

performed by Denise and the rest of her team at the CDC's Polio Eradication Branch. It is only a matter of time before this disease no longer threatens our world's children.

Madam President, Denise is just one of so many Federal employees who have dedicated their lives to serving the greater good. She and her team are truly engaged in what President Obama has called "repairing the world." Their work saves lives and helps demonstrate our Nation's commitment to humanitarian leadership in the global community.

I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring Denise Johnson and her team for their outstanding work, as well as the important contributions made by all of our excellent public servants.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### GROVES NOMINATION

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, in the Constitution, we see laid out before us a framework of how our government is supposed to work, with three branches—legislative, executive, judicial. We also find in the Constitution what our relative responsibilities are, not with great detail but with some definitiveness.

Ironically, one of the requirements the Constitution provides for us in this country is that every 10 years we try to count everybody. We have a census. Most nations do that. We have been doing that really for over 200 years. It does not get any easier. In fact, every 10 years it gets harder, and it also gets to be more expensive.

The Director of the Census does not serve a finite period of time. The Director of the Census really serves at the pleasure of the President, and we have had Census Directors who have served as little as 1 year and some Directors who have served maybe 4 or even 5 years.

This is particularly appropriate to speak about today because we do not have a Director of the Census. We had a Dr. Murdock, from down in Texas, who served for about the last year of the Bush administration as our Census Director. He did a very nice job. But at the beginning of this year, Dr. Murdock resigned. We do not have a Census Director. What we do have coming down the railroad tracks is the requirement to do the census.

Next April 1—I call it a little bit like D-day. At Normandy, we sent all of our troops ashore, and they scrambled off of those landing vessels. They stormed the beaches. That took place after literally months of planning, months of preparation, and finally the day of execution came.

In a way, the census is like preparing for the Normandy invasion. The efforts are underway now. They have been underway for months and will continue up to April 1 and beyond that day, as we try to count everybody. Yet, at this critical time, as we approach the need to conduct our census, to do it in an accurate, cost-effective way, we do not have a leader there. We have some good people, but they lack a Director.

Last month, I held a hearing of our Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Subcommittee, and we invited people who had been high-level officials in, I think, every census since 1970—the 1970 census, the 1980 census, the 1990 census, and the 2000 census. We asked them to come in and talk to us about how they thought we were doing in terms of the preparation for the 2010 census. At the end of their testimony, I asked each of them to give to us on our committee two names of people who they thought would be excellent Census Directors, and they were good enough to do that. I think every one of them included in their recommendations the name of a fellow from Michigan—I am an Ohio State guy, but they recommended a fellow from Ann Arbor whose name is Dr. Robert Groves.

Dr. Groves is an expert in survey methodology. He has spent decades working to strengthen the Federal statistical system, to improve its staffing through training programs, and to keep the system committed to the highest scientific principles of accuracy and efficiency. Having once served as Associate Director of the Census Bureau a number of years ago, Dr. Groves knows how the agency operates and what its employees need to successfully implement the decennial census and other programs. He knows because he has been there. He is not just an academician—one of the most respected people in his field in the country—he actually helped run the Census Bureau at an earlier time. The combination of those experiences has prepared him well to lead the Bureau at a time when rapid developments and changes are occurring.

As a manager, he elevated the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research to a premier survey research organization, respected throughout the country—actually, respected around the globe. Numerous Federal and State agencies and policymakers have sought his expertise in survey design and response. His work has received professional recognition through awards from various professional associations, including the 2001 American Association for Public Opinion Research Innovator Award and more recently the 2008 American Statistical Association Julius Shiskin Award for original and important contributions in the development of economic statistics. Ultimately, his deep expertise in survey response will help the Census Bureau focus on the most important goal of the 2010 census, which is to encourage all people to respond to the census.

