Mr. LOTT. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. We do have a number of unanimous-consent agreements that we have worked out. We would like to go through these. And some of them are still being worked on as we speak. But we can go ahead and get started.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3953

Mr. LOTT, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to consideration of H.R. 3953, the House-passed terrorism bill just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, preserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader modify his consent to provide for passage of the bill as amended by a substitute amendment, providing for roving wiretaps, and requiring taggants for black powder, that the bill be read the third time, and I believe the Democratic leader would object, so I object on his behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The bill will be read on the next legislative day.

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3953

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in light of the objection, I ask that H.R. 3953 be read for the first time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3953) to combat terrorism.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading, and I believe the Democratic leader would object, so I object on his behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The bill will be read on the next legislative day.

NOMINATIONS TO REMAIN IN STATUS QUO UNTIL SEPTEMBER 2, 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that all nominations received by the Senate during the 104th Congress, 2d session, remain in status quo notwithstanding the August 2 adjournment until September 2, 1996, and rule XXXI, paragraph 6 of the standing rules of the Senate.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations:

Calendar 384, Charles Hunnicutt, Assistant Secretary of Transportation; Calendar 509, Charles Burton, U.S. Enrichment Corporation; Calendar 510, Christopher Coburn, U.S. Enrichment Corporation; Calendar 710, Thomas Hill Moore, Consumer Product Safety Commission; Calendar 716, Edward McGaffigan, Jr., Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Calendar 717, Nils Diaz, Nuclear Regulatory Commission; I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would not be able at this time, to agree to that addition to the unanimous-consent request.

A lot of good work was done in this area this week. I think they came very, very close to getting an overall agreement, and I thought yesterday afternoon, actually, it was going to be achieved. They did not quite make it. This is something we will have to work on.

I do personally think additional authority should be granted on wiretap. I think a lot of the aviation security matters that are included in this bill are very, very important. I am sorry we could not get it worked out. I think more than anything else, time has run out on us.

However, I have to object to that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, I share the view expressed by the majority leader. I was very hopeful at the beginning of this week that we could have concluded our work to provide yet another opportunity to pass a good piece of legislation dealing with a very important matter by the end of this week. That was not possible. I am disappointed, but we will have to dedicate our effort to ensure that does happen when we get back. I hope we could do it sooner rather than later.

I object to this bill. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Christopher M. Coburn, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Enrichment Corporation for a term expiring February 24, 2001.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

Thomas Hill Moore, of Florida, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 26, 1996.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Edward McGaffigan, Jr., of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2000.

NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER COBURN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Christopher Coburn to the Board of the U.S. Enrichment Corporation. I believe the nomination of Mr. Coburn to this board would put the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant at a disadvantage in the siting of the Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation [AVLIS] technology.

As a member of the USEC Board, Mr. Coburn will have the responsibility of implementing the privatization of the USEC and charting its future course, including the implementation of the AVLIS technology.

The commercialization of this technology would mean billions of dollars of investment as well as ensuring the continued viability of the U.S. enrichment industry. If I may put the issue in stark, but accurate terms, the USEC's decision about siting AVLIS is more fundamentally a decision about which one of these plants will be able to remain competitive and viable into the next century.

Earlier this year, President Clinton appointed Mr. Coburn to the board because he believed Mr. Coburn was uniquely qualified following his service as the executive director of the Thomas Edison Program as science and technology advisor to the Governor of Ohio. It has come to my attention that while serving as the executive director of the Thomas Edison Project, Mr. Coburn developed a proposal to locate the AVLIS technology in Portsmouth, OH.

Mr. President, the placement of Mr. Coburn on the USEC’s board at this time would cause serious doubts about the objectivity and fairness of the USEC as it begins to address which facility should obtain the AVLIS technology. The stakes concerning this decision are so monumental that we cannot allow any inference of bias to infect the process by which that decision is made.

In an effort to protect the interests of the workers employed at the Paducah plant and the economy of western Kentucky I asked the President to withdraw the nomination of the Mr. Coburn. Since the President has ignored my concerns I have tried to block the confirmation of Mr. Coburn. Unfortunately, I realize the votes are not in my favor. Nonetheless, I will
continue to follow the actions of the Board and Mr. Coburn to ensure that the best interests of the Paducah Gas-eous Diffusion Plant are protected.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SE-CRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 104-28 AND TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 104-29

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the injuction of secrecy be removed from two treaties: A Protocol Amending the 1916 Convention for the Protection of Migratory Birds (Treaty Document No. 104-28); and a United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Drought, Particularly in Africa, with Annexes (Treaty Document No. 104-29); transmitted to the Senate by the President today; and ask that the treaties be considered as having been read the first time; that they be referred, with accompanying papers, to their respective committees, and ordered to be printed and that the President’s message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The messages of the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Protocol between the United States and Canada Amending the 1916 Convention for the Protection of Migratory Birds in Canada and the United States, with a related exchange of notes, signed at Washington on December 14, 1995.

The Protocol, which is discussed in more detail in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, represents a considerable achievement for the United States in conserving migratory birds and balancing the interests of conservationists, sports hunters, and indigenous people. If ratified and properly implemented, the Protocol would further enhance the management and protection of this important resource for the benefit of all users.

The Protocol would replace a protocol with a similar purpose, which was signed January 30, 1979, (Executive W. 96th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1980)), and which I, therefore, desire to withdraw from the Senate.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to this Convention and its Annexes, with the declaration described in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State, and give its advice and consent to ratification.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 2, 1996.

TREATIES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the following treaties on today’s Executive Calendar, Executive Calendar Nos. 24 through 35; I further ask unanimous consent that the treaties be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolutions of ratification; that all committee provisos, reservations, understandings, etc., be agreed to; that any statements in regard to matters not otherwise reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as if read; and that the Senate take one vote on the resolutions of ratification to be considered as separate votes; further, that when the resolutions of ratification are voted upon the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; the President then be notified of the Senate’s action and that following disposition of the treaties, the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The treaties will be considered to have passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolutions of ratification.

The resolutions of ratification are as follows:

TREATY WITH THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA ON MUTU-AL LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on November 23, 1993, together with the Related Exchange of Notes signed on the same date. The Senate’s advice and consent is subject to the following two provisos, which shall not be included in the instrument of ratification to be signed by the President:

Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the Senate.

Pursuant to the rights of the United States under this Treaty to deny requests which prejudice its essential public policy or interest, the United States shall deny a request for assistance when the Central Authority, after consultation with all appropriate intelligence, anti-narcotic, and foreign policy agencies, has specific information that a senior government official who will have access to information to be provided under this Treaty is engaged in a felony, including the facilitation of the production or distribution of illegal drugs.

TREATY WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM ON MUTU-AL LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Treaty Between the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Washington on January 6, 1994, together with a Related Exchange of Notes signed the same date. The Senate’s advice and consent is subject to the following two provisos, which shall not be included in the instrument of ratification to be signed by the President:

Nothing in the Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States.

Pursuant to the rights of the United States under this Treaty to deny requests which prejudice its essential public policy or interest, the United States shall deny a request for assistance when the Central Authority, after consultation with all appropriate intelligence, anti-narcotic, and foreign policy agencies, has specific information that a senior government official who will have access to information to be provided under this Treaty is engaged in a felony, including the facilitation of the production or distribution of illegal drugs.

TREATY WITH AUSTRIA ON MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of The Treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters, signed at Vienna on February 23, 1995. The Senate’s advice and consent is subject to the following two provisos, which shall not be included in the instrument of ratification to be signed by the President: