

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The continuing resolution just arrived. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res 118) making further continuing appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been considered read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would each vote "aye."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) would vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Abraham	Feingold	Moynihan
Akaka	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Allard	Frist	Murray
Baucus	Graham	Reed
Bayh	Gramm	Reid
Bennett	Grassley	Robb
Biden	Gregg	Roberts
Bingaman	Hagel	Rockefeller
Brownback	Harkin	Santorum
Bunning	Hatch	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchinson	Schumer
Chafee, L.	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
DeWine	Levin	Thurmond
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Mack	Wyden
Edwards	Mikulski	
Enzi	Miller	

NAYS—2

Leahy	Stevens
-------	---------

NOT VOTING—31

Ashcroft	Gorton	Lugar
Bond	Grams	McCain
Boxer	Helms	McConnell
Breaux	Hollings	Nickles
Bryan	Hutchison	Roth
Burns	Inhofe	Sessions
Campbell	Jeffords	Thomas
Cochran	Kohl	Torricelli
Crapo	Kyl	Wellstone
Durbin	Lautenberg	
Feinstein	Lieberman	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 118) was passed.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FIGHTING FOR FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to attempt to put some transparence on what is going on around here.

This summer, the Republicans very successfully convinced the American people that their party was for estate tax relief and marriage penalty relief and that the Democrats were not. Well, my friends, that is simply not the case. The Democrats are for eliminating the estate tax for small businesses and family farms valued at \$8 million and for all other estates worth \$4 million. And, Mr. President, it is the Democratic plan for marriage penalty relief that completely eliminates the marriage penalty found in 65 provisions in the tax code.

So, isn't it a bit frightening that the Republicans have so successfully twisted the debate so as to mislead the American people into thinking that they are actually the party supportive of tax cuts. Reality is, however, that they are the party of political rhetoric and political maneuvering. If the Republicans really wanted to give the American people estate tax relief and

marriage penalty relief, they could have—they had many, many opportunities for sending the President real relief. Instead of giving the American people empty rhetoric—we could be sitting here today with elimination of the estate tax and marriage penalty tax relief for virtually all Americans.

Now, why do I bring all this up. Because it is happening over and over again. The Republicans are misleading the American people on a host of critical pieces of legislation, including: patients bill of rights, prescription drug coverage, minimum wage increase, tax cuts, health insurance coverage and education.

Instead of actually providing the American people with real relief—this year—the Republicans prefer the politics.

I have heard from constituents who ask me—"If both Republicans and Democrats want patients bill of rights, then why can't the Republicans and Democrats just work together to get something done?" That is an excellent question. Why?

Why is it that we cannot just reach agreement? Is it that we are missing some magical force here in Washington to bring bipartisanship to all? Unfortunately, the answer is that the Republicans want the rhetoric—and the Democrats want real reform. So, until the Republicans stop pandering and posturing and start sincerely and openly working together, there can be no agreements. You see, the Republicans have a more difficult time even working with each other—there is nothing partisan or bipartisan about that. Yet they have misled the American people to think that the Democrats—not the Republicans—are the ones holding up the works and refusing to work in a bipartisan manner. Mr. President, that is truly overstepping the bounds of the reality of what is going on up here.

Our efforts to fight for fundamental fairness in health, education and tax cuts, are being twisted into political pandering and posturing by the Republicans. But all we are doing is fighting for the fundamental fairness that the American people have fought for by working hard every day of their lives.

Let me illustrate this by highlighting the differences between the policies of the Republicans and the Democrats with respect to the bill that we have before us.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we do as much as possible to meet America's need for safe and modern schools.

Democrats solution—enact the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson proposal to finance \$25 billion in bonds to construct and modernize 6,000 schools.

Republican's bill—is thoroughly inadequate—it provides no guaranteed funding for urgent school repairs, provides only \$16 billion in bonds, and does not include the important Davis-Bacon

provision to ensure that the construction workers who build and repair our nation's schools receive a fair wage for their work.

