

cannot work this out because this really does not compare to some of the difficult issues we have been able to resolve previously. But we have not been able to resolve this.

I am really disappointed for a number of reasons. It involves individual Senators who have also devoted a lot of time on this issue, both Democrats and Republicans. But if there were ever an effort in good faith by the two sides, this has been it.

I hope my objection, which I will enter in just a few moments, will not be the end of this. I hope we can, with a night's rest, work something out. For the last two nights we have come within a whisker of an agreement on these three judges. But in the Senate sometimes a whisker stops us, and it has done that.

So I reluctantly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Nevada, I share his frustration. These are three nominations that are going to be approved, one of them probably unanimously. The assistant Democratic leader and I have wrestled around with this now for the last 2 days, and we find ourselves still not in a position to lock in a vote on Cook and Roberts.

So tomorrow is another day, and we will try again. But it is sort of an indication of where the Senate stands these days, that even in a situation where you have three judges we know are going to be confirmed, we have not been able to reach an agreement after 2 days' work to conclude the inevitable, which is confirmation of these three judges.

Hopefully tomorrow will bring better results.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am very hopeful we will be able to make progress. Again, the three Senators who are speaking now, with Senator DASCHLE, have been working very hard with our colleagues to try to reach an agreement. But we have been unsuccessful. We will keep moving ahead, and I am optimistic these three nominees will be confirmed shortly.

I do want to add, really for the benefit of my colleagues, that progress is being made. As my colleagues know, one of the nominees, Roberts, went back to committee, and the understanding was that with him going back to committee, we would have votes, up-or-down votes, on both Roberts and Cook. That is the background. We have been working on that for actually several weeks, and that process is underway. So we look forward to having that become a reality.

That first step, with Roberts going back to committee, was taken. And now the expectation is, and the general agreement is, we are moving in the direction that we will, at some point in

time—we have not been able to lock in the time—have votes on both Roberts and Cook.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield, I know the hour is late. I don't want to talk longer than necessary. I just want the record to be spread with the fact that we have a couple of Senators who have a different understanding as to what the majority leader and the minority leader and Senator McCONNELL and I thought had been agreed to. Senator McCONNELL was not on the floor; just the three of us thought it had been agreed to. There is an honest dispute as to a fact or two. This is just me speaking personally, not for my colleagues. I really think we should be able to work our way through this. It should not be as difficult as it is.

The Democratic leader and I acknowledge that the majority leader intervened right before the recess to get Roberts back for a hearing. We know that wasn't easy for him to do. We acknowledge that. We appreciate that. And we hope we can resolve this procedural quagmire. There certainly has been no bad faith by the leadership on the Republican side or the Democratic side.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me say, once again, that we will have a cloture vote on Owen tomorrow. And if cloture fails, we will go to Prado and, once Prado is completed, go to the Cook nomination. That will be the general plan.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

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

#### NOMINATION OF PRISCILLA OWEN

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise in morning business for a moment to speak about the nomination of Priscilla Owen of Texas to the Federal bench.

This is really an extraordinary nomination. It is very troubling to me that it appears most of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to keep Justice Owen from getting a vote. In the past, even with very controversial votes on Justices to the Supreme Court—and I have, for example, Justice Clarence Thomas in mind, and there was significant opposition to the confirming of Justice Thomas, primarily by Members of the other side of the aisle—the leaders of the Democratic Party understood that tradition called for a vote—probably knowing they would lose the vote. They, nevertheless, refused to support any kind of filibuster and they voted against Justice Thomas's confirmation. But he was confirmed 52–48.

I always respected the things they said at or about the time of that con-

firmation—that they would not ever support a filibuster, regardless of their particular feelings about the nominee. I thought that took courage, and I respected it, coming, as it did, from some of the key leaders of the Democratic side of the Senate. It confirmed to me that the tradition of the Senate relationship of comity we have with the President in dealing with his nominees, and the importance of our responsibilities with respect to confirming Justices of the Supreme Court and members of the Federal bench generally, is such that partisanship and tactical advantage could be laid to the side for the good of the country and these nominations could be voted on.

Now, there have been votes—sometimes—where the nominee lost. Most of the time, when votes are allowed to happen, the nominees prevail. But the new situation we have in this body, starting out with the President's nomination of Miguel Estrada—and now sadly, it seems, with the nomination of Priscilla Owen—we are going to require that unless 60 Members of the Senate agree to allow a vote, we don't get a vote. A filibuster, in other words, becomes the benchmark, the standard for confirmation of judges.

It has never been that way. There has only been one successful filibuster, and that was a very strange situation. There has never been a partisan filibuster in this body until now. It is especially remarkable because, in the case of Justice Owen, for example, one cannot claim, as has been claimed with regard to Miguel Estrada, that her record is unknown or unclear, or that there is more information that needs to be gleaned. She appeared not once but twice before the Judiciary Committee. The reason I wanted to take the floor briefly today is to say to my friends I don't think I have ever seen a nominee who handled herself or himself better than Justice Owen did at those hearings. She was forthcoming, brilliant in her exposition of the law, measured, and she clearly has the temperament to be a good judge.

She has been serving as a justice of the State Supreme Court of Texas. She has the support of another former justice of that court, Judge Gonzales, who obviously is now acting as the President's counsel, and the support of Democrats and Republicans alike.

The American Bar Association, as with Miguel Estrada, has recommended her for confirmation. She stayed at the hearing for as long as Members wanted her to stay. She answered all of the questions. So the same argument cannot be made that has been made about Miguel Estrada.

In fact, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle made it clear, in discussing the nomination of Miguel Estrada, that the only thing standing in the way of a vote—they would not necessarily commit to voting for him but at least allowing a vote on him—was producing this information which they say they want from the Justice