

I haven't had any experience dealing with the arsenic issue, neither the scientific level nor the cost-effectiveness level of control.

You have an open mind, my friend. Give him this job and he will have an open mind about arsenic in drinking water. He has an open mind about pesticides on fruits and vegetables. He has an open mind about dioxin and its medicinal purposes. He has an open mind about the future of DDT in comparison with other chemicals. And this is the man we want to put in control, the gatekeeper on rules and regulations about public health and safety and the environment?

That is why I have risen this evening to oppose this nomination. I thank my colleagues and all those who participated in this debate. I appreciate their patience. I know we have gone on for some time, but this much I will tell you. If Mr. Graham is confirmed, and it is likely he will be, he can rest assured that many of us in this Senate will be watching his office with renewed vigilance. To put this man in charge of this responsibility requires all of us who care about public health and safety and environmental protection to stay up late at night and read every word, to watch what is going on.

We don't need any more arsenic in drinking water regulations. We don't need to move away from environmental protection. We don't need to second-guess the medical experts on the dangers of pesticide residues on fruits and vegetables and the danger of dioxin. We need sound science and objectivity, and, sadly, John Graham cannot bring them to this position, and that is why I will vote no on his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, let's listen to the scientists on the Science Advisory Board to which the Senator referred.

Dr. Dennis Passionback:

I think John's point [meaning John Graham] is what you thought his point was, Mort, and that is in several studies and hypotheses over the years that there are some harmonic beneficial effects associated with dioxin and related chemicals for certain disease influences. Of course that is at very low dose of course.

These are scientists. It is easy for the rhetoric to get out of hand here, and I want to try to do my part to not engage in escalating, but I find some of the statements attributed to this man amazing. I think our colleagues know better. I think the letters of endorsement and the public endorsements belie this. I think the reflection on Harvard University is unfair. It is not uncommon for centers doing work similar to Harvard's center to receive 40 to 60 percent of their funding from the private sector.

I think what we have here is just a back and forth with regard to a man whose opponents are desperately trying to undermine this nomination. I think we have here a question concerning public service and whether or not we

are going to get decent people to come into these thankless jobs to do them if we are going to see the confluence of scientific work on the one hand and the political process on the other produce such an ugly result.

I think we need to ask ourselves that question. I think we need to ask ourselves also whether or not we want to have these decisions based upon sound scientific analysis, one that is endorsed by all of the people who endorsed Dr. Graham, and say that analysis, that sound analysis that will work to our benefit.

I have a chart of all the areas where lead and gasoline, sludge, drinking water—where Dr. Richard Morganstern, economic analyst at the EPA, has shown where cost-benefit analysis, the kind that Dr. Graham proposes, has been beneficial both from a cost standpoint and increasing benefits. Let's not get into an anti-intellectual no-nothing kind of mode here and try to label these fine scientists and this fine institution with labels that do not fit and are not deserved.

I sincerely hope my colleagues will vote for this nomination.

Mr. REID. Is all time yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH). All time has expired.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill, S. 1172; that the only amendments in order be a managers' amendment and an amendment by Senator SPECTER; that there be 10 minutes for debate on the bill and the managers' amendment, equally divided between the two managers, Senators DURBIN and BENNETT; that there be 5 minutes for debate for Senator SPECTER; that upon the disposition of these two amendments, the Senate proceed to third reading and vote on final passage of S. 1172; that when the Senate receives from the House of Representatives their legislative branch appropriations bill, the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the text of the bill relating solely to the House remain; that all other text be stricken and the text of the Senate bill be inserted; provided that if the House inserts matters relating to the Senate under areas under the heading of "House of Representatives" then that text will be stricken; that the bill be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table; that following the vote tonight on the Senate legislative branch appropriations bill, the Senate return to executive session and vote on the

Graham nomination, followed by a vote on the Ferguson nomination, with 2 minutes for debate equally divided between these two votes; that the motions to reconsider be laid on the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; the Senate then return to legislative session, that S. 1172 remain at the desk and that once the Senate acts on the House bill, passage of the Senate bill be vitiated and it be returned to the calendar.

I further ask unanimous consent that after the first vote, the subsequent two votes be limited to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. At the appropriate time I will ask for the yeas and nays on the Graham nomination.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1172) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous consent request which was just allowed regarding procedures for the remainder of the evening, I will give a brief summary of this bill.

I am pleased to present to the Senate the fiscal year 2002 legislative branch appropriations bill, as reported by the full committee.

I thank Chairman BYRD for his support and the high priority he has placed on this bill. He has provided an allocation which has ensured we could meet the highest priorities in the bill. In addition, I wish to thank the ranking member of the full Committee Senator STEVENS who has been actively involved in and very supportive of this bill.

I am grateful to my ranking member, Senator BENNETT, for his important role in this process and his excellent stewardship of this subcommittee for the past 4½ years.

The fact is that this bill bears the imprint of Senator BENNETT and his hard work in keeping an eye on this particular appropriations bill. I was happy to join him in bringing this bill to the floor. I couldn't have done it without him. I appreciate all of his assistance.

The bill before you today totals \$1.94 billion in budget authority and \$2.03 billion in outlays. This is \$103 million—5.6 percent—over the fiscal year 2001 enacted level and \$104 million or 5 percent below the request level.

The bill includes \$1.1 billion in title I, Congressional Operations, which is \$88 million below the request and \$123 million above the enacted level.