

and commitment to the Constitution and the rule of law, and believe me, he was an inspiration to young judges like me who were inspired to do the same. He has been an inspiration to so many judges, lawyers, and law students for decades.

I admired and respected Justice Scalia. Like many Texans, I was proud of the fact that he also seemed to love Texas, believe it or not, even though he was a Virginian. He remarked once that if he didn't live in Virginia, he would "probably want to be a Texan."

I wish to spend a couple of minutes remembering this great man and the contributions he made to our Nation. Beyond his incredible resume, Justice Scalia was a devoted husband to Maureen for more than 50 years. He was a dedicated father to 9 children and a grandfather to more than 30 grandchildren. As I said earlier, he was not only a family man, which I am sure he would have considered his most important job, he was a role model for a generation of lawyers, judges, legal scholars, and those who loved the Constitution.

One of the interesting things about Justice Scalia—and perhaps he could teach all of us a little something these days—was that he was quick to build relationships with people who had different views from his own and fostered an environment of collegiality and friendship on the Court.

As we learned earlier, Justice Scalia had relationships with people with whom he couldn't have disagreed more on key issues that the Court confronted—people like Justice Ginsburg, for example. We all know he was a gifted writer and possessed an infectious wit, but Justice Scalia's most important legacy is his life's work and his call for a return to our constitutional first principles.

Justice Scalia strongly believed that words mattered, and I think that is one of the reasons why he quickly became one of the most memorable writers on the Court and one of the best in the Court's entire history. He believed the words written in the Constitution mattered because that was the only thing the States voted on when they ratified the Constitution. Those were the words with which the American people chose to govern themselves. For decades he tried to give those words force and fought against an attempt to say that we really don't have a written Constitution; we have a living Constitution that should be reinterpreted based on the times when, indeed, the text had not changed one bit.

His originalist interpretation of the Constitution meant that he viewed the Court as a place to vindicate the law and what it meant, not express the preferences of five Justices. Justice Scalia was one of the most fervent advocates for the rule of law and a written Constitution. On many instances, he made the important point that if the Supreme Court was viewed merely as a group of nine individuals making

value judgments on how our country ought to be governed under our Constitution, then the people may well feel that their values were equally as valid as those of the "high nine" on the Potomac given life tenure and a seat on the Supreme Court. It was his strict adherence to the text of the Constitution, and not evolving value judgments over time, that gave protection to our democracy.

Justice Scalia was strongly committed to the separation of powers. This is so fundamental to the Constitution that, until the first Congress, James Madison didn't even think that we needed a Bill of Rights because he felt that the separation of powers and the division of responsibilities would be protection enough because they viewed the concentration of powers, the opposite of separation of powers, as a threat to our very liberty. I think he said that the very definition of tyranny was the concentration of powers. So he saw the separation of powers as nothing less than the most important guarantor of our liberty and the most important shield against tyranny.

In one dissent Justice Scalia wrote "without a secure structure of separated powers, our Bill of Rights would be worthless." I guess you would have to say he is a Madisonian and not a Federalist by temperament and view. This recognition of the importance of separation of powers could not be any more important at this point in our history because scarcely a month goes by when this administration has chosen to undermine this basic constitutional precept by exerting itself and claiming authorities which the Constitution does not give the President.

Justice Scalia understood what was at stake. He believed that every blow to the separation of powers would harm our Republic and liberty itself.

As Justice Scalia wrote in a case in which the Court unanimously struck down the President's violations of the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers, he said: "We should therefore take every opportunity to affirm the primacy of the Constitution's enduring principles over the politics of the moment." He continued, warning against "aggrandizing the Presidency beyond its constitutional bounds." That is what Justice Scalia did time and again, and that is what he reminded all of us about—the importance of doctrines of separation of powers, adherence to the text of the Constitution, and not making it up as you are going along or expressing value judgments that can't be related to the actual text and original understanding of the Constitution.

