

THOMAS about the legislative calendar, or I might be able to talk to other Members of the Senate Republican caucus, but I prefer to deal with the majority leader. I think we ought to see the reciprocal here. I have not had a chance to see it or check with my colleagues. Until that happens, nothing is going to get done on this side.

Mr. LOTT. As I indicated earlier, I will be glad to try this again later on today once you have a chance to talk to your colleagues. I will be glad to come back to this at 4, 5, 6 o'clock, so we can deal with this issue. I know there are Senators interested in it on both sides. So I will put you on notice, I have tried to bring it up. I will try it again later. If we do not get it today, I will try it again tomorrow.

At some point, I want to say this, if the objection continues to be heard that would bring it up under unanimous consent, then I will want to schedule time for it and move to bring it up, have some debate. I am willing to do that, too. I am just trying to find a way to get some of these things up and get them considered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we might want to bring it up under regular order. I am told, just now, we may have amendments to the legislation. So that might be the most appropriate vehicle.

Mr. LOTT. I might say, if there are going to be a lot of amendments to what I thought was going to be relatively noncontroversial, that will affect when it comes up, because we do have appropriations bills that take priority over everything else.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 2980

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate turn to Calendar No. 421, H.R. 2980, a bill relating to stalking, and the bill be then read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the measure appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Because we have amendments pending, we are not prepared at this point to agree to this unanimous consent as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 4 p.m.

There being no objection, at 2:27 p.m., the Senate recessed until 4 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. 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 quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR MURRAY AND THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I rise to make a statement on behalf of my colleague from Washington, Senator MURRAY. Senator MURRAY is unable to attend today's session of the Senate, because she has been called away to participate in very important national business. She is charting the course of Democratic priorities for the balance of this century, and into the next, as part of a distinguished group of 16 Americans meeting today to write the National Democratic platform on which the President and all of us will run this fall.

As a person who came to public service as an outsider, with a message of commonsense middle class values, Senator MURRAY is uniquely qualified to make sure the 1996 National Democratic Platform reflects the hopes and dreams and concerns of all Americans. Her priority is making modern Government policies relevant to families in particular, including workers, young parents, senior citizens, and all people looking to work hard, get ahead, and live the American dream. I speak for all my colleagues on this side in saying that we are grateful for her leadership, and we take comfort in knowing she is bringing an important personal touch to our national agenda.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The legislative clerk continued to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 6 p.m. this evening.

The motion was agreed to, and at 5:17 p.m., the Senate recessed until 6 p.m.;

whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I had hoped that we could come to some agreement with regard to these numerous matters that we had taken up, but it does not look like that is going to be possible; therefore, I intend to ask unanimous consent again on a number of items.

There has been a concerted effort on behalf of the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, and the Senator from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, and the Senators from Nevada to see if an agreement could be reached.

I thought we had one that was time-consuming but fair to all concerned, but at the last minute it appears that that is not possible after an effort to get an agreement that would have allowed the nuclear waste issue to be brought up later on in July. I think the 23d, for limited debate, a vote on cloture, then bringing it back up after the August recess, the first day we are back, with a vote and then 30 hours of debate, and then a vote on final passage, and then go to conference.

That is an awful lot of time when the Senate has limited time to do its work, but it is a way to allow the Senators from Nevada to make their point and to get this issue resolved. But then we find, no; they want to reserve the ability to add three more hurdles to filibuster and get votes on going to conference. That was a river too far. There is a limit to what we can do in terms of agreeing to what is obviously just, you know, a dilatory agreement. So it was not acceptable in that condition.

We will be in session tomorrow. Hopefully we can make some progress then. If not, we will go next Tuesday to the cloture vote. But it does gridlock the Senate. The inability to get this agreement between the key players ties up the Department of Defense appropriations bill and ties up everything else that is pending around here. I think that is really unfortunate because we need to get the agreement on these issues if at all possible.

Perhaps there has been some positive result of our discussions earlier today. At least now I do have something in writing with regard to the medical savings accounts. I just received it within the last 15 minutes. I will take a serious look at it and discuss it with the key Senators involved on the Republican side in the House and Senate. We need to get this done.

I still find it indefensible that we have not appointed conferees on health insurance reform for 80 days. I have the conferees. It is a fair division. Even if we get an agreement on the medical savings accounts, we still are going to need a conference to agree on the final

details of exactly what the rest of the bill will entail even though almost everybody knows what is in it. But we need to make sure that the Senators and the Congressmen on both sides have a chance to go over it and make sure that the words are as we think they are supposed to be.

So I am very disappointed about this. I even wondered once again if there was an intent not to have any votes tonight or tomorrow from the very beginning. The Senator from South Dakota, the Democratic leader, assured me that is not the case, and I accept his word. But it sure looks to me like maybe there was some knowledge that there were not going to be any votes tonight.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DASCHLE. The majority leader raises the question on the floor, so I think it is important that I again reiterate to him for the Record that there was absolutely no desire on my part to avoid doing business, whatever the business may be. There are obviously some very serious questions that the distinguished Senators from Nevada have attempted to raise in light of their concern on nuclear waste. But at no time have I instructed members of our caucus that they should feel free to leave.

