tremendous burden, an unsurmountable operational burden on the intelligence community. I agree and yield the remainder of my time to the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I would say to the Presiding Officer that this amendment would prevent disclosure or dissemination of any collected information by U.S. persons if the FISA Court finds there are deficiencies in the Government's targeting or minimization procedures under the new authority.

There is no need to add another penalty to ensure compliance with the requirement of the statute. The amendment gives the court very little discretion to determine whether nondisclosure is the appropriate remedy. Nondisclosure could be required even if the information is particularly significant foreign intelligence information, or if there is only a minor deficiency in the procedure that cannot be corrected within 30 days.

It is a very short way of saying that I oppose this amendment strongly.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume consideration of the following Feingold amendments, Nos. 3915 and 3913, and that the time until 5:25 p.m. be for debate with respect to these amendments en bloc;

that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed above; that there be 2 minutes of debate prior to the second vote, with all time equally divided and controlled in the usual form, and the second vote 10 minutes in duration; that when the Senate resumes S. 2248 on Friday, February 8, and on Monday, February 11, all remaining amendments be debated and all time used; that on Tuesday, February 12, at a time to be determined, the Senate then proceed to vote in relation to the amendments in an order specified later, with 2 minutes of debate prior to the votes, equally divided and controlled in the usual form, and any succeeding votes in the sequence be limited to 10 minutes; that no further amendments be in order Tuesday; and that upon disposition of all amendments, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 2248; and that if cloture is invoked on the bill, Senator DODD be recognized to speak for up to 4 hours, Senator FEINGOLD for up to 15 minutes; that upon the conclusion of these remarks and the recognition of the managers for up to 10 minutes each, the Senate then proceed to vote on passage of the bill, and any other provisions of the previous order remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOND. Reserving the right to object, if I could ask the majority leader, I had talked with Senator FEINGOLD and suggested we have 4 minutes equally divided on the next vote so he can have 2 minutes and the chairman and I may each have a minute.

Mr. REID. I accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request as so modified? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3915

Mr. FEINGOLD. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 2 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the argument of the Senator from West Virginia that this amendment would somehow impose a burden because it would require the Government to identify information about U.S. persons. I wish to be clear, these use limits kick in only if the Government proposes to disseminate and use the information, in which case the bill's minimization procedures already require the Government to identify information about U.S. persons. So I can't for the life of me figure out what the Senator is referring to when he refers to new burdens. My amendment imposes no additional burden at all.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I have already spoken on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we have made our point that it makes no sense to exclude the use of information simply because there is a deficiency, any deficiency in the certification and procedures used to target foreign terrorists overseas.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3915.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent. The Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCAIN.

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

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 11 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Akaka	Feingold	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Harkin	Reed
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reid
Boxer	Kerry	Salazar
Brown	Klobuchar	Sanders
Byrd	Kohl	Schumer
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Levin	Webb
Conrad	Lincoln	Whitehouse
Dodd	McCaskill	Wyden
Dorgan	Menendez	
Durbin	Mikulski	

NAYS—56

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Barrasso	Domenici	Murkowski
Bayh	Ensign	Pryor
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Graham	Rockefeller
Brownback	Grassley	Sessions
Bunning	Gregg	Shelby
Burr	Hagel	Smith
Carper	Hatch	Snowe
Chambliss	Hutchison	Specter
Coburn	Inhofe	Stevens
Cochran	Inouye	Sununu
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Johnson	Vitter
Corker	Kyl	Voinovich
Cornyn	Landrieu	Warner
Craig	Lieberman	Wicker
Crapo	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—4

Clinton	Nelson (NE)
McCain	Obama

The amendment (No. 3915) was rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators LEAHY and SPECTER, managers on the part of the Judiciary Committee, be recognized for up to 20 minutes on Tuesday, February 12, postcloture.

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

There is now 4 minutes equally divided before the next vote.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3913

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the reverse targeting amendment No. 3913 was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee and is cosponsored by several of my colleagues. It simply ensures that the new authorities contained in this bill are not used to engage in what is known as reverse targeting of Americans here at home. FISA requires the Government to get a court order when it is wiretapping Americans on American soil. Reverse targeting refers to the possibility that the Government will try to get around this requirement by using these new authorities to wiretap someone overseas, when what the Government is trying to do and is interested in is the American with whom that foreign person is communicating.

The bill pretends to ban reverse targeting, but this ban is so weak as to be meaningless. It would allow reverse targeting as long as the Government can claim it has some interest, however minor, in the foreigner it is wiretapping. The amendment says the Government needs an individualized court order when a significant purpose of the surveillance is to acquire communications of a person inside the United States.

The Director of National Intelligence has testified that this practice, reverse targeting, is a violation of the fourth amendment. That is what the DNI says. This amendment merely codifies that constitutional principle.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on our side to the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this turns the bill on its head. This says if we are targeting folks overseas, that in effect we have to get a FISA Court approval for each and every time that happens.

Let me say the amendment causes enormous operational problems for intelligence professionals. They are very serious about it. The DNI and the Attorney General say it will hamper U.S. intelligence authorizations currently authorized because every single person would have to have a court order, and

when you are collecting overseas, that becomes kind of a burden.