The question arises: When the President makes a nomination to fill the vacancy left by Justice Scalia's death, what is the constitutional responsibility of the U.S. Senate? It is true that under our Constitution, the President of the United States has a unique role and the authority to make a nomination to fill this vacancy, but it is also true that the Senate has an essen-

tial and unique role to play as well. The founding generation regarded the Senate's role in the appointment process as "a critical protection against 'despotism.'" Nothing less. That means that the U.S. Senate has a unique and separate role to play, and certainly a coequal role with that of the President, in the process of filling vacancies on the Court. We are not, and the Constitution never intended us to be, a rubber stamp for the President of the United States.

I know that President Obama would love to nominate somebody in the waning months of his last term of office as he is heading out the door and perhaps fill this vacancy, which in the case of Justice Scalia was filled for 30 years, far extending President Obama's term of office. That is not what the U.S. Senate is about. We are a coequal branch of government, and we have an independent and separate responsibility from that of the President. He can nominate anybody he wants, but it is up to the Senate, in its collective wisdom, on whether or not to grant advice and consent. When we say that, we mean that if the Senate did not play its unique role, liberty itself would be weakened and despotism strengthened.

As I said before, the American people can and should have a voice in the selection of the next Supreme Court Justice. In the waning days of this Presidential election year after voters have already cast their ballots in primaries for Republican and Democratic candidates—even as I speak, there is a caucus convening today in Nevada—I believe giving the American people a choice in who selects the next Justice of the Supreme Court is very important. I think it elevates what is at stake in this next election this November, and that means simply that this vacancy should not be filled at this time by this President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from California.

#### FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I came to the floor because I am stunned. I just learned that the Republicans have announced to the country they will not even call a hearing, if and when President Obama does his job and nominates a replacement for Justice Scalia.

We send our heartfelt sympathy to his family.

I don't know where the Republicans have come up with this notion that this is the right thing to do. If you look at the strict constitutionalists, you know they are reading the Constitution, unless they are phonies. This is what the Constitution says, the President shall "nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court." Where in this does it say: except in election years. As a matter of fact, we have acted 14 times in election years.

Whoever is a strict constructionist should read the Constitution, article II, section 2, clause 2. I am going to read it again: The President shall "nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the supreme Court."

It doesn't say as Senator CORNYN said: Oh, the President can nominate, but nobody else has a job to do. Oh no. It says: "... and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate . . ."

To have such a press conference, as I understand it—I didn't see it myself, but it has been reported to me—there has been an announcement that the Republicans will not even hold a hearing, which goes against this Constitution. I wouldn't be surprised if there is a lawsuit brought by the people of this country, 70 percent of whom believe we have an obligation. We have an obligation.

Nowhere in the Constitution does it say it is too late for the President to nominate. Guess what. The Republicans keep saying we need an elected President. Well, I have good news for them. This President was elected twice and he has about a year left. Guess what. I am not going to run again, but I am here now. I want to work. I did not take this job to have a year off and not worry about working in my last year.

Nowhere in the Constitution does it say: Oh, and by the way, don't advise and consent if it is a Democratic President in his second term. It does not say that. So if you consider yourself a strict constructionist, then pay attention to this. I am proud that several Republicans on the other side said: Baloney, we don't go along with it. Good for them and more should do it.

It doesn't say in the Constitution, you only advise and consent if it is a Republican President with a Republican Senate.

Again, the Senate over the years has repeatedly considered Supreme Court nominees in both election years and in the final year of a President's term.

Justice Kennedy, who serves now, a fellow Californian, was nominated by President Reagan in 1987. I was over on the House side, and I didn't have anything to do with it, but I sure watched it. Kennedy was confirmed by a Democratic Senate during Reagan's last year in office.

My Republican friends say: Oh, but this Senator said this about it and that Senator said that and JOE BIDEN said this. It doesn't matter what people say. It is what we do, and 14 times in history we have voted on judges in an election year.

My Republican colleagues who suggest that this process cannot be done before President Obama leaves office are fooling themselves. History has disproven them and the Constitution is going to chastise whoever says: I want a dead Constitution. Read this. This is very clear. It absolutely is.

So I have a message for my Republican friends. Pretty simple. Pretty simple. Do your job. Do your job. If you are afraid to do your job, then do something else with your life. If you don't want to do your job because you are worried that one moderate may get through, then make your argument. If you want to vote no, vote no, but to hold a press conference and say you will not even hold a hearing is outrageous.

