

Mr. CONRAD. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. CONRAD. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will once again have the opportunity to demonstrate its support for America's family farmers and ranchers by improving emergency agricultural disaster assistance as part of the supplemental appropriations bill.

For over a year, I, along with Senate colleagues from both sides of the aisle, have attempted repeatedly to convince the Congress of the United States and this administration to provide desperately needed disaster assistance.

As part of the hurricane supplemental last year, the Senate approved an agricultural disaster package. That measure was dropped in conference as a result of opposition from the administration. The need for this legislation has only been made more compelling by the severe disasters that have hit California, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Oklahoma during the final weeks of 2006.

In my own home State of North Dakota, in 2005, we had a disaster that was devastating to thousands of farm and ranch families. This is what we saw across North Dakota—flooded lands, over a million acres of land that could not even be planted and another million acres of land that was drowned out. Then, irony of ironies, the next year we had a devastating drought—the third worst drought in this Nation's entire history, hitting not only North Dakota but right down the heartland of America.

This is a farm field near my home, in Burleigh County. I live in Bismarck. This is a farm field in that same county, and you can see almost nothing growing.

Here is the U.S. Drought Monitor, and they determine on a scientific basis the effect of drought across America. This is from July 25, 2006, and you can see drought right down the heartland of America—in our case, exceptional drought. That is the dark brown right on the border between North Dakota and South Dakota—exceptional drought. The next category going down the scale, extreme drought, an even broader area between the two States. We also see exceptional and extreme droughts in these parts of the country, and then severe drought. That is the tan. Virtually all of North Dakota had exceptional, extreme, and severe drought conditions. And, of course, not just North Dakota, it was right down the heartland of the country.

This is a headline from July 30, 2006, from the Grand Forks Herald: "Dakotas the Epicenter of a Drought-Stricken Nation. More than 60 percent of the United States in drought."

This has been an absolutely bizarre set of circumstances: One year, extreme flooding; the next year, extreme

drought. But that is the reality of what we have confronted, and if assistance is not provided, thousands of farm families will be forced off the land.

The President's chief economic adviser was in my office to visit me on another matter at the same time there were independent bankers from my State there to talk to me about agricultural assistance—bankers talking to me about the desperate need for drought assistance. They told me and told the President's chief economic adviser that if assistance were not forthcoming, they would lose 5 to 10 percent of their clients. These are farm and ranch families who work hard, who love this country, who work the land, and who are some of the most independent people you would ever want to meet. The last thing they want is a government handout, but if they do not have a helping hand extended to them, they are going to be out of business. That shouldn't be the result. We should provide the very basic assistance we have provided in other times in other parts of the country to those who have been hard hit.

Let me make certain that people understand. To get any assistance, producers will need to demonstrate they have had a 35-percent loss, and they will get no help for that first 35 percent of loss. That is the floor. They have to have lost 35 percent before they get anything, and then the assistance will apply to the losses beyond 35 percent.

Nobody is getting rich on this program. Some have suggested this bill will result in farmers becoming more than whole because of crop insurance. That is simply incorrect. Under the provisions, a producer receiving disaster assistance cannot recover more than 95 percent of the expected value of the crop, after both crop insurance and the expected market income from the crop have been deducted.

This is desperately needed. It is done in a way that is fair and balanced and prevents abuse. I hope my colleagues will support it.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF GEORGE H. WU TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George H. Wu, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 20 minutes for debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, with this confirmation—and I expect Mr. Wu will be confirmed—we will have confirmed 14 lifetime appointments to the Federal bench so far this year. This is March. I mention that because, when President Clinton was in office and the Republicans controlled the Senate, there were only 17 confirmations during the entire 1996 session of the Senate.

For those who think there is partisanship in the confirmation of judges, yes, there has been. Fortunately, it has been my friends on the other side.

Today the Senate continues, as we have since the beginning of this Congress, to make progress on judicial nominations. The Senate will consider and, I believe, confirm the nomination of George H. Wu to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

With this confirmation, the Senate will have confirmed 14 lifetime appointments to the Federal bench so far this year. There were only 17 confirmations during the entire 1996 session of the Senate. I have worked cooperatively with Members from both sides of the aisle on our committee and in the Senate to move quickly to consider and confirm these judicial nominations so that we can fill vacancies and improve the administration of justice in our Nation's Federal courts.

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts lists 48 remaining judicial vacancies, yet the President has sent us only 27 nominations for these vacancies. Twenty-one of these vacancies—almost half—have no nominee. Of the 20 vacancies deemed by the Administrative Office to be judicial emergencies, the President has yet to send us nominees for 10 of them. That means half of the judicial emergency vacancies are without a nominee.

Judge Wu's nomination has the support of his home State Senators, and I thank Senators FEINSTEIN and BOXER for their support of this nomination.

Judge Wu has an extensive record of public service as a State trial judge, a Federal prosecutor, and a law professor. In his 14 years on the State trial bench, Judge Wu has served in the Los Angeles Municipal Court and in the Los Angeles Superior Court, handling an array of criminal and civil cases. Previously, Judge Wu worked on complex commercial matters in private practice for two Los Angeles law firms. Judge Wu has also served as a law professor at the University of Tennessee School of Law, and as an assistant U.S. attorney and later assistant division chief in the civil division of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of California.

I am pleased that the nominee before us is an Asian-Pacific American. I have urged, and will continue to urge, the President to nominate men and women to the Federal bench who reflect the diversity of America. Racial and cultural diversity remains a pillar of strength for our country and one of our greatest

natural resources. Diversity on the bench helps ensure that the words "equal justice under law," inscribed in Vermont marble over the entrance to the Supreme Court, are a reality and that justice is rendered fairly and impartially. Judicial decisions should reflect insight and experiences as varied as America's citizenry. A more representative judiciary helps cultivate public confidence in the judiciary which strengthens the independence of our Federal courts.

There is still much work to be done. Out of the 875 seats on the Federal judiciary, there are only 5 active Asian-Pacific American judges on the Federal bench, less than 1 percent of all Federal judges. President Bush has nominated only two Asian-Pacific American candidates during his 6 years in office, neither to a seat on a Federal circuit court. With outstanding lawyers like Dean Harold Koh of Yale, Professor Goodwin Liu of Boalt Hall School of Law at the University of California at Berkeley, or attorneys Karen Narasaki, John Yang and Debra Yang, it is not as if there is a dearth of qualified candidates who would be universally endorsed.

Our Nation has highly qualified individuals of diverse heritages who would help to unify our Nation while adding to the diversity of our courts. I hope the President will send us more consensus nominees that reflect the rich diversity of our Nation.

I congratulate Judge Wu, and his family, on his confirmations today.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, this emergency supplemental bill that we are debating today has been long seen as our best chance of extricating ourselves from the quagmire in Iraq. As one of only 23 Senators who opposed the authorization of the use of military force, I have supported every credible proposal that has come before this body to bring our troops home.

The war in Iraq was not about September 11. It was not about al-Qaida. It was not about making our Nation safer. While no one can prove a negative, I believe the damage this war has done to our national security, our national interest, and our international standing has been incalculable. When we had a chance to capture Osama bin Laden, the master mind of 9/11, we let him get away because the administration, the Bush-Cheney administration, wanted to take our troops out of Afghanistan and send them to Iraq, a country that had absolutely nothing to do with 9/11. The injustices perpetrated at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo have tarnished our national reputation and leadership, and the way Iraq has become a rallying cry for religious extremists has made the American people less safe.

For whatever misguided reasons, the President started a unilateral, preemptive war in Iraq which has cost us thousands of American lives and made us less safe. I think that historians will

look back at this war as one of the most costly, reckless mistakes made by any administration in this history.

