

claims of activism or anti-business philosophy being leveled against Richard Paez.

Now if his record as a judge doesn't support these charges of "judicial activism" where did Judge Paez's opponents get the idea that he must be stopped. Opponents aren't saying it openly but it could be that they are worried that a judge who formerly worked in a legal aid capacity must be a liberal, and incapable of making balanced decisions. Having failed to find any hint of bias or lack of judicial temperament in 20 years of judicial decisions, what other reason for opposition could there be other than a belief that if you are an attorney who agrees to work on behalf of those unable to access the legal system because they are poor or under-educated, as Judge Paez did for nine years early in his career, you must be a liberal, right?

Wrong. Dead wrong. The organized Bar in every single state requires public service of attorneys. Every major law firm has dedicated efforts to reach under-served populations needing legal advice. That's part of the profession, a noble part of the profession, and those who would complain about Judge Paez's service to those in need would do well to remember their own reasons for choosing to serve the public. For my part, I applaud the decision of Judge Paez and others like him to serve the poor, and I cannot imagine how his unique perspective from working one on one with these populations for nine years would not be desirable and an advantage to parties before the 9th Circuit. His perspective is badly needed in a circuit which serves 20% of the nation's population, many of whom are people who needed legal aid when he was working with them during the 70s.

If opponents of Judge Paez want to fill the court only with seemingly conservative judges, they mistake their role in the constitutional scheme in my opinion. Let's not kid ourselves. Partisan politics shouldn't play a part in the confirmation of judges, but they do. But to hold up a well-qualified judge for a President's entire term on the basis of unsupported allegations of "judicial activism" is shameful, it takes the impact of politics on this process to an extreme that we have not seen before, and I hope we never see again.

Mr. President, regardless of the reason for delays in acting on Judge Paez's nomination, the effects of delay are damaging and unmistakable. I believe they are twofold. First, as I discussed before, justice is put on hold in the 9th Circuit because of crowded dockets. Second, this Senate sends a subtle, but unmistakable signal to Hispanic Americans, or recent immigrants about opportunities in America.

It's an old adage but a true one. Justice delayed is justice denied. Parties

take their disputes to court to reach a resolution. Longer dockets mean delays for families and businesses seeking to settle legal conflicts and move forward. Holding up qualified nominees like Judge Paez and leaving huge holes to fill on appellate benches literally delays justice.

And the subtle, even subconscious message sent to Hispanic Americans when they examine who hears their disputes in a court of law is that Circuit court judgeships are not open to them. Young Hispanic Americans hearing about Judge Paez will unfortunately learn the message without it ever being said out loud that there are limitations to their advancement in careers of public service. The signals sent by Senators' failure to vote for Paez's confirmation lead to diminished expectations and a view of limited, not limitless opportunities for millions of Hispanic Americans. The Washington Post reported on Monday that only 9 Hispanic American judges currently sit on appellate courts in this country out of a total of 170 appellate judges. And only 31 out of 655 District Judges, including Judge Paez, are Hispanic Americans. That's a shameful record as we begin the 21st century.

Here's the message sent if Judge Paez is not confirmed. You can go to law school at UC Berkeley's Boalt Hall School of Law, work tirelessly with under-served and under-represented populations needing legal assistance, be a successful and well-respected judge on the local bench and the federal District Court, get the highest rating from the American Bar Association, receive endorsements from law enforcement organizations, bar leaders, business leaders, and community leaders, and yet be needlessly and unfairly delayed and prevented from being elevated to the prestigious 9th Circuit Court of Appeals based on unsubstantiated and vague concerns that you are a "judicial activist" or a "liberal." There is only one nominee in this position, whose nomination has been held up for over 4 years. That is Richard Paez, who is a Hispanic American. That's the wrong message from this Senate to millions of Americans, and we should not send it.

I strongly support Judge Paez's confirmation, and urge my colleagues to join me in quickly filling this and other vacancies on the 9th Circuit. This long delayed confirmation vote for Richard Paez is an important test for the Senate. I hope we pass it.

I yield the floor.

WENDELL H. FORD AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 5 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now

vote on adoption of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1000.

There are 2 minutes equally divided for debate. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this bill provides a generous contribution to the future of aviation in the 21st century. It significantly reforms the operations of the Federal Aviation Administration. It represents the collective wisdom of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Commerce Committee, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, and the majority and minority leaders of this Senate. We do not have many bills such as this. I commend it to my colleagues for passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We have known a long time we have been underfunding our aviation system as a whole, particularly our air traffic control system, reforming the FAA—all the rest of it—building airports.

Overall, aviation funding is increased by 25 percent in this bill. It is a start. FAA operations funding is increased. Airport money is increased by 33 percent; air traffic control modernization is increased by 40 percent.

