

as many of those ideas as we can. We have learned in carrying out our day-to-day responsibilities that trust and civility are more than nice things to have; they make a real difference in what we can accomplish together. Moreover, if changes are not made soon, we believe it will become more and more difficult to find good people to serve on Capitol Hill either as Members of Congress or as staff, further undermining the ability of the institution to do its essential job in our democracy.

We came from both chambers, from both sides of the aisle and from very different backgrounds, but in the course of our Fellowship we found that our shared commitment to the institution of Congress and its critical role in our democracy far outweighed our differences. The Stennis Fellowship provided an all too rare opportunity for us to step outside of our normal roles, share experiences, explore new ideas and learn from each other. It provided a space for dialogue, within which we were able to build, in microcosm, the kind of trust and civility we hope will grow more widely both in Congress and across society. We also found that maintaining the dialogue requires real work and attention—it is easy to slip back into familiar patterns—but that the increased trust, civility, insight and ability to work together that result more than justify this effort.

In the end, perhaps the best way to understand dialogue is to experience it. We hope that many others in Congress can have the sort of experience we have had during our period of Fellowship, and that this sort of dialogue also can take place more regularly not just in Congress, but in other parts of our society and between Congress and the public. The need is urgent to find ways to strengthen trust and civility both within Congress and across society. To make a difference we need to start from where we are. We each can make a contribution from any starting point. We invite you to consider what you can do to help address this challenge, starting from where you are.

MEETINGS OF THE 108TH CONGRESSIONAL STAFF FELLOWS PROGRAM

1. Fellows met first in July 2003 to get acquainted and to define their Learning Agenda.

2. To set the stage for exploring their Learning Agenda, Fellows participated in a November workshop on "Dialogue Essentials" led by Steven Rosell and Mark Gerzon from Viewpoint Learning.

3. The Fellows pursued their Learning Agenda in four roundtables with outstanding resource persons:

Historical Context: Changes in Trust and Civility (December 2003)

Dr. Richard A. Baker, Senate Historian.
Dr. Patrick Towell, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.

Rules of Engagement that Foster Trust and Civility (February 2004)

Brian Lamb, Chairman and CEO, C-SPAN
Burdett Loomis, Chair, Political Science Department, University of Kansas.

External Influences on Congressional Trust and Civility (March 2004)

The Honorable David Skaggs Executive Director, Center for Democracy and Citizenship Program, Council for Excellence in Government.

Ruth Wooden, President, Public Agenda.

Rules of Engagement that Impact Trust and Civility (March 2004)

The Honorable Dale Bumpers, Arent, Fox, Kintner, Plotkin and Kahn, PLLC.

The Honorable Bob Michel, Hogan and Hartson, LLP.

4. Fellows visited the USS *John C. Stennis* aircraft carrier at sea in November 2003 and March 2004.

5. Fellows worked together first in small groups in May of 2004 and then at a two-day retreat and subsequent half-day session in The Capitol in June to synthesize what they had learned and to produce this report.

108TH CONGRESS STENNIS FELLOWS

Richard A. Arenberg, Legislative Director & Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Senator Carl Levin.

John M. Ariale, Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Representative Ander Crenshaw.

Winfield Boerekel, Jr., Administrative Assistant/Legislative Director, Office of U.S. Representative Gerald D. Kleczka.

David Cavicke, Chief Counsel, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, House Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Jo-Ellen Darcy, Senior Policy Advisor, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Lula Johnson Davis, Assistant Secretary for the Minority, Office of the Secretary for the Minority.

Don DeArmon, Associate Staff for Appropriations, Office of U.S. Representative Lucille Roybal-Allard.

Bruce M. Evans, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Beverly Ann Fields, Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson.

Gene T. Fisher, Legislative Director/Special Assistant for Appropriations, Office of U.S. Representative Carolyn C. Kilpatrick.

Monique P. Frazier, Legislative Director, Office of U.S. Representative Mike Ross.

Jennice Fuentes, Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Representative Luis Gutierrez.

Christina Langelier Hamilton, Administrative Assistant, Office of U.S. Representative David Obey.

Elisabeth Wright Hawkins, Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Representative Christopher Shays.

Clayton Heil, Legislative Director, Office of U.S. Senator Thad Cochran.

Robert Gregory Hinote, Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Representative Jim Cooper.

Robert Holste, Administrative Assistant, Office of U.S. Representative Phil English.

Stacey Leavandosky, Legislative Director, Office of U.S. Representative Lynn Woolsey.

Evan Liddiard, Senior Tax Policy Advisor, Office of U.S. Senator Orrin Hatch.