While the technical details concerning such intelligence operations are classified, the concern is that the restriction would prevent the Government from doing intelligence collection against a foreign city, or a neighborhood in a foreign city, in advance of a military operation or perhaps in pursuit of a terrorist cell.

The amendment is unnecessary, and I urge its defeat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, there is an explicit bright-line prohibition against reverse targeting in the current bill. As the DNI said, it would be in violation of the fourth amendment. But Senator FEINGOLD wants to replace this test with one that would make analysts engage in mental gymnastics, trying to figure out if "a significant purpose" is to target someone inside the United States. This significant purpose throws in an additional concern: The analysts who gather and examine intelligence need clear rules, not an ambiguous significant purpose standard.

The adoption of this amendment is seriously detrimental to the operation of our analysts and the DNI and the Attorney General would recommend a veto if it is adopted.

We worked hard, and we have a good bipartisan bill that significantly adds to the protections of civil liberties. We need to pass this bill. I join with my colleague from West Virginia, the chairman of the committee, in urging our colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have made progress on FISA. We have more progress to make. It appears to me that this will be the last recorded vote. We have a number of other measures we are going to try to dispose of on this bill. I know we have at least one of Senator BOND's amendments that will be disposed of by voice vote. We have an agreement that we will move this bill forward for passage on Tuesday.

On Tuesday, everyone, there will be no morning business. We will come in at 10 o'clock on Tuesday and start right on FISA, and hope by that time to have all of the debate completed on this legislation.

Again, this will be the last vote today. I appreciate everyone's good, hard work this week and look forward to next week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If all time is yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr.

NELSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent. The Senator from Arizona, (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Akaka	Dodd	Mikulski
Baucus	Durbin	Murray
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Harkin	Reed
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reid
Boxer	Kerry	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Byrd	Kohl	Stabenow
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Tester
Cardin	Leahy	Webb
Carper	Levin	Whitehouse
Casey	McCaskill	Wyden
Conrad	Menendez	

NAYS—57

Alexander	Domenici	Martinez
Allard	Ensign	McConnell
Barrasso	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennett	Feinstein	Pryor
Bond	Graham	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Rockefeller
Bunning	Gregg	Salazar
Burr	Hagel	Sessions
Chambliss	Hatch	Shelby
Coburn	Hutchison	Smith
Cochran	Inhofe	Snowe
Coleman	Inouye	Specter
Collins	Isakson	Stevens
Corker	Johnson	Sununu
Cornyn	Kyl	Thune
Craig	Landrieu	Vitter
Crapo	Lieberman	Voinovich
DeMint	Lincoln	Warner
Dole	Lugar	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Clinton	McCain	Obama
Dorgan	Nelson (NE)	

The amendment (No. 3913) was rejected.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SALAZAR. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3941, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3941, as modified, the Rockefeller-Bond amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, this amendment modifies a provision of the Protect America Act. I think, along with my colleague, the chairman of the committee, it makes a lot of sense. It lays out a process for the FISA Court to conduct a review of a petition from an electronic communication service

provider challenging a directive from the Government in review of a petition by the Government to enforce compliance with its directive. Having the court conduct expedited reviews of these petitions, whether from the provider or from the Government, is in everyone's best interest.

These questions are essential to be resolved one way or the other for the protection of the private partners, as well as the protection of our national security. As long as challenges of enforcement proceedings remain pending before the court, the intelligence community cannot intercept terrorist communications through that provider. Those are not unreasonable requirements. Rather, it reflects the judgment of this body and the other in the area of national security that important decisions that go to the heart of our intelligence production should be made on an expedited basis.

The DNI and the Attorney General advised us they strongly support this amendment because it would "ensure challenges to directives and petitions to compel compliance with directives are adjudicated in a manner that avoids undue delays in critical intelligence collection." We could not agree more.

I hope we will be able to accept this amendment.

I yield the floor to my distinguished chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, my remarks are only to indicate strong support for this amendment. It is a wise modification. As far as I know, there are none who are in dissent. I hope it will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3941, as modified.

The amendment (No. 3941), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we have made some progress today. We have laid out, through the good work of the leadership of this body, with Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL, a means of going forward on Tuesday. We have now had over 2 weeks of debate on FISA. I think not only the fact that everything that could be said pro and con of all the amendments has been said, but I believe we have given everybody a chance to say it.

The good news is that when Tuesday comes around, we will have short time agreements and proceed to vote on these critically important amendments, and then we hope cloture and, if cloture is invoked, final passage, with everybody having an opportunity to express themselves.

Again, I personally express my thanks to the leadership, to the members of the committee who stood with

us and our staff, and I thank our colleagues for letting us come to this position where we see the end in sight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, in every respect, I second the words of the vice chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. Speaking for this Senator, in the course of last year, this Senator has spent 6 months working on the children's health insurance bill with staff who do so much work that they sleep 2 or 3 hours a night, including the weekends, and achieved nothing. We have had, in a sense, the same process on the FISA bill. It is very complicated because it is a very delicate subject and requires this very difficult balance between intelligence collection for the security of the Nation and civil liberties of the people.