Every day in talented cities across this country, Americans show up for work and they do their jobs. They don't call their bosses and say: You know, I just don't feel like doing this today. I am healthy, I am fine, I am well, but you know what, I don't want to do my job. They would be fired and they should be. Do your job. You are elected to do your job. The American people show up for their jobs. They do their jobs. It is as simple as that. The Justices of the Supreme Court show up and they do their jobs every day. Justice Scalia did it. They all do it. They hear cases. They write opinions.

The Supreme Court is the last stop on the justice train, but to be able to function as our Founding Fathers in the U.S. Constitution intended, they need a full bench with all nine Justices. A Supreme Court with eight Justices is not a functioning Court.

Let us look at the Republicans' hero, Ronald Reagan. We always hear them say: Ronald Reagan. I was proud to serve in the House during Ronald Reagan's term. I didn't agree with him on a lot of things, but I agree with him on this. Do you know what he said?

I look forward to prompt hearings conducted in the spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship. I will do everything in my power as President to assist in that process.

President Ronald Reagan, November 12, 1987. What did he say? Did he get up and say: Oh, it is an election year—which it was. No. Kennedy was voted on in an election year and President Reagan made the case.

This is what else Ronald Reagan said: "Every day that passes with a Supreme Court below full strength impairs the people's business in that crucially important body."

Let me say that again. Ronald Reagan, who was pushing for a vote on a Supreme Court Justice in an election year, said the following: "Every day that passes with a Supreme Court below full strength impairs the people's business in that crucially important body."

I don't understand where the Republicans are coming from. They are disregarding Ronald Reagan, their hero. They are disregarding the Constitution that they say is their shining star of their being, which it should be for all of us, and they stood there today and blatantly announced they are not even going to hold a hearing on a nominee before they even know who he or she is. What is that about? I am truly stunned. I thought I had seen everything, but I have never seen this. You show up and you do your job.

I am going to show you a few other quotes of people who are very important to this conversation and what they are saying about not moving forward. How about Sandra Day O'Connor, what an incredible woman. She was appointed by Ronald Reagan, the first female ever appointed to the Supreme Court, a magnificent person and a Republican.

What did she say? "I think we need somebody there, now, to do the job, and let's get on with it." She just said that 10 days ago or less. Is she a partisan? I don't think so. She is speaking from the heart. She is speaking from her soul. She is speaking from experience. She knows the Court has important cases before it and will be tied in knots if we don't have a Court at full strength.

Again, here is what she said, Republican Sandra Day O'Connor, esteemed member of the Supreme Court, a Ronald Reagan nominee: "I think we need somebody there, now, to do the job, and let's get on with it."

I am going to show you two more quotes. This is from the American Constitution Society:

A vacancy on the Court for a year and a half, which is what the Republicans want, at least a year and a half, would mean many instances where the Court could not resolve a split among the circuits. There would be the very undesirable result that the same federal law would have differing meanings in various parts of the country.

That is the American Constitution Society.

Then we have another quote I wish to share with you by the director of the Byron White Center at the University of Colorado:

It would essentially shut the Supreme Court down for two years. It would be a monumental crisis for the development of the law and the need to resolve large legal questions.

Let me say it again.

It would essentially shut the Supreme Court down for two years. It would be a monumental crisis for the development of the law and the need to resolve large legal questions.

It is not as if large legal questions aren't at stake. Right now the Supreme Court is set to look at some incredibly important cases that have real effects on our people. This isn't some argument in a salon. This is real stuff. The cases can't wait, and it doesn't matter what side you are on with these cases. They have to be resolved.

What about voting rights? I don't think there would be a difference of opinion in this Chamber that this is what makes this country great and special, the right to vote, the responsibility to vote. We have many States that have put forward voter ID laws. They need to be told whether they are fair or unfair, whatever side you come down on. We need a Court to look at voting rights cases and see who the eligible voters are.

Affirmative action. They are going to reexamine that case. Whatever side you are on, it has to be decided.

Workers' rights. The Court will decide the impact of the ability of the union to represent millions of working Americans. Whatever side you are on, there needs to be a decision, otherwise you are going to have different States with different laws and it makes no sense.