Result of their plan—the arbitrage provision encourages delay in urgently needed school construction and would disproportionately help wealthy school districts.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we promote bipartisanship in health care by coupling both the Republican and Democrat priorities on health care and long-term care.

Democrats solution—our FamilyCare proposal would expand coverage to 4 million uninsured parents at a cost of slightly over \$3,000 per person.

Republican's bill—provides additional coverage to one-seventh of the people at \$18,000 per person—that is one-seventh of the people at 6 times the cost. Their approach is inequitable, inefficient, and counterproductive to health care policy.

Result of their plan—completely ignores a proposal to cover millions of uninsured, working Americans and jeopardizes the insurance coverage of those individuals currently receiving employer-based coverage. In fact, on the Republican health deduction, the Joint Tax Committee estimates that while over 26 million individuals would receive benefits under the proposal, only 1.6 million individuals would be newly insured as a result. In contrast, the Democrats in Congress and the Clinton-Gore Administration plan would expand coverage to 5 million uninsured Americans.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we help the families who care for our nation's elderly.

Democrats solution—accept the Republicans deduction for long-term care insurance in exchange for inclusion of a proposal to provide a \$3,000 tax credit for long-term care costs.

Republican's bill—provide a health care deduction for long-term care costs.

Result of their plan—they provide half of the benefits of the long-term care credit that the Democrats provide.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that all Americans are insured.

Democrats solution—bipartisan policies for health insurance options for children with disabilities, legal immigrant pregnant women and children, and enrolling uninsured children in schools, needed payment increases to hospitals, academic health centers, home health agencies and other vulnerable providers.

Republican's bill—provides over one-third of the cost of their medicare bill to the HMOs.

Result of their plan—there is no accountability to prevent excessive payment increases to HMOs and failure to address the urgent health needs of seniors, people with disabilities, and children.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we encourage medical research and expand vaccine distribution to proactively approach medicine.

Democrats solution—a bipartisan tax credit for vaccine research and purchases for malaria, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS and any infectious disease that causes over 1 million deaths annually.

Republican's bill—nothing.

Result of their plan—this is a failure to address a problem of serious ramifications. These diseases cause almost half of all deaths worldwide of people under age 45, killing over 8 million children each year and orphaning millions more.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that low and middle income individuals save and invest for their future.

Democrats solution—provide savings incentives to low and middle income individuals through retirement savings accounts.

Republican's bill—they specifically dropped this provision from the bipartisan Senate Finance Committee bill.

Result of their plan—a failure to address the lack of pension coverage for 70 million people. I want to just add one point here. Every year, through tax incentives, private pensions cost the fisc \$76 billion. Yet 75 percent of American households in the 15 percent tax bracket—that means income of about \$30,000—receive little or no tax incentive on their IRA or pension contribution.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we meet our current obligations before we promise new programs for distressed communities.

Democrats solution—fully fund the currently existing empowerment zones to spur economic development in distressed communities.

Republican's bill—create new renewal communities without meeting our promise to the existing empowerment zone communities.

Result of their plan—irresponsible pandering to wealthy business owners who will benefit from their new renewal communities at the expense of low and middle income entrepreneurs.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we don't turn our backs on those areas most in need.

Democrats solution—provide an economic activity credit to encourage business investment in jobs for the residents of Puerto Rico.

Republican's bill—they specifically rejected this provision.

Result of their plan—this equates to turning their backs on the hard working people of Puerto Rico. Even while at an historical low of about 10.1 percent, the unemployment rate in Puerto Rico continues to remain well above that of any state; the per capita income in Puerto Rico, which was \$9,908 in FY 1999, is less than half that of any state; and well over 50 percent of the labor force in Puerto Rico are within \$1.00 of the current minimum wage.

The Democrats are fighting to ensure that we encourage adoption of special needs children from foster care programs.

Democrats solution—change a few words in the current tax code to ensure that families who adopt children from foster care can benefit from the same tax credit which is available to parents who adopt international children.

Republican's bill—specifically ignored a more inclusive approach.