This supplemental contains another \$96 billion to support U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. I supported the use of military force to remove the Taliban from power, and I support the continued efforts of our military and NATO forces against the Taliban and al-Qaida in Afghanistan. But I did not, do not, and will not agree to the use of the U.S. military to continue putting our people in harm's way in the middle of a continuing civil war in Iraq.

This bill also contains money to help the people of Lebanon rebuild after the devastating war between Hezbollah and Israel last year, aid for refugees in Darfur, the Congo, Uganda, and other humanitarian crises, and to prevent the spread of avian influenza. It contains resources to help Kosovo as it moves toward independence, for Liberia to rebuild after their civil war, and to support the peace process in Nepal which finally has a chance to shed its feudal past.

It contains a provision I sponsored, with the support of both Republicans and Democrats, to fix the illogical and unfair provisions in the Immigration and Naturalization Act that have been used to prevent victims of terrorist groups or members of groups who fought alongside the United States from admission as refugees or from obtaining asylum.

As the chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, I am also pleased to report the bill includes, for the first time, benchmarks on a portion of the reconstruction assistance for Iraq. We are not going to continue to pour billions of dollars into no-bid contracts that have been plagued by rampant fraud and shoddy workmanship. It is about time we put an end to the practice of handing out American taxpayers' money with no strings attached. These benchmarks reflect what the Iraqi Government itself has pledged and what even President Bush acknowledged is necessary if the Iraqi Government is to succeed in bringing stability to that country.

So there is much in this bill that I support, but despite that, I do not support the funding to continue the military operations in Iraq, and I will vote against this bill unless it contains the provision relating to the withdrawal of our forces, which is similar to legislation which narrowly lost in the Senate last week. I voted for it then, and I will vote for it again.

The withdrawal provision in this bill is not, in some respects, as definitive as what passed the House by the slimmest of margins last Friday. Like many others, I would have written it differently. I wanted a deadline for commencement of the withdrawal of our forces but also for completing it within a target date. I have cosponsored legislation that contains such a

deadline. But this provision represents a 90-degree change of course from the President's policy of escalation in the middle of a civil war. It is our best hope of obtaining the majority of votes needed to begin that process. So I am confident that once the withdrawal of our troops begins, there will be no turning back.

We have to remove our troops from the Iraq civil war. That argument has been made eloquently, including by former senior military officers whose credibility is unimpeachable. Retired LTG William Odom, in an op-ed piece of February 11 in the Washington Post, said it better than I ever could. It is the only way the Iraqis will make the difficult political compromises that can save their country from further destruction.

The President has threatened to veto this bill if the troop withdrawal provision is included. That is not surprising for a White House that has stubbornly refused to change course even in the face of dwindling support from the American people whose sons and daughters are dying. For more than 4 years, President Bush, Vice President CHENEY and former Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, backed by a rubberstamp Congress, made one incompetent decision after another, arrogantly insisting they knew best and dismissing anyone who so much as questioned their policy for "not supporting the troops." It has been reminiscent of the old "soft on communism" and "soft on drugs" refrains that were used, and still are used, for political purposes to justify failed policies.

None of us should be intimidated by these worn out arguments. If they want to show their support of the troops, they should do something about our VA system. Fix up Walter Reed and fix up the other facilities where we are not giving proper help to our wounded soldiers when they return from Iraq. We Democrats want to support those troops, too, and not just to be at the parades when they go over but to be there to help them when they come back. If this administration wants to support the troops, it should have given them the equipment, the training, and the armor they still don't get in a war that has lasted longer than World War II. And they should take care of the wounded whose bodies, minds and lives have been shattered.

None of us should have confidence in a failed war effort that has already wrought enormous toll in American blood, treasure, and credibility, not after the fiasco this White House has wrought. It is time for the Congress to act as the voice and the conscience of the American people.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to urge my colleagues to support the nomination of

Judge George H. Wu to be U.S. district judge for the Central District of California. Judge Wu currently serves as a judge on the Los Angeles Superior Court, where he has presided since 1996, and before that was a judge on the Los Angeles municipal court from 1993 to 1996.

