

Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2000. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the National Rural Development Council.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8 at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 8, 2000 at 2 p.m., in open session, to receive testimony on national security space programs, policies and operations, in review of the fiscal year 2001 defense authorization request and the Future Years Defense Program.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privilege of the floor be granted to Michelle Greenstein during the pendency of the Export Administration Act.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mike Daly, a fellow in the office of Senator ABRAHAM, be granted floor privileges for the period of consideration of S. 1712, the Export Administration Act of 1999.

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

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a research assistant on my staff, Miss Tamara Jones, be allowed floor privileges.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 9. I further ask consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be

reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin the postcloture debate on the Ninth Circuit judicial nominations of Ms. Berzon and Judge Paez under the previous order.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of postcloture time, the Senate begin a period of morning business until 2 p.m. and resume morning business following the scheduled votes during morning business. I ask unanimous consent that Senators may speak for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions:

Senator HUTCHINSON for 10 minutes;

Senator MURKOWSKI for 10 minutes;

Senator DOMENICI for 10 minutes;

Senator BROWNBACK for 30 minutes;

Senator BAUCUS for 10 minutes;

Senator MIKULSKI for 15 minutes;

Senator WYDEN for 10 minutes;

And Senator LIEBERMAN for 40 minutes.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 9:30 a.m. We will have 4½ hours postcloture debate on the Berzon and Paez nominations. Under the previous order, the votes will occur at 2 p.m. The Senate will return to morning business for the purpose of bill introductions and statements. The Senate may also have consideration tomorrow of any Executive or Legislative Calendar items that are available for action.

Does Senator LEAHY wish to propose a request at this time?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished leader—once he has completed, and I realize there are others waiting—if I might be recognized for not more than 5 minutes to refer to the unanimous consent agreement on the judges. I did not want to delay earlier.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you very much.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following statements by Senator LEAHY and Senator LANDRIEU.

Does the Senator wish to specify a time?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I amend my request to say 5 minutes for Senator LEAHY and 15 minutes for Senator LANDRIEU.

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

Mr. LOTT. Thank you very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, first of all I wish to thank the distinguished leader for his usual courtesy. He and I have served together for a long time. I do appreciate that.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to underscore what I have said, what the distinguished Senator from California has said, and what others have said in support of the Paez and Berzon nominations.

Judge Paez has waited more than 4 years to have his nomination heard on this floor—4 years—notwithstanding the fact that he has the highest rating the American Bar Association can give a nominee. He has one of the most distinguished records of any nominee, Republican or Democrat, to come before this body since I have been here.

Similarly, Ms. Berzon has waited for more than 2 years, an unconscionable period of time—again, a woman with an extraordinary background and the highest of ratings from the American Bar Association.

They have for some reason been held to a higher standard than most judicial nominees. I do not recall a situation where a nominee has had to go through these kinds of hoops to get here and have an up or down vote.

Again, I compliment the majority leader and the Democratic leader for helping us put together a successful cloture petition on each of these nominations. We have now 85 or 86 votes to move forward.

I hope the Senate will not shame itself by taking the unprecedented step tomorrow of moving to postpone indefinitely either of these extraordinary nominees. It is a fact that one can make a motion to suspend or indefinitely—that is true—or to indefinitely postpone. One can make such a motion. But it would be unprecedented for a judicial nominee. We have asked informally and I have asked the presiding officer and through him the parliamentarian and no precedent for such a motion against a judicial nomination following cloture has been provided.

I defy anybody to point out, certainly in my lifetime—as I said earlier, I am 59 years old—to point out in my lifetime where a judicial nominee has gone through the extraordinary hoops of multiple nominations hearings, being reported favorably twice, having a nomination have to be resubmitted by the President Congress after Congress, being forced to wait more than 4 years to be debated, getting past a filibuster, invoking cloture with 85 or 86 votes—an overwhelming majority of the Senate—and then having a motion to indefinitely postpone, in effect, to kill the nomination.

It would shame the Senate, No. 1, to even bring up such a motion, but certainly to allow such a motion to be