Result of their plan—the Republicans turned their backs on those children with the greatest needs.

Let's look at some of those who do benefit under the Republican plan for example—the Texas State Universities. Now, stay with me on this. The Republicans—well I should say only about 4 or 5 Republicans, in their closed door, secret meetings included a couple of interesting rifle shots in their tax bill. The one, interestingly enough, would provide a specific exception just for the Texas state universities, that would make their interest on bonds non-taxable. The American people are giving the Texas state universities a \$4 million gift—while our public elementary and high school students are learning in trailers.

The bottom line is that the Republicans want to help big business and the HMOs. The Democrats reject this approach. The Democrats are fighting for fundamental fairness for the American people—our children, our elderly, and all individuals of every race, color, and creed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President I rise again today to urge President Clinton not to veto the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill that the Senate passed yesterday.

President Clinton has threatened a veto because we did not include his so-called Latino fairness act. But have included something much better—the Legal Immigration Family Equity Act, the LIFE Act. This act reunites families and restores due process to those who have played by the rules. Our proposal does not pit one nationality against another, nor does it pit one race against another. Our legislation provides relief to immigrants from all countries. A veto of CJS would be a blow against immigrant fairness.

But a veto would do far more than that. A veto would cut off funding for some of our most important programs.

CJS appropriations allocates: \$4.8 billion for the INS and an additional \$15.7 million for Border Patrol equipment upgrades, \$3.3 billion for the FBI, and \$221 million for training, equipment, and research and development programs to combat domestic terrorism, \$4.3 billion for the federal prison system; \$1.3 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration; and \$288 million for the Violence Against Women Act program—legislation that I have strongly supported and that provides

assistance to battered women and children.

Actions have consequences. If President Clinton vetoes this bill, he's putting the public's safety and well-being at risk both at home and abroad, and he's doing this all in an effort to play wedge politics, the President's veto threats ring especially hollow because this appropriations bill provides many proposals to help immigrants. The President himself has stated that he wants "to keep families together and to make our immigration policies more equitable." Well, this is exactly what the LIFE Act does.

So, please, I ask Mr. Clinton, sign CJS appropriations so we can keep all of these programs funded for the American people.

UPCOMING ELECTION AND THE FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is not often that the President of the United States, the editorial board of the Washington Times, People for the American Way and Gary Bauer all agree. They all do about the importance of the upcoming election to the rights of Americans in the decades ahead because of its impact on the third branch of the Federal Government, our federal judiciary.

This first national election of this new century will give the American people a choice—a clear choice for President and for Congress. Also at stake is the third branch of our Federal Government, the judiciary. It is this branch of government, headed by the Supreme Court, that is the guardian of our rights under the Constitution.

The next President is likely to nominate not only the next Justice on the United States Supreme Court, but possibly as many as four of the nine members of the Supreme Court over the course of his term. The next Senate will be called upon to vote to confirm or reject the President's nominations to the Supreme Court and the federal courts throughout the country.

These are the judges who can give meaning to the Bill of Rights in cases they decide every day or who can take away our rights and the authority of our elected representatives and impose their own narrow view of our Constitution. The rights of free speech, to practice any religion or no religion as we choose, the right to be treated equally by the government, the right to privacy and a woman's right to choose are fundamental rights that require constant vigilance and protection. This new century will pose challenges to our fundamental rights. Will we have a President and a Senate who will combine to provide judges to protect those rights, or ideologues who will erode them?

Nothing is more sharply at stake this November than the future of our constitutional rights.

Five-to-four—five-to-four is how closely the Supreme Court is now di-

viding on fundamental issues. One or two votes on the Supreme Court can, for the next half century, tip the balance away from the right to choose, away from rights of privacy, away from equal rights and toward government establishment of religion and government orthodoxy over free expression. One or two votes could make it much harder to protect the environment or pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

This last year by a five-to-four majority the Supreme Court held that a rape victim can bring no claim in federal court and that Congress was wrong to provide that remedy in the Violence Against Women Act. By five-to-four majorities the Supreme Court held that state employees have no rights to be paid for overtime work and have no protection from age discrimination, in spite of the laws passed by Congress. What will this mean for other laws prohibiting discrimination in the workplace, regulating wages and hours and health and providing safety standards for working Americans? And by a mere five-to-four vote, the Supreme Court decided that a Nebraska law imposed an undue burden on a woman's right to choose when it sought to prohibit medical procedures by vague language and without regard to the health of the woman.

