

business until 5 p.m., with Senators speaking for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator THOMAS, or his designee, 15 minutes; Senator DURBIN, or his designee, 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Therefore, the Senate will be in a period of morning business on Tuesday.

Following the morning business, the Senate will begin consideration of any available conference reports, if available from the House. It is more likely the Senate will not receive these Senate appropriations reports until either late on Tuesday or Wednesday morning. Votes are not anticipated during Tuesday's session. Senators will be notified when votes are scheduled.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOTT. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators HARKIN, LANDRIEU, REID, DORGAN, DURBIN, and LOTT.

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to withhold the final request.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I merely want to ask the majority leader a bit more about the schedule. I understand there are no votes tomorrow, on Tuesday, and the potential of votes on Wednesday. I missed part of the presentation of the majority leader for which I apologize.

Is it the intention of the majority leader to try to complete business this week?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to repeat it because I know we want to make sure all Senators have heard this. We have four appropriations bills that are in some degree of completion. I think two of them have been wrapped up and two are still being discussed between the House, the Senate, and the White House. It is possible the House will act on one of those appropriations bills on Tuesday, but it appears it wouldn't be until late in the afternoon or even early evening, so we wouldn't get it until late Tuesday or perhaps Wednesday morning.

We also have a discussion underway involving a tax bill which would provide for FSC and the pension and IRAs that have been approved by the Senate Finance Committee, so that could be completed and be available late tomorrow afternoon. But both of those would also probably be done on Wednesday.

Hopefully, with three or four votes, we would be able to complete the session for the year. That could be done Wednesday; hopefully it will be done not later than Thursday. Of course, that all is dependent upon final agreement between the two bodies and final

comments we might get from the White House.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the majority leader for his response.

Might I inquire on one further issue, the issue of the tax matters that the Senator described? Can the Senator tell me how those tax issues will come to the floor of the Senate and the House? In what form? Attached to what legislation?

Mr. LOTT. I don't mean for that to be all inclusive. I assume we will be clearing bills right along as we did last week and this week. We also have a number of Executive Calendar nominations that we anticipate clearing. I started the process last week to get to a vote on bankruptcy. We hope that will also come up, probably Thursday, before we go out.

With regard to the tax provisions, there is a bill to which they would be attached. I don't recall the number right offhand. It does relate to small businesses, small business tax relief, but I can't give an exact name.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask our distinguished leader, he mentioned the Executive Calendar. The Finance Committee has held hearings on six nominees, two tax court judges of some considerable salience, two public trustees of the Social Security trust funds. We have not been able to find a committee presence, a majority in which to report out the measure.

We had hoped that possibly the committee might be discharged. These are persons of distinction who we all want to be in place. Will that be possible?

Mr. LOTT. If I could respond, I understand there are two tax court judges, two trustees with the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, two Social Security advisory board nominees, and Assistant Secretary of Commerce. It is our intent to get clearance to discharge committee and confirm those before we go out—hopefully, maybe even tomorrow; certainly, Wednesday or Thursday. But we have the list and we are going to be working on that.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That is most reassuring. I thank the leader.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE AGENDA

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, we are now 23 days from the end of the last fiscal year, and 15 days before the election. So far, this Congress can be de-

finer more by what it has failed to do than what it has done. The majority has so far succeeded in killing a number of critical initiatives needed by working families and senior citizens. The list of legislative corpses could fill several obituary pages.

Here is the report card on this Congress: Patients' Bill of Rights, not done; prescription drug benefit for Medicare, not done; school modernization and renovation, not done; class-size reduction, not done; minimum wage increase, not done; pay equity, not done; farm bill reforms, not done; gun safety measures, not done; campaign finance reform, not done; hate crimes legislation, not done; Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act, not done; college tuition tax deductibility, not done; long-term care tax credit, not done; child care tax credit, not done.

That list could go on and on but I think that summarizes it pretty well.

One might ask, what have we been doing around here this year? Quite frankly, not a heck of a lot when it comes to the people's business. And not only regarding the agenda, there are important authorizations and reauthorizations that have not been authorized.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the first time since 1965 that Congress fails to reauthorize. The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, Older Americans Act, the Superfund, Clean Water Act, Energy Policy Act and Veterans Health Care Eligibility Reform Act—none of these reauthorizations have taken place this year.

On top of that, we failed to pass our critical appropriations bills.

Right now, we are meeting—I'm the Senate leading Democrat on the Labor-HHS and education bill—on our education appropriations bill. We are in negotiations now. We have been in negotiations since last July and we can't seem to get it done. We are talking about class-size reduction. We have had it for 2 years. It is working well. Go around to your States and talk to the schools. Teachers love it. They are getting more teachers in the classroom. They are getting aides, assistant to come in, especially for kids with disabilities. And right now the Republicans want to turn the clocks back. They don't want to do that anymore. They want to turn the clock back.

On school modernization and construction, they don't want to do that one, either. Mr. President, 14 million American children attend classes in buildings that are unsafe or inadequate. How do we expect our kid to learn for the 21st century when they are in schools not equipped for the 20th century? Yet this Congress says no; no to the educational things that will make our kids better students, make our schools better schools, make the future a better one for all of our people. They say no.

We have had for 3 years, a demonstration projects in Iowa on school

repair, \$17.6 million in Federal funds to make needed repairs. It is leveraged an additional \$141 million, a ratio of \$8 to every \$1.

It has been a great success. This is what we could expect around the nation if the Republicans would just get serious and fund this modernization and classroom construction program. We need to continue the class size reduction.