This is one Nation under God. That is why we have a U.S. Senate and a U.S. House and a U.S. President and a U.S. Supreme Court—because we are one Nation and these issues have to be decided. There is one on employee discrimination. How do people get their day in court if they are being discriminated against? It doesn't matter what side you are on. The fact is there needs to be a decision.

Women's health. There is a big case on women's health as to whether workers can get birth control. Again, whatever side you are on, pro, con, there needs to be a decision.

It is about women, health care, voting rights, students. These cases have real consequences. I am going to conclude with one more chart that deals with the length of Supreme Court Justices for the past 35 years. Here you see the list of the various nominees. Not all of these made it, a couple did not, but here is the deal with these. O'Connor waited 95 days, Rehnquist 92, Scalia 82, Bork 109, Kennedy 113, Souter 74, Thomas 110, Ginsburg 137, Breyer 114, Roberts 90, Alito 95, Sotomayor 97, Kagan 118.

Under MITCH MCCONNELL's plan, the Republican plan that they laid out, if you averaged all of this, you get 102 days. That is the average it takes. Under MCCONNELL's plan, it would take 444 days, at best. That is assuming everything goes perfectly well. It could take a lot longer.

What does this mean? Anyone within the sound of my voice has heard this: Justice delayed is justice denied. That is a fact. And it is used throughout the country when we talk about the importance of making these decisions. When our constituents go to jury duty, what are they asked? Can you make this decision? Can you come to this decision? Because everyone deserves to have an answer.

So, in conclusion, take a look at this. This is an abomination. This is the number of days we have seen over the last 35 years that it took to confirm. Fourteen of our Justices have been confirmed in election years since the beginning of this country, and this takes us back to the Civil War days—imagine—when we really had a country divided.

This is not what we need to do right now, with all of these decisions coming up. Regardless of your stand on them, people deserve justice.

I will conclude with the "Do Your Job" chart because I have to say that is what it comes down to. I urge the people of this great country to call the Republicans, every one of them, with three words: Do your job. And if the person who answers says "I don't know

what you mean," say "Do your job. Let the process move forward on the Supreme Court Justice." And if they say "Well, we want an elected President," what will be told to them is "We are fortunate. We have one, elected not once but twice." More than enough time remains for him to do his job, and more than enough time remains for us to do ours.

Republicans, do your job.  
I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the importance of filling the current vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States. I appreciate the words of my colleague from California.

I wish to begin by saying that my prayers and thoughts are with the family and friends and Supreme Court colleagues of Justice Scalia. He was a great scholar who had friends in many places. Just last week I was at the University of Chicago Law School, where I went to law school, and so many people have stories. He used to teach there. He taught there for a long period of time, and they miss him very much.

The Supreme Court has the constitutional responsibility to weigh some of the most important issues facing the American people. From freedom of speech, to due process, to doing business in America, Supreme Court decisions have impacted and continue to impact the daily life of every citizen of this country. As one of the three pillars of our government, we value the Court's distinctive insulation from public opinion. Justices commit themselves to the law and to the Constitution and not to politics or partisanship.

Americans need and deserve to have a functional and fully staffed Supreme Court. We cannot delay consideration of the next Supreme Court nominee. As my colleague just pointed out, we would have to go back to the Civil War, to a time where a position—an important key position on the Supreme Court of the United States—was left open. We would have to go back to a time when it was left open for more than a year. We would have to go back to a time before we had planes, before we had automobiles, before we had washing machines—you name it. We would have to go back to the Civil War.

Delaying the confirmation of a new Justice will prevent the Court from issuing binding precedent and deny access to justice for Americans. Lower courts will be left with decisions, and decisions will not be made in those cases. That is why the Constitution of the United States says that the President shall—shall—nominate someone to the Supreme Court. It doesn't say that he will wait for a year. It doesn't say that he can't do it in an election year. It says that he shall nominate someone.

We have a lot of Members of this great body who are lawyers, a lot of whom I have heard quoting the Con-

stitution. A lot of them believe in strict interpretation of the words of the Constitution. Well, the words of the Constitution say that the President "shall nominate" and that the Senate's job is to "advise and consent." It says that it is the Senate's job. It doesn't say that it is the Senate's job to avoid things and to just go on TV and to run ads. No. It says that the Senate has a job to do. The Senate has a job to do.