Our desire is to get some work done, regardless of whether we make a great deal of progress or not, at least to be here to try to get the work done. I have emphasized that. I cautioned them not to leave because there could be votes either tonight or tomorrow. I reiterate that statement now, as I did this afternoon in our Democratic policy committee. So I think that point ought to be very clear to everybody. I hope we can put that rumor to rest once and for all.

Mr. LOTT. I appreciate that assurance.

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LEAHY. I want to totally confirm what the Democratic leader has said. I am one of the more senior Members on our side, and I certainly would be one who would have known had there been any such plan. I can assure both leaders that had there been such, I would not be here talking to the two Senators. I would probably be on the front porch of my farm in Vermont right now planning to spend the weekend seeing constituents and working from my computer connection in Vermont rather than here.

So I can assure both my friends, who are my friends, the two leaders, that had there been any such plan on this side, first, I would have known about it, but, second, I would be in Vermont by now.

Mr. LOTT. Having been through good times and bad times with the Senator from Vermont, that is very comforting. I accept that, and I thank the Senator for that assurance.

Can I inquire of the Democratic leader if there is a possibility we could get an agreement on the taxpayers bill of rights tonight? I thought we kind of worked through that. I think it could maybe be some sign of good faith here if we could get that done. Again, it is bipartisan. The American people deserve it. Why do we not do it? If it would be possible, I would like to try to get that agreed to tonight.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, responding to the distinguished majority leader, we have consulted with the senior Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN. It is my understanding that, on the assumption that we can insert in the RECORD at the time of the consideration of H.R. 2337 a colloquy between Senators ROTH and GLENN concerning confidentiality of records, I think we would be prepared to move the taxpayers bill of rights. That is assuming, of course—and the distinguished majority leader has been very good about moving these judges and keeping them ahead, but I would like to do that as well today if we could.

Mr. LOTT. If we could get this done, then we could maybe—I have always maintained that the only way you get these things moving is to get them moving one at a time. If we get a little reciprocity, we get a little something here and something there, then we can get this locomotive moving again.

Mr. BRYAN. Would the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. Let me respond to the taxpayers bill of rights. It is my understanding, with regard to Senator GLENN's concerns, that the Finance Committee chairman has agreed to move, in a future appropriate tax bill, Senator GLENN's amendment to impose criminal penalties for the unauthorized browsing of confidential taxpayer information by IRS employees. I believe that is the assurance that he wanted. That is my understanding, and I feel sure that would be lived up to.

Mr. DASCHLE. I am informed that that is the commitment he was looking for. On that basis, I think we would be prepared to move to that particular piece of legislation.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to.

Mr. BRYAN. What is the nature of the unanimous-consent agreement that is being propounded?

Mr. LOTT. I did not actually propound one. I am asking whether it is possible that the concerns that have been raised have been worked out. I understand they have been, and this would be a unanimous-consent request to pass the taxpayers bill of rights. In view of that, let me go through, then, some requests.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1936

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for an agreement with regard to nuclear waste. I ask unanimous consent that

the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1936, the nuclear waste bill, on Tuesday, July 23, at 12 noon, and immediately after the bill is called up, the majority leader be recognized for the purpose of filing a cloture motion on the bill, and there then be 15 minutes for debate prior to the cloture vote.

This is the latest version. The time is equally divided in the usual form, with the cloture vote occurring at 2:15 on Tuesday, July 23. If cloture is invoked, the bill will immediately be laid aside and it will become the pending business on Tuesday, September 3, 1996, at a time to be determined by the two leaders; and following final passage of the bill, if in the affirmative, then it would be in order for the Senate to insist on its amendments, if applicable, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all without further action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRYAN. I object.

Mr. LOTT. Could I inquire of the Senator from Nevada what his objection is to that?

Mr. BRYAN. I would be happy to state my objection. As you know, the Senators from Nevada have worked with the majority leader, with those on the other side of the aisle who are proponents of this legislation. We have had an exchange of proposals, as the majority leader knows, during the course of this afternoon.

The latest proposal that was brought back by the other side of the aisle had a provision in it which had not previously been discussed and was unacceptable, so we could not accept it.

Mr. LOTT. The provision with regard to going to conference?

Mr. BRYAN. That is the provision that had not heretofore been discussed, as the majority leader knows, and we had assumed within the parameters of what was being discussed all rights would be reserved under rule XXII, including any options that might be available to us in the event that this legislation moved to conference.

So it was on that basis that we interposed our objection.

Mr. LOTT. I want to make sure I understood. I just note that if every opportunity was taken with regard to going to conference, that could lead to at least three more votes, three more debatable motions, and would take up days, and therefore without that, we have accomplished almost nothing with that.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. REID. I do have the right to object. I think there has been an objection. I say respectfully to my friend the majority leader and to the minority leader, we have an obligation to move legislation along here. We agree with the statement of the majority leader, we should move legislation, but take it a step at a time.

What we thought we were doing, the Senators from Nevada, is moving this—