I am extremely proud of the way the vice chairman and others, particularly the majority leader and the minority leader, have conducted this affair. It took quite some time to get it going. I do believe I also see light at the end of the tunnel. I think if we do our work on Tuesday, we will have time to conference this bill with the House and send a bill to the President. In any event, I am grateful, particularly to the staff whose work is never mentioned enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be allowed to proceed as in morning business for the next 5 minutes.

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN AND GOVERNOR MITT ROMNEY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this afternoon, I and a number of others who have been supporting Gov. Mitt Romney for the Presidency of the United States met with the Governor and his good wife Ann to have a post-mortem following his announcement that he was suspending his campaign.

I was perhaps the first Member of this Chamber to announce my public endorsement of Governor Romney, so I wish to be among the first to extend my congratulations to Senator MCCAIN, who has now, by virtue of Governor Romney's suspension of his campaign, locked up the Republican nomination.

We all have our understanding of Senator MCCAIN's persistence and his determination to go forward in what he considers to be a good cause. There has never been a demonstration of the importance of that persistence quite as dramatic as his comeback from this campaign.

We can remember the time when all of the pundits and, frankly, all the rest of us, myself very much included, wrote off the McCain campaign, assuming that Senator MCCAIN was lying

dead in the gutter by the side of the road. I remember talking with some of his supporters in this Chamber at that time who said the McCain campaign is reeling and we don't know whether it is going to ever come back. I remember the rumors that flowed around this town, where people said: We cannot raise any money for the McCain campaign. No one wants to contribute to a lost cause.

JOHN MCCAIN, perhaps alone—maybe he had the support of his wife; I assume he did—said: No, I am going to go forward. He picked himself off, took himself off to New Hampshire, and did the same kind of thing he did 8 years ago when he ran against President Bush. In this case, he not only won New Hampshire, but he was able to expand that to wins elsewhere, to the point where we have the result today. So he deserves our congratulations as we recognize this truly extraordinary political accomplishment on his part.

I share with my colleagues this comment from Governor Romney. As those of us were supporting him from both the House and the Senate were gathered around him and talking about this, he shared with us this particular insight. He looked at what has happened. He sat down with his supporters. He looked for all the reasons why he should feel good. They pointed out he had won 4 million votes in the various primaries and caucuses and Senator MCCAIN had won 4.7 million. So in terms of the voters who supported him, he was not that far behind. He had won 11 States. Senator MCCAIN had won 13. So on that basis, he was not that far behind.

But the cold calculating reality of it was he was very far behind as far as the delegates were concerned. So he said to his advisers and his political consultants: What would it take for me to win the nomination? And they said to him very bluntly: You must destroy JOHN MCCAIN. That was not his word. I don't remember his exact word, but you must go negative, to use the vocabulary of the political consultant, in such a way as to make it impossible for JOHN MCCAIN to proceed with the confidence of the American people. Governor Romney said: I am not going to try that. Even if it might work, I don't want to try that. I don't want to do that. And he made the decision that was announced today.

Along with my congratulations to Senator MCCAIN on his extraordinary achievement and his assuming the position now as the obvious Republican nominee, I also congratulate my friend, Mitt Romney, on the graciousness with which he recognized what was happening and his willingness to withdraw now rather than drag the party on into a protracted fight that would make it very difficult for Senator MCCAIN to take control of the levers of power in the party and organize himself for the fight in the fall.

These are two good men, each one of different views, each one of very dif-

ferent background, each one of which would bring a different set of talents to the Presidency, each one of which has now exposed himself to the fire of the primary process. One has emerged victorious; the other has recognized that and stepped aside. I think it is a demonstration that the American political system, however messy, works.

Again, I extend my congratulations to Senator MCCAIN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

SERVICE OF PAGE SAM WOHS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Senate Page Program has been an integral part of the functioning of the Senate since its inception in 1829. Senate pages are always on the Senate floor when the Senate is in session, helping to ensure that the proceedings in the Chamber run smoothly and efficiently. Pages also are asked to complete a variety of other tasks when the Senate is not in session. We ask a lot of our Senate pages, and they always respond. A page is not only expected to serve the needs of the Senate, which is an important and time-consuming task, but also is expected to attend school and complete the necessary requirements of a high school junior.

Senator Daniel Webster selected the first Senate page. In those days, as is the case today, a page was chosen and sponsored by a Senator. There is a long and fine tradition of pages chosen by Michigan Senators, and I am proud to have sponsored many pages that have ably and responsibly served the Senate.

Sam Wohns, Michigan's most recent Senate page, completed his service as a Senate page last month with dedication and enthusiasm. Sam is a part of a fine tradition and a select group that has had the privilege to serve as a Senate page. He has proven through his hard work in the Senate and through his many successes in the past that he, like many of his peers, are some of our nation's best and brightest. This experience has prepared him well to meet future challenges, as it has for the many that have preceded him.

Each semester the Senate Page School conducts an essay competition. Every page is given the opportunity to