I read this morning in the Congress Daily that the majority leader may make public a tax plan that he intends to pass before we leave: \$260 billion over 10 years, more than the prescription drug plan that we do not even have time to consider. I am very disappointed that we have not considered a prescription drug plan. Now, we may have a \$260 billion tax plan dropped in front of us with a request to pass it before we have an opportunity to find out what is in it. I have not seen it. No one seems to have seen this tax bill. Unfortunately, I hear it is full of tax breaks for the wealthy and breaks for the middle class and those with modest incomes are being taken out. If we do get a tax bill, we are going to have to look through this with a fine tooth comb before we vote on it. The American people deserve to know who benefits from this bill. I will be having more to say about that later, if and when we do see this so-called tax bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. HARKIN. As I have almost every day we have been in session, now, for the last few weeks—I brought up the issue of Bonnie Campbell, who has bipartisan support, who has had her hearing in the Judiciary Committee, yet has not been reported out for a vote. This is it. We had 7 nominations for circuit court judges, 2 had their hearings, one was referred, and one was confirmed—one out of 7 this year. Yet in 1992, when there was a Republican President and a Democratic Senate, we had 14 nominations for circuit court judges in the election year, 9 had a hearing, 9 were referred, and 9 were confirmed. Everyone who had a hearing got confirmed, and that was during the election year. Yet this year we only got 1 out of 7.

One of those stuck in there who has had the hearing is Bonnie Campbell, who headed the Office of Violence Against Women ever since it started. She has done an outstanding job at that. We passed the Violence Against Women Act. We reauthorized it by an overwhelming vote in the House and Senate. I think that is a testimony to the fact that Bonnie Campbell has done such an outstanding job of running that Office of Violence Against Women.

She was nominated in March, had her hearing in May, yet she has been sitting there ever since. It is unfair to her. It is unfair to make her sit bottled up in that committee. So, as I do when I get on the floor:

I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Judiciary Committee on further consideration of the nomination of

Bonnie Campbell, that her nomination be considered by the Senate immediately following the conclusion of action on the pending matter and that debate on the nomination be limited to 2 hours, equally divided, and that a vote on her nomination occur immediately following the use or yielding back of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HARKIN. We always hear that objection, but we don't know why. She has had her hearing. Let's bring her out for a vote; do the decent thing. Bring her out and vote it up or down. That's the decent thing.

Until we finish here, I will ask that unanimous consent to point out we are not the ones holding it up. All we want is a vote for Bonnie Campbell for the eighth circuit. I believe she deserves no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

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

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

THE UNFINISHED AGENDA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, a few moments ago, as he spoke about the unfinished agenda. I suppose every Congress finishes with a speech by 1 or 2 or 10 or 20 Members of Congress talking about the unfinished agenda. But that unfinished agenda in this Congress is mighty long and also mighty important.

The Senator from Iowa talks about the Patients' Bill of Rights, education issues such as the crumbling schools, smaller class sizes—a whole series of initiatives that we really should get to. The Senator just asked unanimous consent—I guess it was a nomination he was attempting to get to the floor of the Senate.

I made this point last week to the consternation of a couple of my friends here in the Senate, but I think it is important to make it again. On September 22, a motion was brought to the floor of the Senate, a motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2557. That is an energy bill. That motion to proceed has now been pending here in the Senate for a month and a day. On September 22 it was put on the floor, and it has been here for 1 month and 1 day. My feeling is that the motion to proceed is here—and we are not voting on it and we are not proceeding—it is here because it is a motion to block any other effort to bring up any other

issues. We have a wide range of issues; I suppose some of them are being negotiated these days, but most of them will remain unfinished at the end of this session.

The Senator from Iowa, who has a real passion to want to get certain things done, is unable on a Monday or Tuesday to come to the floor to say I want to offer a motion to proceed on his issue. Let's assume it is the minimum wage. He wants to test whether time has changed some minds on the minimum wage. He is unable to offer that. The Patients' Bill of Rights? He has been unable to offer that. Campaign finance reform? Unable to offer that. Why? Because there is a motion pending, and the motion pending is the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2557, a bill that I do not believe was ever intended to come to the floor. But the motion pending is a motion to block the efforts of others who might want to offer a motion here on the floor of the Senate. That is what I think is thwarting the interests of the Senator from Iowa.

When he described the unfinished business, one might say: If it is unfinished, why don't you come down here and make a motion? The Senator cannot make a motion because that particular motion to proceed has been blocking anyone else from offering anything for a month and a day.

The Senator did ask unanimous consent. Of course, unanimous consent never clears here. There is always an objection to unanimous consent to move to something. Then the question would be, Why couldn't he just make a motion? The answer is: You can not move to it because we have a blocking motion that has been here for a month and a day.

Mr. HARKIN. If the Senator will yield, I thank the Senator for pointing that out. I am as guilty as anyone—we get wrapped up in the language of the Senate, the language of legislation. I did not realize until now the Senator is making the point that the average person out there, maybe listening to what I said about the fact that we have not brought up or voted on a Patients' Bill of Rights or prescription drugs or Medicare or an increase in the minimum wage—we haven't brought any of those up—might say: Why don't you bring them up? The Senator has pointed it out—we cannot because we are blocked.

Again I ask the Senator, to again clarify this one more time. This motion to proceed that has been here for a month and a day—is it the observation of the Senator that nothing has been done to move to that? We have not gone to that bill. It has just been sitting there. Does the Senator see any move on that side to go to S. 2557, whatever it is?

Mr. DORGAN. I would say after a month now it is quite clear this motion to proceed is simply an effort to block the opportunity of others to offer amendments. People have a right to do