Dr. Groves will undoubtedly face a host of operational and management challenges as we move closer to the 2010 census. However, I remain confident he is well equipped—remarkably well equipped—to understand the agency's inner workings, to lead his staff—he has led a large organization already; he served at a senior level at the Census Bureau before—and to also be a national spokesperson for the 2010 census and the agency's other equally important ongoing survey programs. It is for these reasons that I hope the full Senate will support his nomination and move it quickly.

Let me just reiterate, we are now about 8 months away from when the first forms go out as part of the start of the 2010 census. The Bureau has already completed something we call address canvassing—an operation in which 140,000 people on the ground nationwide were making sure the address lists we have to do the census are accurate.

Since the 2000 count, the population in this country is estimated to have increased by over 40 million people, with increased numbers of minorities and an increase in the number of languages spoken. Further complicating the 2010 decennial operations is the mismanagement and lack of preparation that occurred in past years, most notably in the failure of the field data collection automation contract, resulting in a last-minute decision to return to paper-based questionnaires, ultimately adding billions of dollars to the census budget. And it is only going to get harder the longer the Senate delays the confirmation process.

The reason we do not have a Census Bureau Director is not because we do not have a qualified candidate. It is not because our Subcommittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has not endorsed his candidacy. We have done so unanimously, and actually we have endorsed him with acclaim. We are just lucky, very fortunate in this country to have—at a time when we are about to try to meet our constitutional responsibility to count everybody accurately and in a cost-effective way—to actually have somebody with his gifts and his talents to bring to the job. What we do not have is the permission to bring his name up for a vote in the Senate. If we leave here today without having had the opportunity to vote up or down on the nomination of Dr. Groves, we will have made a very grave mistake.

I understand our Republican friends are uncomfortable, unhappy with the pace for the confirmation process for Judge Sotomayor, who has been nominated, as we know, to be an Associate Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. I voted for Chief Justice John Roberts a couple of years ago. The timetable for approving his confirmation was almost the very same from the day he was nominated by former President Bush to the day we voted for him here, it was almost the same number of days we are

talking about with respect to the Sotomayor nomination. The timetable on Justice Alito: almost the same from the day he was nominated by President Bush until the day we voted here in the Senate—at least a majority of our colleagues did—to confirm him. It was almost the same number of days. I realize some of our colleagues are unhappy that we are providing the same kind of timetable for Judge Sotomayor that we provided for Justice Alito and Chief Justice Roberts. I, for the life of me, do not see what the beef is.

Just as I believe we are fortunate to have someone with Dr. Groves' credentials to serve as our Census Director, I think we are lucky to have somebody with Judge Sotomayor's credentials to serve on the Supreme Court. I have had the opportunity to meet with her. I know a number of my colleagues have too. I must say, among the things I most like and respect about her: She is up from nothing. She was a kid born in the Bronx, raised in the Bronx, and very humble, from a humble setting, a humble beginning. She worked hard, won herself a scholarship to Princeton, went there, excelled, and later went off to law school at Yale—two of the finest institutions we have in our country.

After that, she was a prosecutor for a number of years; beyond that, a corporate litigator; and finally nominated by a Republican President—George Herbert Walker Bush—to serve as a district court judge. By all observers, she did a superb job. She was not just so-so. She was an exceptional judge—so good, in fact, that a few years later, when there was a vacancy on the circuit court of appeals in her district, a Democratic President, Bill Clinton, said: I think she ought to get the nod. He nominated her for that position, and she was confirmed by a wide margin. So she has actually been through this process not once but twice. I think she has gone on to serve longer as a Federal judge—when you add together the district court time and the circuit court of appeals time, I think she has served longer as a Federal judge than anybody in the last 100 years who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

I have read the comments some of her colleagues have to say about her, including colleagues who were also nominated by Republican Presidents. They have been uniformly complimentary, very gracious in their remarks, very laudatory as well.

So I would say to my Republican colleagues, while you struggle to get over the fact that we are going to set the same timeline or try to set the same timeline for the confirmation of Judge Sotomayor that we set for the nominations of Judges Alito and John Roberts—I just don't understand the angst you feel.