Both the President and the Senate have a constitutional duty to protect the Supreme Court's ability to function and dispense justice—not to tell the Supreme Court what to do, not to dictate their decisions, but to make sure they are simply able to do justice. This means they must be fully staffed and have the Justices in place, and it also means they should be funded. Those are our jobs.

According to our Constitution, the President replaces vacant seats on the Supreme Court. That duty does not end, as I noted, in a Presidential year, just as the responsibilities of all Senators in their States and in their Nation do not end in an election year.

President Obama was elected to serve out his entire second term, not just the first 3 years. For 332 long days, the President will be the democratically elected President of the United States—democratically elected, as in a democracy, as in how our democracy functions. He has an obligation to all Americans to dutifully execute his oath of office.

The President has not yet announced a nominee to fill the current vacancy on the Court. When he does, it will be the constitutional duty of each one of us to consider the nominee on his or her merits and then choose whether to vote yes or no. It is really not that hard. It is what the kids learn when they are taught social studies and civics when they are in elementary school. The American people who voted for us, as well as those who didn't vote for us, expect us to do the jobs we were elected to do, regardless of the timing.

A complete refusal to engage in this constitutionally required process before the President has even announced a nominee is dangerous for our system of governance. It defies the words of the Constitution. This Chamber would be neglecting a key constitutional duty if it prevented a well-qualified nominee from serving on the Supreme Court. And guess what. How do we figure out if someone is well qualified? We have hearings. That is what we have been doing for decades now. We have hearings to figure out whether this person is qualified. That is how we advise. That is how we consent. That is how we do our duty under the Constitution.

It is for that reason that I urge my colleagues to continue in the Senate's bipartisan tradition of giving full and fair consideration to Supreme Court nominees. We have precedent for the Senate performing this role in the final year of a Presidency. Most recently,

the Senate confirmed Justice Kennedy, someone who is currently serving on the Supreme Court, a current member sitting on the Supreme Court, someone who makes decisions every day. When was he confirmed? He was confirmed in the last year of Ronald Reagan's Presidency. And guess what. The Senate was controlled by Democrats. So we had the exact opposite situation. Now we have a Democratic President and we have a Senate that is in the control of Republicans. Back then we had a Republican President and a Senate that was in the control of Democrats. People say: Well, what does history show us? What do we know? To me, that is the best example of history. And we know what happened: Justice Kennedy was confirmed, on Ronald Reagan's nomination, by a Democratic Senate in an election year unanimously—unanimously.

The Senate has taken such action more than a dozen times in our Nation's history, and there is no reason to abandon that precedent now. I am talking about when a Justice position opens up during an election year. We have that precedent, which I think is important. Again, I think the most important precedent, the most important example for historians, is what I led with: the fact that we have to go back to the Civil War to find a time when we left a vacancy on the Supreme Court open for a year. Think about that. Through World War I, through World War II, through huge tumult in this country, we always made sure we had a fully staffed Supreme Court.

It would be unprecedented to deny a Supreme Court nominee fair consideration in the U.S. Senate. In the last 100 years, the Senate has taken action on every Supreme Court nominee regardless of whether the nomination was made in a Presidential year. It is now February, which gives us plenty of time to consider and confirm a nominee. Let's go to that next.

People say: When will we have the time to get that done? I would submit that we do. We have hundreds of days before us. In fact, the Senate has taken an average of only 67 days. Let's make it easier: 2 months—about 2 months. That is the average since 1975 from the date of the nomination to the confirmation vote—2 months. That means that if the President offers a nomination, say, in the month of March—that sounds like a good month to have a nominee—that nominee would receive a vote in the Senate by Memorial Day. There are our 2 months. And if we even wanted to add a little time on, we would certainly do it by the Fourth of July, which is a very good holiday for those who believe in the Constitution and in the words of the Constitution.