He came to those judicial positions with an excellent academic background—a bachelor's degree from Pomona College in 1972 and a law degree from the University of Chicago in 1975. He has an outstanding record in the practice of law. He was assistant professor of law at the University of Tennessee College of Law from 1979 to 1982. He was an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the civil division of the Central District of California office in Los Angeles from 1982 to 1989. He later served as Assistant Division Chief in the U.S. Attorney's Office from 1991 to 1993. Judge Wu is very well qualified, rated so by the American Bar Association. They unanimously rated Judge Wu as "well qualified."

His nomination to the Federal bench is recognition of the contributions of lawyers from the Southern California Chinese Lawyers Association, where he was a member from 1984 until the present time.

I recently spoke at the convention of lawyers from the Asian-Pacific American Bar Association, who made the point to me that there ought to be more representation, more diversity for judges with a background from Asia and specifically from China. There are not very many judges representing that particular group. I think it is a good idea to have diversity on the Federal bench among people from all walks of life, all backgrounds, all national origins, all ethnic representations, and applaud his nomination from that point of view, in addition to the excellent credentials which I have cited.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his resume and background on two pages be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE H. WU

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Birth: November 3, 1950, New York, NY.
Legal Residence: California.

Education: B.A., Pomona College, 1972;
J.D., University of Chicago Law School, 1975.

Employment: Associate, Latham & Watkins, Los Angeles, CA, 1975-1976, 1977-1978; Law Clerk, Hon. Stanley N. Barnes, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, 1976-1977 (and again for brief periods in 1979 and 1980); Associate, Latham & Watkins, Los Angeles, CA, 1977-1978; Assistant Professor of Law, University of Tennessee College of Law, 1979-1982; Assistant U.S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office, Civil Division, Central District of California, 1982-1989; Associate, LaBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae, Los Angeles, CA, 1989-1991; Assistant Division Chief, U.S. Attorney's Office, Civil Division, Central District of California, 1991-1993; Judge, Los Angeles Municipal Court, 1993-1996;

Judge, Los Angeles Superior Court, 1996-Present.

Selected Activities: Member, Committee on Standard Jury Instructions (Criminal and Civil) of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, California, 2000-2004; Member, Southern California Chinese Lawyers Association, 1984-Present; Member, Federal Bar Association, 1983-1986 (Member, Judicial Evaluation Committee, 1984-1985); Member, Los Angeles County Bar Association, 1983-1992 (Member, Committee on Federal Courts and Practice, 1984, 1985); Member, Barristers—Los Angeles County Bar Association, 1983-1986 (Co-Chairman, Government Attorneys Committee, 1985-1986).

Judge George Wu was nominated in the last Congress, but his nomination was not acted upon prior to its adjournment.

President Bush re-nominated Judge Wu on January 9, 2007. A hearing was held on his nomination on February 6 and the Judiciary Committee favorably reported him on March 1.

Judge Wu is a highly qualified nominee with a distinguished record.

In 1972, he earned his B.A. degree from Pomona College. In 1975, he earned his J.D. from the University of Chicago Law School.

After law school, Judge Wu became an associate at the firm of Latham & Watkins in Los Angeles from 1975 to 1976.

Judge Wu subsequently served as a judicial clerk for the Honorable Stanley N. Barnes on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

From 1979 to 1982 Judge Wu was an Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Tennessee College of Law in Knoxville, Tennessee, where his courses included civil procedure, torts, and labor law.

Judge Wu served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Civil Division of the Central District of California office in Los Angeles from 1982 to 1989 and later served as Assistant Division Chief from 1991 to 1993.

From 1989 to 1991, Judge Wu returned to private practice, this time as an associate at LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae in Los Angeles.

In 1993, Governor Pete Wilson appointed Judge Wu to the Los Angeles Municipal Court, which handles misdemeanor cases, preliminary felony hearings, and small civil actions. In 1996, Governor Wilson elevated Judge Wu to the Los Angeles Superior Court, which handles felony cases and larger civil suits.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Wu "Well Qualified."

ATTORNEY GENERAL GONZALES

Mr. SPECTER. I note we are scheduled to vote on Judge Wu at 12:10. As ranking member, I have the balance of the time until that period. I choose to use it to comment briefly on a letter which I received yesterday from John M. Dowd, who is an attorney for Ms. Monica Goodling, who was counsel to Attorney General Gonzales and White House liaison. In this letter, Mr. Dowd asserts the basis for having Ms. Goodling claim her constitutional rights under the fifth amendment, and privilege against self-incrimination, not to testify before the Judiciary Committee on our inquiry into the eight U.S. attorneys who were asked to resign. Mr. Dowd makes the point emphatically that in asserting this privilege against self-incrimination, Ms. Goodling is not saying she has done anything wrong and explicitly denies any wrongdoing but cites Supreme Court authority for

the right of an individual to claim the privilege against self-incrimination, even those who are innocent, as well as those who might have something to hide. There is a firm assertion of her innocence by her attorney and her own affidavit.

I can understand the reasons for this claim of privilege and the reasons Ms. Goodling does not want to testify before the Judiciary Committee. In Mr. Dowd's letter, he references some of my prior statements and then says:

Senator Schumer has no less than five times characterized the Department's testimony to date as "false" or "a falsehood," and concluded that there have been misleading statement after misleading statement, deliberate misstatements.

If a false statement has been made to a congressional committee, that constitutes a crime under title 18 of the United States Code, section 1001. That was the basis on which the No. 2 man in the Interior Department entered a guilty plea during the course of the past week. Where there have already been characterizations, as cited by Mr. Dowd of Senator SCHUMER's statement that there are misleading statements which have been made, which I state is a crime, I can understand the sense of a potential witness in not wanting to be ensnared in that kind of proceeding where conclusions have already been reached by Senator SCHUMER who is in charge of the investigation.

Mr. Dowd's letter further goes on, citing comments which I had made earlier, "that Senator SCHUMER is using the hearings"—this is Mr. Dowd's statement—"hearings to promote his political party. That is not a legitimate reason for the Judiciary Committee to conduct hearings."

I have said in the Judiciary Committee hearings, in the presence of Senator SCHUMER, eyeball to eyeball, so to speak, that I thought there was a conflict of interest. In concluding there was a conflict of interest, I did not ask Senator SCHUMER to step aside. I said that was up to him.

But following the testimony of U.S. Attorney Iglesias, from New Mexico, the very next day the Web site of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign had Senator DOMENICI's picture on it, urging his defeat in the 2008 election. Then, shortly thereafter, there was a fundraising letter from the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee to raise money, saying the Democrats were elected to clean up Washington and this is an example of what needs to be cleaned up.

Any of us may be subject to comment in a political situation. Senator SCHUMER has a right to make political hay out of whatever he chooses. But I think it is inconsistent with leading an inquiry, and I can understand Ms. Goodling's decision not to testify in this context. I think it is very unfortunate,

because it is very important for the Judiciary Committee to get to the bottom of what has happened with the request for eight U.S. attorneys to resign. There is a cloud over U.S. attorneys, and I think it has had a distinctly chilling effect on all 93 U.S. attorneys, not knowing what will come next.

It is generally agreed that the President of the United States has the authority, standing, right to discharge U.S. attorneys for no reason at all. When President Clinton took office, in one fell swoop he replaced 93 U.S. attorneys and no one raised any question. But I think not if U.S. attorneys have been asked to resign and have been replaced for an improper reason, for a bad reason. Suggestion has been made that the U.S. attorney in San Diego, Ms. Lam, was replaced because she was hot on the trail of political operatives who may have been connected to former Congressman Duke Cunningham, who is now serving an 8-year sentence; or the allegation has been made—it has not been substantiated but it has been made—that New Mexican U.S. Attorney Iglesias was replaced for failure to prosecute a vote fraud case. An extended article in the New York Times a week ago Sunday gave extensive analysis, which might lead to the conclusion that there was justification for Mr. Iglesias's resignation, or perhaps there was not. But that is up to the Judiciary Committee to make a determination.