Stephanie J. Monroe, Chief Counsel, Senate Committee on Health, Labor and Pensions.

Sue A. Nelson, Minority Deputy Staff Director, Senate Committee on Budget.

Janet Perry Poppleton, Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Representative Ralph M. Hall.

Judy Schneider, Specialist on the Congress, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

Russell Sullivan, Minority Chief Tax Counsel, Senate Committee on Finance.

Kristine Svinicki, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of U.S. Senator Larry Craig.

Alison Taylor, Minority Chief Counsel, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Paul Unger, Counsel and Legislative Director, Office of U.S. Senator George Allen.

Mark S. Wellman, Chief of Staff, Office of U.S. Representative Paul E. Gillmor.

STENNIS CONGRESSIONAL STAFF FELLOWS PROGRAM

The Stennis Congressional Staff Fellows Program, sponsored by the Stennis Center for Public Service, is a practical, bipartisan leadership development experience for senior-level staff of the United States Congress. Established in the 103rd Congress (1993-1994), the Stennis Fellows Program brings together chiefs of staff, committee staff directors, legislative directors, and others to explore ways

to improve the effectiveness of the institution of Congress. A new class of 24 to 28 Stennis Fellows is selected competitively from each Congress. A Member of Congress must nominate each Fellow. The Fellows class is balanced with nearly equal numbers from both political parties and both chambers.

The Stennis Fellows Program focuses on the future challenges of Congress as an institution and the leadership role played by senior Congressional staff in meeting those challenges. Stennis Fellows meet periodically over a fifteen-month period, and examine issues of their own choosing. The program invites nationally and internationally renowned experts to meet and dialogue with the Stennis Fellows. While learning from these outside authorities is a unique opportunity, a primary benefit of the program is the learning and relationship building that takes place among the Stennis Fellows themselves.

STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

The Stennis Center for Public Service was created by Congress in 1988 to promote and strengthen public service leadership in America. The Stennis Center is headquartered in Starkville, Mississippi, with an office in Washington, DC. Programs of the Stennis Center are funded through an endowment plus private contributions.

The Stennis Center's mandate is to provide development and training for leaders in public service, including Congressional staff, and to attract young people to careers in public service leadership. The Stennis Center accomplishes its mission through conferences, seminars, special projects and leadership development programs.

NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE PORTER GOSS TO BE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, I was unavoidably absent from yesterday's vote on the nomination of PORTER GOSS to be Director of Central Intelligence. I wish the RECORD to show that if I had been present, I would have voted in favor of the nomination.

The Constitution gives the President the power to select the heads of government agencies and departments. The Senate was given the responsibility of reviewing these choices and approving or disapproving them. As a body, the Senate was not given the authority to choose whomever it wishes to fill these positions. Nor is any Senator able to substitute the President's choice with an individual who he or she feels is better qualified than the President's nominee. Rather, the Senate's consent is designed to act as a "check" on the selection of an egregious candidate and a final review of the qualifications and competencies of the nominee.

PORTER GOSS would not have been my choice for Director of Central Intelligence. I share the concerns of many of my colleagues about the partisan political nature of many of Representative GOSS's statements and positions in recent months. His opposition to the creation of the 9/11 Commission is particularly troubling. With his extensive knowledge of the intelligence community, I would have expected him to be acutely aware that the commission was

vitably important to improving national security and healing the wounds of September 11, 2001.

However, one cannot dispute the fact that Representative GOSS has a great deal of experience both inside and outside the intelligence community. Early in his career he worked for the CIA both in covert operations during the Cold War and in analysis for the Directorate of Operations. This familiarity with the agency proved very valuable when, after his election to Congress in 1988, he joined the House of Representatives Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, serving as its chairman for the past 7 years. By all accounts, Representative GOSS has worked diligently to perform the oversight functions invested in Congress and to improve the quality of intelligence operations.

Representative GOSS indicated in his testimony last week before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that he appreciates that the Director of Central Intelligence, DCI, does not have the same freedom as a Member of Congress to be partisan or provocative. The DCI is required by law to be non-partisan, and remain above the political fray. As we saw in the Iraq war, politicization of intelligence is one of the gravest threats to our national security. Representative GOSS acknowledged that "objective and precise intelligence is only possible if the intelligence community's leadership is itself objective, independent and clear in its commitment to these ideas."

Mr. GOSS has been quite forthright in criticizing the intelligence community for relying too heavily on national technical means and not investing in the more difficult area of human intelligence collection. This takes more time and commitment, but it is essential if we are to make headway against international terrorism.