Until we confirm a nominee, the Court is left with only eight Justices. A split decision will prevent the Supreme Court from making critical decisions and leave lower courts without a precedent to follow. A major responsibility of the Supreme Court is to re-

solve disagreements among lower courts. A failure of the President or the Senate to meet its constitutional obligations would cause the Supreme Court to be unable to fill its constitutional obligations.

These Supreme Court Justices aren't elected directly; they have lifetime appointments. Their job is to be insulated from elections and politics, and that is why we have these strict and straightforward words in the Constitution that say that the President shall nominate someone for the job, and they also say that the Senate will advise and consent. We have those words in place in the Constitution, in that incredibly important document that guides us in this Chamber every single day, just for a situation such as this one, just for situations such as these.

In closing, I remind my colleagues of the important work the people have sent us here to do. Yes, we have major disputes every day. That happens every day. We get into arguments about issues. There are political campaigns going on. But we have always at least followed the Constitution. That is what this is about today.

As soon as we have a nominee, as soon as the President exercises his constitutional duty and puts someone in place, we should follow the Constitution and our longstanding traditions and the history of this country and uphold that duty. We should diligently consider the President's nominee to be the next Supreme Court Justice. As members of the Judiciary Committee, we must have the confirmation hearing. We must do our jobs.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am here to talk about Takata airbags, but I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota that she is so right on. The Constitution, article II, says that the President "shall nominate" and the Senate "shall confirm." It doesn't say "may" or "wish." It says "shall." It is a constitutional responsibility of our duties.

Just do your job, U.S. Senate. Just do the job, and we will see, once the President comes forward with a nominee. Let's see. Are we going to have committee hearings? Let's see if we are going to have open and bipartisan discussion on the merits of the nominee that is put forth. Let's see if the Constitution is trashed or whether the Constitution is upheld in the process put out to us in the third branch of government. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

#### TAKATA AIRBAGS

Mr. President, I came here to speak about something else—something that looks very sinister. As a matter of fact, I ask unanimous consent to have two items to show to the Senate with regard to the Takata airbag crisis.

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

Mr. NELSON. It looks kind of sinister, unfortunately, because it is. It is supposed to save lives, not kill. This is an airbag. It obviously has already been inflated. It goes right in the steering wheel, so when you get in an accident, this inflates and fills up with gas within a split second, and that protects your head and your torso from coming forward and being injured.

What happens if this malfunctions, and what happens if the very manufacture of it causes it to malfunction under conditions? Let me show you what happens.

I said these things look pretty sinister. Indeed, this is pretty sinister because this is a fragment that was in the metal casing in one of these airbags in Florida that, when it malfunctioned, caused the explosive force of the ammonium nitrate gas. It was so explosive that it ripped apart the metal casing, and this part that I am showing came flying into the face of the driver, severely injuring the driver. In this case it hit the forehead.

I have told the Senate on many occasions that fragments of metal like this have come out just within the Orlando area of my State. They found a woman in the middle of an intersection where she had a collision, and when the police arrived, they found out that she was dead. She had bled to death. They looked at her neck and it was slashed. The police's immediate response was that this was a homicide. Upon reflection, she had a collision in the intersection that otherwise would have been a major fender bender, but because of a defective Takata airbag, it sent a piece of metal like this into her neck and cut her jugular vein.

Near Orlando, a firefighter—a big, strapping, 6-foot-4 hunk of a man—doesn't have an eye anymore because a piece of metal fragment like this one from a Takata airbag came out when there was nothing more than a fender bender. When this bag exploded, it sent out a piece of metal. In his case, that firefighter doesn't have the sight in one eye because this piece of metal fragment hit him.

Unfortunately, this has happened all over the country. Unfortunately, it has happened with a great deal of, shall we say, dragging of feet, coverup, and obfuscation. These airbags are supposed to save lives, but when they fail, they rupture violently and they send metal fragments right at the driver or the passenger.

These Takata airbags have such an explosive force. What is behind it? Well, our staff on the Commerce Committee has just produced a report which this Senator is releasing today. It is an update on this report which found, through a review of recently obtained internal documents in the Takata Corporation, that Takata employees routinely manipulated safety testing data. That would be bad enough, but let's see the consequence of this drip, drip, drip approach to now a substantial number of recalls. There