So it is unfortunate that you have a situation where witnesses are not coming forward. It is my hope we would not rush to judgment on this matter, that we would avoid conclusory statements, and that instead we would wait until we find out what the facts are. If these U.S. attorneys were asked to resign for improper reasons, I will be among the first to say so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is true Ms. Goodling's attorney has said that she will take the fifth amendment. Now, as both a former defense attorney and a former prosecutor, I respect the right under our Constitution for anybody to take the fifth so they won't say something that might incriminate them and bring about criminal charges against them from their own statements. But it is a little bit odd that in a letter from Ms. Goodling's attorney, he speaks that she does not want to face the fate of Mr. Libby, or words to that effect. Scooter Libby was convicted of perjury. He was convicted of obstruction of justice. While I realize many believe he is going to be pardoned, those are the reasons he was convicted.

I would have assumed that Ms. Goodling—who has been a very high-ranking member of the Department of Justice, would come in and tell the truth. If she takes the fifth amendment, that's a more difficult thing. We won't hear

from her. If she feels that what she has to tell us would subject her to criminal prosecution, well, that raises some serious questions. We hope that others will testify and that they will testify honestly. We'll continue to ask people. But it is very, very difficult to get the facts when you have key members of the Bush-Cheney administration taking the fifth.

Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. LEAHY. If I have any further time, I yield it back and I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of George H. Wu, of California, to be a U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), and 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 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Dorgan	Mikulski
Alexander	Durbin	Murkowski
Allard	Ensign	Murray
Baucus	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Graham	Obama
Bingaman	Grassley	Pryor
Bond	Gregg	Reed
Boxer	Hagel	Reid
Brown	Harkin	Roberts
Bunning	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burr	Hutchison	Salazar
Byrd	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Inouye	Schumer
Cardin	Isakson	Sessions
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	Kerry	Smith
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Snowe
Clinton	Kohl	Specter
Coburn	Kyl	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Stevens
Coleman	Lautenberg	Sununu
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Conrad	Levin	Thomas
Corker	Lieberman	Thune
Cornyn	Lincoln	Vitter
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner
DeMint	Martinez	Webb
Dodd	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Dole	McConnell	Wyden
Domenici	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Enzi	McCain
Brownback	Johnson	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be

immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1591

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote with respect to the Cochran amendment No. 643 occur at 5 p.m. today; the time from 3:45 to 5 p.m. be for debate with respect to that amendment, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that no amendments be in order to the amendment or the language proposed to be stricken; that the last 10 minutes prior to the vote be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders, with the majority leader controlling the last 5 minutes.

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

TONY SNOW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on a matter of concern and seriousness, in my office this morning I had a newspaper clipping regarding Tony Snow. He had a tumor removed and the cancer had not returned, and I wrote a letter and signed it. A few minutes later, my secretary brought in a news clipping that Tony Snow's cancer has returned. I have known Tony Snow long before he became the spokesperson for the White House. My relations with him have always been superb. To me he has always been very fair. I have great respect for him and his family.

I want the record to reflect that I speak for everyone on this side of the aisle of our real concern. He has been a tremendously good representative for the President. He does an outstanding job dealing with some of the most serious issues any person could face. He has done a wonderful job. I hope and pray that Tony Snow will again be able to whip the cancer he has already whipped once. With the good thoughts and prayers from everyone in this body and the many friends he has in Washington and around the world, it will go a long way toward healing this man who certainly deserves it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me join the majority leader in expressing our best wishes, hopes, and prayers for Tony Snow's speedy recovery. He has been a spectacular press secretary to the President. He enjoys widespread respect and admiration. We wish him well for a speedy recovery.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.