The coming years will bring considerable reorganization and potential turmoil for the intelligence community. I believe changes must be made in a very careful, conscientious, and nonpartisan manner. Representative GOSS has said he understands that politics must stop at the DCI's office door. Based on his assurance that he understands the difference between being a Member of Congress and being in charge of the Nation's intelligence, I will support his confirmation. For the sake of the Nation, we all must hope that he is successful.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I regret that I was unable to vote yesterday afternoon on the nomination of PORTER GOSS to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Yesterday, I was surveying the significant flood damage in Pennsylvania with President Bush. As my colleagues know, the remnants of Hurricane Ivan wreaked havoc in my home State. Parts of Allegheny County received eight inches of rain in a 24-hour period. A member of my Pittsburgh staff lost everything he owned in the flood. A total of 41 coun-

ties in Pennsylvania have now been declared Federal disaster areas. I was pleased that President Bush took the time to visit with my constituents and bring a message of hope and aid to Western Pennsylvania.

On the nomination of PORTER GOSS, I would like to add my voice to the others that have expressed confidence in his abilities to lead the CIA in these difficult times. Congressman GOSS' experience as a former Army intelligence officer and as a CIA field officer will serve him well as we undertake the awesome responsibility of guiding and improving the CIA.

The need for a coordinated and comprehensive intelligence system for this country is imperative. I am pleased that President Bush has nominated a capable candidate to take on the difficult challenge of improving not only our level of human intelligence, but also the ability of our intelligence community to provide our policy makers with better intelligence products.

I ask that the RECORD reflect that, had I been here, I would have voted in favor of the nomination of PORTER GOSS to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005, S. 2666, as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations provides \$560 million in budget authority and \$540 million outlays in fiscal year 2005. There is no mandatory funding in this bill.

The bill provides total discretionary budget authority in fiscal year 2005, of \$560 million. This amount is equal to the President's request, it matches the 302(b) allocations adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and is \$18 million more than fiscal year 2004 enacted levels excluding fiscal year 2004 supplemental appropriations.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for bringing this legislation before the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2826, 2005 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS
[Spending Comparisons—Senate-reported bill (Fiscal Year 2005, \$ millions)]

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget authority	560		560
Outlays	540		540
Senate Committee allocation:			
Budget authority	560		560
Outlays	554		554
2004 Enacted:			
Budget authority	542		542
Outlays	516		516
President's request:			
Budget authority	560		560
Outlays	534		534
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority	560		560
Outlays	538		538

S. 2826, 2005 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
[Spending Comparisons—Senate-reported bill (Fiscal Year 2005, \$ millions)]

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority			
Outlays	-14		-14
2004 Enacted:			
Budget authority	18		18
Outlays	24		24
President's request:			
Budget authority			0
Outlays	-14		-14
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority			0
Outlays	2		2

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I would like to discuss the issue of federally funded stem cell research. On August 9, 2001, President Bush outlined the policy of his administration regarding federally funded research using only existing stem cell lines. He indicated that he felt this would allow for Federal research dollars to be used on about 60 lines of stem cells. In actuality, over 3 years later, there are indications that Federal research has been done on only as many as 24 lines and as few as 5.

Yet, the administration continues to state this policy is appropriate. As recently as Monday, President Bush stated on a campaign stop in Derry, NH, that his stem cell policy "balanced good science with good ethics." I disagree. We must use modern medical technology to its fullest capability to use stem cells to develop cures for debilitating diseases such as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, diabetes, cancer and ALS, commonly referred to as Lou Gehrig's disease. The Federal Government should not restrict our policy to only existing stem cells but expand the policy to include newly discovered stem cell lines as well as unused cells that would otherwise be discarded from in vitro clinics. This is the position of the majority of the American people and it is the position of former First Lady Nancy Reagan.

On a personal note, a dear friend of mine, William Kooistra, of Grand Rapids, MI, was recently diagnosed with ALS. Bill Kooistra founded Project in Rehabilitation in 1968, seeing the need for the medical community to become involved in treating the problems of drug addiction. Project Rehab is now one of the largest and longest running substance abuse programs in my home State. There is hope that stem cell research can one day cure diseases such as ALS. Although that cure may come too late for my friend Bill, I hope and I know that he hopes that a cure can be found one day so that the generations to come won't have to worry that they are genetically predisposed to contract ALS. I ask unanimous consent a September 12, 2004, letter from Bill Kooistra to the Grand Rapids Press on this subject be printed in the RECORD.