I am confident that AL GORE and JOE LIEBERMAN will nominate women and men who understand the proper role of judges as protectors of our rights and the proper limits on judicial power. On Tuesday evening the President of the United States spoke about the importance of the election to the Supreme Court, to the federal courts generally, to our rights and to the distribution of power in our country. The President noted that "the American people will make a decision in this election which will shape the Supreme Court and the other federal courts, and the range of liberty and privacy, and the range of acceptable national action for years to come" and that "whether we have a new form of ultra-conservative judicial activism that rejects the government's authority to protect the rights of our citizens and interests of our citizens" is at stake in the November election. As the President explained:

Now we're just a vote or two away from reversing *Roe v. Wade* in the United States Supreme Court, and I think it's inevitable that the next President will have two appointments to the Supreme Court, could be more. Beyond that, as I intimated in my opening remarks, there has already been a majority in this Court for restricting the ability of Congress, even a bipartisan majority in Congress, to get the states to help implement public interest legislation that protects people.

There is much at stake in the next election and in the appointment of our Supreme Court Justices and other federal judges. In June, the People for the American Way Foundation published

an extensive report called "Courting Disaster: How a Scalia-Thomas Supreme Court Would Endanger Our Rights and Freedoms" that considered the future makeup of the Supreme Court and its likely effects on our fundamental rights. In his message accompanying that report, Ralph Neas observed:

The United States Supreme Court is just one or two new Justices away from curtailing or abolishing fundamental rights that millions of Americans take for granted.

The Washington Times lead editorial on Thursday noted pointedly:

Before the Supreme Court could overturn *Roe vs. Wade*, it would take the appointment of two pro-life justices to replace two pro-choice jurists—and their successful confirmation in what would undoubtedly be among the most explosive battles in U.S. Senate history.

Mr. Bauer made much the same point in a recent appearance on NBC's Today Show, in which he said: "I think if Governor Bush gets to put a couple of justices on the court, we will be more likely to protect our unborn children under the Constitution."

The Republican party platform talks of ideological litmus tests for judges and the end of a woman's right to choose. The Republican candidate for President says that his models for judicial nominees are the most conservative current Justices, Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas. If they formed the majority in the years ahead, our rights would be greatly diminished, protections approved by Congress would be routinely invalidated and our Constitution would be harshly reinterpreted.

While the other party's platform is filled with calls for rewriting the Constitution, we Democrats seek to preserve the Constitution and protect our fundamental rights as the guaranties of our freedoms. While the Republican Senate has delayed and dissembled over judicial nominations during the last six years—to the point that the Chief Justice of the United States chastised them for refusing to vote up or down—Vice President GORE, Senator DASCHLE and I have pressed for action on outstanding judicial nominees, including historic levels of women and minorities.

While Republican Senators all voted lockstep against the confirmation of the first African-American Justice on the Missouri Supreme Court to become a federal judge, Democrats voted for Ronnie White of Missouri, for Richard Paez and Marsha Berzon of California, for Sonia Sotomayor of New York, for Julio Fuentes of New Jersey, and for Barbara Lynn and Hilda Tagle of Texas.

While the Republican leadership of the Congress sought to intimidate federal judges, Vice President GORE and Democrats have been working for fair up or down votes on the nominations of

qualified women and minorities such as Enrique Moreno of Texas, Judge James Wynn of North Carolina, Roger Gregory of Virginia, Judge Helene White and Kathleen McCree Lewis of Michigan, Judge Legrome Davis of Philadelphia, Dolly Gee of California, and Rhonda Fields of the District of Columbia.

