

Of the 16 million men and women who served in World War II, only 5 million are alive today. We are now losing veterans of the greatest generation at the rate of 1,100 veterans a day. I questioned that, but we checked it; 1,100 veterans of World War II are passing away each day. By the year 2004, there will be less than 4 million of us.

In my home State of Alaska, in the last 10 years, we lost one-third of the veterans whom I had known and worked with so long.

The site design of our memorial has been endorsed by the Historic Preservation Officer of the District of Columbia, it has received four endorsements of the District of Columbia's Preservation Review Board, and five approvals each from the Committee on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The memorial is governed by the Commemorative Works Act of 1986. That act gave the final site and design approval to the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission and the Secretary of the Interior.

Eight sites were considered for the memorial. In 1998, the design was approved by the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission and the site selection was reaffirmed. In 1998, the National Park Service, in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, completed an environmental assessment and issued a finding of no significant impact. In the year 2000, the final design was approved by the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, and on November 11 of last year, the year 2000, a ceremonial groundbreaking took place for this memorial.

More than 500,000 Americans have sent donations to the fundraising campaign, 48 State legislatures have done the same thing, 1,100 schools and more than 450 veterans groups, who represent 11 million veterans.

Even though all the procedural steps have been taken, the memorial has now been delayed because of a procedural issue involving the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Planning Commission decision of 2 years ago of including a World War II memorial has been placed in question because the former National Capital Planning Commission chairman continued to serve after the expiration of his term. The legislation that would originally establish this commission permitted members to serve until replaced, but when that law was amended, inadvertently the language allowing continuous service fell out with no explanation. That created a technicality that has forced a review now, again, by the National Capital Planning Commission.

This memorial has been through 22 public hearings, it has complied with

every applicable law, and this technicality regarding the National Capital Planning Commission Board should not penalize the millions of veterans who served our country honorably when asked to do so. They want to see this memorial.

I congratulate the House of Representatives, particularly Congressman Stump, for sending this legislation to the Senate. I thank all who have been very considerate in trying to work out the problems relating to it. I believe I am joined by all the veterans of World War II who serve in this body in urging that the House bill be enacted and sent to the President for his signature immediately.

For many of us, this year marks the 55th year since we left the military service. We were in World War II and returned home.

We want to see this memorial finished while a significant number of our comrades are still alive. We want to be there when this memorial is opened.

Memorial Day for 2001 is just 1 week from next Monday. The veterans of this Nation intended to celebrate the initiation of this memorial on that day. They will not be able to do so unless the bill gets to the President in time to sign it. This is more than a dream of our veterans; it is a demand on our country. I urge no Senator stand in the way of the prompt enactment of this bill.

REQUEST FOR ABSENCE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from the voting in the Senate until 6:30 p.m. next Tuesday, commencing at the adjournment today.

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

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I come to the Senate to report on the progress the Judiciary Committee is making with respect to a number of administration nominations to the Department of Justice.

Over the last several weeks, I have been working to reach an understanding on how this committee will handle nominations. A number of procedural and substantive issues have been raised in these regards for both Executive and Judicial Branch nominations. The Democratic members have sought to work out arrangements and understandings so that all members of the committee would know what our rules are, know what our practices and procedures will be, and understand how this committee will approach our important responsibilities with respect to nominations.

Over the last 2 weeks the chairman's insistence that the committee proceed

with nominations before those practices and procedures had been agreed upon has led to public reference to outstanding issues that we should have resolved first. I always regret when we are not able to work out matters through reason and cooperation. I do not believe it was appropriate for Republican members of this committee to deride Democratic members as acting "irresponsibly" or "despicably" or "in breach of their constitutional duties." I know that it was not helpful.

Nonetheless, I was proud of the Democratic members of this committee when we jointly sent our May 4 letter to the chairman and provided a way out of the impasse in spite of the name calling. A few days later the chairman responded with language that reflected our respectful tone and for which I thank him.

While I disagree with much of what the chairman argues and asserts in his letter, I appreciate that he has now indicated that with respect to judicial nominations, he "intends to be fully respectful of [Democratic Senators'] views and will assist in any way to ensure that you and our other Senate colleagues receive real, meaningful consultation by the White House on judicial nominees." I appreciate that in his letter he writes that he "respect[s our] views and efforts in ensuring [we] will be appropriately consulted in a meaningful manner on nominees to vacancies in [our] home states."

For the last several weeks, we have also been seeking to resolve concerns about how this committee handles certain confidential information about nominations, information that may reflect on their fitness for office, and may be relevant to how Senators in this committee vote on reporting nominations to the Senate, as well as how Senators vote on confirmations. Those concerns have also been pending for several weeks now without resolution. Those concerns are what prompted our request for an executive session in accordance with Rule 26.5 of the Standing Rules of the Senate so that we could fully discuss these very important matters in accordance with the confidentiality rules that bind us.

Those concerns made it inappropriate to proceed on certain matters over the last few weeks. Although our Republican colleagues knew about our concerns, they nonetheless berated us without any acknowledgment that those open issues, which affect executive as well as judicial nominations, were still unresolved. That, too, was most unfortunate.

Over the last several days I have also reached out to the Bush administration to work with us on ways to resolve these concerns. Those outreach efforts may provide the opportunity to reach a mutually acceptable resolution of these matters. I hope so.

In light of the cooperation we began receiving from the administration last