This is the first shot we have at making the airways safe for the American people. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. President, I note Senator LAUTENBERG wanted to have 1 minute in opposition, but I do not see him on the floor. I do not know what to add further to that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. 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. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, we are about to vote on a bill that purportedly takes care of the problems of the FAA. I have to say, this bill guarantees funding increases in a manner that is grossly imbalanced. It threatens to cut funding from Amtrak, from the Coast Guard, from highway safety, and the NTSB in order to provide an aviation entitlement.

Investments in aviation do have to be made, but it has to be in a balanced way if we are going to avoid gridlock. You cannot ignore the rail system or highway safety and only focus on aviation.

The agreement seeks to guarantee a 64-percent increase in airport grants and a 37-percent increase in modernization funding. Tight budget caps mean either cuts in transportation appropriations—including the Coast Guard

or Amtrak—or cuts to other discretionary programs, such as education, health care, veterans' benefits, or agriculture.

Further, it does not provide for the kinds of funding that operations will need to put on more controllers to man this larger system. It does not provide money for the continued training of new controllers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report to accompany H.R. 1000. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Akaka	Feingold	McConnell
Allard	Feinstein	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Murkowski
Baucus	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Grassley	Reed
Biden	Hagel	Reid
Bingaman	Harkin	Roberts
Bond	Hatch	Rockefeller
Boxer	Helms	Roth
Breaux	Hollings	Santorum
Brownback	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Bryan	Hutchison	Schumer
Bunning	Inhofe	Shelby
Byrd	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Snowe
Cleland	Kennedy	Specter
Cochran	Kerrey	Stevens
Collins	Kerry	Thomas
Conrad	Kohl	Thompson
Coverdell	Landrieu	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Torricelli
DeWine	Levin	Torrice
Dodd	Lieberman	Warner
Domenici	Lincoln	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lott	Wyden
Durbin	Lugar	

NAYS—17

Bayh	Frist	Moynihan
Burns	Gramm	Nickles
Craig	Grams	Robb
Crapo	Gregg	Sessions
Edwards	Kyl	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	Lautenberg	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next vote in this series be limited to 10 minutes in length.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MARSHA L. BERZON TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NOMINATION OF RICHARD A. PAEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CLOTURE MOTIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 159, the nomination of Marsha L. Berzon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit:

Trent Lott, Orrin G. Hatch, Susan M. Collins, Arlen Specter, Ted Stevens, Thad Cochran, James M. Jeffords, Robert F. Bennett, Richard G. Lugar, Chuck Hagel, Conrad Burns, John W. Warner, Patrick J. Leahy, Harry Reid of Nevada, Charles E. Schumer, and Tom A. Daschle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Marsha L. Berzon to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 36 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Abraham	Collins	Gregg
Akaka	Conrad	Hagel
Ashcroft	Coverdell	Harkin
Baucus	Crapo	Hatch
Bayh	Daschle	Hollings
Bennett	Dodd	Hutchinson
Biden	Domenici	Inouye
Bingaman	Dorgan	Jeffords
Bond	Durbin	Johnson
Boxer	Edwards	Kennedy
Breaux	Feingold	Kerrey
Bryan	Feinstein	Kerry
Burns	Fitzgerald	Kohl
Byrd	Frist	Kyl
Campbell	Gorton	Landrieu
Chafee, L.	Graham	Lautenberg
Cleland	Grams	Leahy
Cochran	Grassley	Levin

Lieberman	Reid	Specter
Lincoln	Robb	Stevens
Lott	Roberts	Thomas
Lugar	Rockefeller	Thompson
Mack	Roth	Thurmond
McConnell	Santorum	Torricelli
Mikulski	Sarbanes	Voinovich
Moynihan	Schumer	Warner
Murray	Sessions	Wellstone
Nickles	Smith (OR)	Wyden
Reed	Snowe	

NAYS—13

Allard	Enzi	Murkowski
Brownback	Gramm	Shelby
Bunning	Helms	Smith (NH)
Craig	Hutchinson	
DeWine	Inhofe	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 13. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion on the nomination, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 208, the nomination of Richard A. Paez, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Trent Lott, Orrin G. Hatch, Susan M. Collins, Arlen Specter, Ted Stevens, Thad Cochran, Robert F. Bennett, Harry Reid, Richard G. Lugar, Chuck Hagel, Conrad Burns, John Warner, Patrick Leahy, Charles E. Schumer, Thomas A. Daschle, and Barbara Boxer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call under the rule is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Richard A. Paez, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 85, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 37 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Abraham	Campbell	Feingold
Akaka	Chafee, L.	Feinstein
Ashcroft	Cleland	Fitzgerald
Baucus	Cochran	Gorton
Bayh	Collins	Graham
Bennett	Conrad	Grams
Biden	Coverdell	Grassley
Bingaman	Crapo	Gregg
Bond	Daschle	Hagel
Boxer	Dodd	Harkin
Breaux	Domenici	Hatch
Bryan	Dorgan	Hollings
Burns	Durbin	Hutchinson
Byrd	Edwards	Inouye