While the Republican candidate for President made a fine statement in which he called for votes on judicial nominations within 60 days, he has not prevailed upon the Senate Republican majority to treat nominees fairly now. Instead of 60 days, we see Judge Helene White's nomination to the Sixth Circuit pending more than 1400 days; Elena Kagan, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, pending 500 days; Judge James Wynn, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, pending more than 440 days; Kathleen McCree Lewis, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, pending more than 400 days; Enrique Moreno, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, pending more than 400 days; Bonnie Campbell, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, pending more than 240 days; Roger Gregory, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, pending more than 115 days; Lynette Norton, U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, pending more than 1300 days; Judge Legrome Davis, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, pending more than 800 days; Patricia Coan, U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, pending more than 500 days; Dolly Gee, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, pending more than 500 days; Rhonda Fields, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, pending more than 350 days; Linda Riegle, U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada, pending more than 180 days; Ricardo Morado, U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, pending more than 165 days. The Senate is adjourning leaving 33 judicial nominees whose nominations have been pending without Senate action for more than 60 days.

And while the Republican majority in the Senate refused for over three years to vote up or down on the confirmation of Bill Lann Lee to head the Civil Rights Division, this outstanding American continued to do his job on behalf of all Americans. With Vice President Gore's support, this Senate slight has finally been made right by the recess appointment of the first Asian-Pacific American to lead the Civil Rights Division.

The election next month presents a clear choice. The choice the American people make will determine what kind of judges sit on the Supreme Court and on federal courts all across the country. Those elected by the American people in November will select the judicial guardians of our liberties and the

enforcers of our constitutional protections next year and in the decades to come. The future for our children and grandchildren hangs in the balance. I am proud that to support AL GORE and JOE LIEBERMAN. They will nominate judges who understand the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Kelaher, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:25 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Sullivan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 614. An act to provide for regulatory reform in order to encourage investment, business, and economic development with respect to activities conducted on Indian lands.

S. 835. An act to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1586. An act to reduce the fractionated ownership of Indian Lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2719. An act to provide for business development and trade promotion for Native Americans, and for other purposes.

S. 2950. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Sand Creek Massacre Historic Site in the State of Colorado.

H.R. 2780. An act to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for organizations to find missing adults.

H.R. 2884. An act to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through fiscal year 2003.

H.R. 4404. An act to permit the payment of medical expenses incurred by the United States Park Police in the performance of duty to be made directly by the National Park Service, to allow for waiver and indemnification in mutual law enforcement agreements between the National Park Service and a State or political subdivision when required by State law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4957. An act to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the legislative authority for the Black Patriots Foundation to establish a commemorative work.

H.R. 5083. An act to extend the authority of the Los Angeles Unified School District to use certain park lands in the city of South Gate, California, which were acquired with amounts provided from the land and water conservation fund, for elementary school purposes.

H.R. 5157. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to ensure preservation of the records of the Freedmen's Bureau.

H.R. 5314. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate the adoption of re-

tired military dogs by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these dogs, and other persons capable of caring for these dogs.

H.R. 5331. An act to authorize the Frederick Douglass Gardens, Inc., to establish a memorial and gardens on Department of the Interior lands in the District of Columbia or its environs in honor and commemoration of Frederick Douglass.

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

ORDERS FOR SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 4 p.m. on Sunday, October 29. I further ask unanimous consent that on Sunday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate proceed to a period for morning business until 6:45 p.m., with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Sunday, it stand in recess until 5 p.m. on Monday, October 30; that following the routine convening requests, there be 2 hours for debate on the continuing resolution to be equally divided in the usual form.

I further ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on the passage of the continuing resolution, if the resolution contains funding for 1 day, if received from the House, at 7 p.m. on Monday, and that paragraph 4 of rule XII be waived. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled to occur at 7 p.m. on Sunday now begin at 6:45 p.m., assuming the papers have been received from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

I have no objection.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we will convene at 4 p.m. on Sunday with up to 2 hours 45 minutes equally divided for morning business. Under the previous order, there will be a vote occurring on