I do know this: Apparently, the nomination of Dr. Groves is being held up along with 25 to 30 other names, all of whom have cleared committees, I think, by wide margins. We can't move

forward on those nominations. Some of them maybe are not of grave consequence. The nomination of Dr. Groves is of grave consequence. If we have the opportunity later today in the course of business to actually consider a number of nominations that are before the Senate, that are awaiting our consideration, I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to allow the nomination of Dr. Groves to come here for a vote and to give us the opportunity to vote him up or down. I am sure we will vote him up, and I am equally sure he will make us proud with the service he will provide as the Director of the Census Bureau for our country in the years ahead.

With that having been said, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, just before walking into this Chamber, I attended a historic rally on health care reform across the street. Today, thousands of Americans—some from every State in this country—traveled to Washington for one of the largest health care lobby days in the history of the Nation. I joined these citizens—volunteers, almost all—representing more than a thousand organizations and more than 30 million people who are fighting to ensure that every American has access to affordable health care coverage.

I am inspired by their activism and energy and by the message I hear from these Americans. I am hearing from hundreds of thousands of middle-class Ohioans, and their message is: Don't let the special interests hijack this health insurance reform.

The message I hear is to make sure health care reform includes a strong public option. I will tell you about individuals, Americans like Joseph from Powell, OH, who are demanding they change. Joseph, an ordained pastor and doctor of psychology, wrote to me that as a child he suffered a stroke and became paralyzed and blind. His father's insurance expired and his family had no coverage. They struggled to provide the care he needed. As an adult, he is concerned that too many Americans are not receiving the medical care they need. Joseph wishes to see a public insurance option that will bring down costs and help all Americans lead a productive life.

The spirit and energy of the people I met today—thousands from around

this Nation demanding change—reaffirms why health care reform is so important.

Health care reform is about keeping what works and fixing what's broken. Middle-class families from all over the country are demanding a health care system that reduces costs, enhances quality of care, and provides choice—choice either of a private insurance plan or of a public option. It is their choice. The existence of both will make the other behave better and make the other work better and will improve the quality of care for all Americans. Good old American competition.

People are reminding elected officials in the Senate and House about Americans like Ken from Findlay, OH. He lost his manufacturing job a few years ago, after working in the industry for nearly 30 years. Shortly before losing his job, Ken began having serious health issues—unexplained seizures and memory loss. In and out of the hospital, and out of a job, Ken was forced to find expensive private insurance after being denied Social Security disability and not yet old enough to be eligible for Medicare. Unfortunately for Ken, the price of the private insurance was simply too high.

After a near-death seizure a few years ago, Ken was hospitalized again and diagnosed with lupus. After a month-long hospitalization, Ken entered a nursing home for rehabilitation.

All this treatment was done without insurance. With tens of thousands of dollars in medical expenses, Ken had to withdraw from his 401(k) savings early—facing tax penalties, I might add—ultimately draining his lifetime, hard-earned savings, and putting his retirement security in jeopardy.

It is unacceptable that Ohioans such as Ken, who worked hard all their lives, have to fight for health insurance simply to take care of their disability. That is why the time for health care reform is now.

The HELP Committee has accomplished a lot on quality, on prevention and wellness, in part thanks to the contribution and efforts of the Presiding Officer from North Carolina. We have done well with the workforce shortages issue. We have good language on fraud and abuse. Clearly, most important, the most difficult work is in front of us. We have more work to do to make sure health care reform is about providing people with affordable, quality health insurance that protects them, to protect what works and to fix what is wrong.

I need some of my colleagues to explain to me something that is pretty confusing. As we talk about this public option, I hear the insurance industry tell us over and over they can do things better, that with their marketing, their skills, their bureaucracy, their well-paid executives and all the things they do they can do things better. As they argue against the public option, they say the government cannot do