

spending for the war in Iraq. The money to fund the war on terrorism, the money to fund this war in Iraq is not included in the President's budget. President Bush's plan to privatize Social Security was not included, either. The \$2 trillion that is needed for this transition in Social Security is not there.

The Republican Policy Committee wants to criticize Democrats on Social Security instead of answering the hard questions about the President's privatization plan. Where did the money go that Americans paid into Social Security? Where will the money come from to transition to any privatization system?

Instead of criticizing the so-called Democratic bill that does not exist, the Republicans ought to produce their bill to privatize Social Security. Once the American people understand it doesn't add up, they will reject it.

We are going to go back to principles and values which say we should protect Social Security first. That is what President Clinton said. That should still be our guiding value in this debate.

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. CORNYN. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. CORNYN. Mr. President, I understand we are in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will spend a few minutes correcting the record in response to a question of press availability on Tuesday about whether Democrats were opposing as a caucus all of the renominated judges that previously were denied an opportunity for an up-or-down vote when a bipartisan majority stood ready to confirm them last year.

The Senate minority leader said, "Renomination is not the key. I think the question is, those judges that have already been turned down in the Senate"—in other words, he said these judges, even though they commanded the support of a bipartisan majority of the Senate during the last 2 years and were not permitted to have an up-or-down vote, he characterized those judges who have now been renominated by the President as judges who have, in fact, been turned down by the Senate.

So my question is, to whom is the distinguished Democratic leader referring? None of President Bush's nominees have been turned down by the

Senate—none, zero. The nominees he referred to were denied a vote altogether. In fact, all of these nominees would have been confirmed last Congress had majorities been allowed to govern as they have during the entire history of this country and the entire history of the Senate—save and except for the time when Democrats chose to deny a majority the opportunity for an up-or-down vote.

So I would say, correcting the record, it is a little difficult to turn down a nominee, as the minority leader has said, if the nominee never gets an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor.

Now, the second part I would like to correct is that when the Democratic leader was asked whether obstruction would create a 60-vote threshold for all future judicial nominees, he said:

It's always been a 60-vote for judges. There is—nothing change[d].

He said:

Go back many, many, many years. Go back decades and it's always been that way.

Well, we took his advice, and we did go back over the years. It turns out it has not always been that way. Indeed, there has never, ever, ever been a refusal to permit an up-or-down vote with a bipartisan majority standing ready to confirm judges in the history of the Senate until these last 2 years. Many nominees have, in fact, been confirmed by a vote of less than 60 Senators. In fact, the Senate has consistently confirmed judges who enjoyed a majority but not 60-vote support, including Clinton appointees Richard Paez, William Fletcher, and Susan Oki Mollway; and Carter appointees Abner Mikva and L.T. Senter.

Specifically, the distinguished Democratic leader, yesterday, when he said this had been used by Republicans against Democratic nominees, mentioned Judge Paez. Well, obviously, that is not correct because Judge Paez, indeed, was confirmed by the Senate and sits on the Federal bench today.

So it reminds me of, perhaps, an old adage I learned when I was younger, when computers were not as common as they are now, and people marveled at this new technology, and those who wanted to chasten us a little bit would say, well, they are not the answer to all of our concerns, and they said: Garbage in, garbage out. In other words, if you do not have your facts right, it is very difficult to reach a proper conclusion.

So I thought it was very interesting—and I thought it was important—that the Democratic leader would make this claim, first of all, as I said, that these judges had been somehow turned down by the Senate when, in fact, they had been denied an opportunity for an up-or-down vote; and, secondly, that somehow there is a 60-vote requirement, and it has always been that way, because the facts demonstrate that both of those conclusions are clearly incorrect.

Finally, he said something I do more or less agree with, although I would differ a little bit on the contentious tone. He said: We're hopeful they'll bring them to the floor so there will be a fair fight. Well, I think I knew what he meant. I hope he meant a fair debate. Frankly, the American people are tired of obstruction and what they see as partisan wrangling and fighting over judicial nominees.

In the end, that is what happened during the Clinton administration when, perhaps, judges who were not necessarily favored by our side of the aisle did receive an up-or-down vote and did get confirmed. And that is, of course, what happened during the Carter administration. In fact, that is what has happened throughout American history—until our worthy adversaries on the other side of the aisle decided to obstruct the President's judicial nominees and they were denied the courtesy of that fair process, that fair debate, and an up-or-down vote.

Let me just conclude by saying this really should not be a partisan fight. Indeed, what we want is a fair process. We want a process that applies the same when a Democrat is in the White House and Democrats are in the majority in the Senate as we do when a Republican is in the White House and Republicans are in the majority in the Senate.

We want good judges. The American people deserve to have judges who will strictly interpret the law and will rule without regard to some of the political passions of the day. A judge understands that they are not supposed to take sides in a controversy. That is what Congress, the so-called political branch, is for. That is why debate is so important in this what has been called the greatest deliberative body on Earth. But we do not want judges who make political decisions. Rather, we want judges who will enforce those decisions because they are sworn to uphold the law and enforce the law as written. Members of Congress write the laws, the President signs or vetoes the laws, and judges are supposed to enforce them but not participate in the rough and tumble of politics.

So it is important that the process I have described produces a truly independent judiciary because we want judges who are going to be umpires, who are going to call balls and strikes regardless of who is up at bat. So I think the process we have seen over the last couple years, which, unfortunately, it sounds like, if what I am hearing out of the Democratic leader is any indication, is a process that has not only been unfair because it has denied bipartisan majorities an opportunity to confirm judges who have been nominated by the President, but it is one which, frankly, creates too much

of a political process, one where it appears that judges who are sworn to uphold the law, and who will be that impartial umpire—it has made them part of an inherently political process.

Now, I want to be clear. It is the Senate's obligation to ask questions and to seriously undertake our obligation to perform our duty under the Constitution to provide advice and consent. But, ultimately, it is our obligation to vote, not to obstruct, particularly when we have distinguished nominees being put forward for our consideration, when they are unnecessarily besmirched and, really, tainted by a process that is beneath the dignity of the United States. Certainly none of these individuals who are offering themselves for service to our Nation's courts in the judiciary deserve to be treated this way.

So, basically, Mr. President, what we are talking about is a process that works exactly the same way when Democrats are in power as it does when Republicans are in power. That, indeed, is the only principled way we can approach this deadlock and this obstructionism. I hope the Democratic leader—who I know has a very difficult job because he, no doubt, has to deal with and reflect the views of his caucus on this issue—I hope he will encourage his caucus, the Democrats in the caucus, and we will all, as a body, look at the opportunity to perhaps view this as a chance for a fresh start, a chance for a fair process, one that is more likely to produce an independent judiciary that is going to call balls and strikes regardless of who is at bat.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Journal clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of South Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of South Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 4 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:02 p.m., recessed until 4 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COBURN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### THE NOMINATION PROCESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, before going up to the 3 o'clock briefing, I heard my friend—he is a friend and col-

league of mine—Senator CORNYN make comments about our leader, Senator REID, accusing him and Democratic Senators of obstruction in the judicial nomination process earlier today.

That sort of rhetoric may be good for sound bites, but it doesn't match the reality of the Senate's tradition or the Founding Fathers' vision in creating the checks and balances of our constitutional system.

In the Constitutional Convention, they considered four different times who should have the authority about naming justices. On three of those four times, it was unanimous that the Senate of the United States was named. The last important decision the Constitutional Convention made was dividing the authority between the President and the Senate of the United States. Any reading of those debates will reaffirm that.

With all respect to my colleague making comments about our leader, the Senator from Nevada, he clearly has not read carefully that Constitutional Convention. It says that we have a responsibility, a constitutional responsibility to exercise our will on these matters. Historically, the record shows more than 98 percent of the President's nominees have been approved. In fairness to my friend who can speak for himself and does that very well and does not need me here, as to these attacks on Senator REID, it is important to understand the facts and get them correct if we are going to have those interventions in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### GENETIC INFORMATION NONDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 3, S. 306, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2005; provided that there be 90 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the HELP committee; provided further that the only amendment in order, other than the committee-reported amendment, be a substitute which is at the desk, and following the use or yielding back of time the substitute amendment be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote

on passage without any intervening action or debate at a time determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 306) to prohibit discrimination on the basis of genetic information with respect to health insurance and employment.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

[Strike the part shown in black brackets and insert the part shown in italic.]

S. 306

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### [SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2005".

[(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

[Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

[Sec. 2. Findings.

#### [TITLE I—GENETIC NONDISCRIMINATION IN HEALTH INSURANCE

[Sec. 101. Amendments to Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

[Sec. 102. Amendments to the Public Health Service Act.

[Sec. 103. Amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

[Sec. 104. Amendments to title XVIII of the Social Security Act relating to medigap.

[Sec. 105. Privacy and confidentiality.

[Sec. 106. Assuring coordination.

[Sec. 107. Regulations; effective date.

#### [TITLE II—PROHIBITING EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GE- NETIC INFORMATION

[Sec. 201. Definitions.

[Sec. 202. Employer practices.

[Sec. 203. Employment agency practices.

[Sec. 204. Labor organization practices.

[Sec. 205. Training programs.

[Sec. 206. Confidentiality of genetic information.

[Sec. 207. Remedies and enforcement.

[Sec. 208. Disparate impact.

[Sec. 209. Construction.

[Sec. 210. Medical information that is not genetic information.

[Sec. 211. Regulations.

[Sec. 212. Authorization of appropriations.

[Sec. 213. Effective date.

#### [TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISION

[Sec. 301. Severability.

#### [SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

[Congress makes the following findings:

[(1) Deciphering the sequence of the human genome and other advances in genetics open major new opportunities for medical progress. New knowledge about the genetic basis of illness will allow for earlier detection of illnesses, often before symptoms have