

with the most able and talented individuals available. That is why I am very pleased that President Clinton chose to nominate Mr. Droney to serve on the Federal bench.

Chris Droney is a man of strong character, and I believe that his skills and intellect will enable him to serve the country with honor and integrity as a Federal judge. Since 1993, Mr. Droney has served as the U.S. attorney for Connecticut. During his tenure, he has been well-received by the judiciary and law enforcement agencies and has played a key role in the State's crack-down on street gangs. The Justice Department's last evaluation of his office concluded that Mr. Droney is, and I quote, "strongly committed to the Department's law enforcement priorities and has demonstrated significant leadership in the law enforcement community, as witnessed by the remarkable cooperation among the law enforcement agencies through the District." We are proud that the Justice Department has recognized what we in Connecticut already know: Chris Droney is an outstanding lawyer and public servant.

Prior to becoming U.S. attorney, Mr. Droney was in private practice in Hartford specializing in civil litigation. He also served as mayor of West Hartford from 1985 to 1989, where he did an excellent job.

He has been very active in a number of charitable organizations, and his community service has earned him several honors and awards. In particular, he was named Citizen of the Year by the Connecticut division of the Boy Scouts of America, and he received the Distinguished Law Enforcement Award from the Hartford Police Union.

Christopher Droney is an honest, forthright, and intelligent individual, who is highly qualified to serve on the Federal bench. I am confident that he will serve Connecticut well as a district judge for many years to come, and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Christopher Droney, of Connecticut, to be U.S. District Judge for District of Connecticut. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Abraham	Byrd	Dorgan
Akaka	Campbell	Durbin
Allard	Chafee	Enzi
Ashcroft	Cleland	Faircloth
Baucus	Coats	Feingold
Bennett	Cochran	Feinstein
Biden	Collins	Ford
Bingaman	Conrad	Frist
Bond	Coverdell	Glenn
Boxer	Craig	Gorton
Breaux	D'Amato	Graham
Brownback	Daschle	Gramm
Bryan	DeWine	Grams
Bumpers	Dodd	Grassley
Burns	Domenici	Gregg

Hagel	Leahy	Roth
Harkin	Levin	Santorum
Hatch	Lieberman	Sarbanes
Helms	Lott	Sessions
Hollings	Lugar	Shelby
Hutchinson	Mack	Smith (NH)
Hutchison	McCain	Smith (OR)
Inhofe	McConnell	Snowe
Inouye	Mikulski	Specter
Jeffords	Moseley-Braun	Stevens
Johnson	Moynihan	Thomas
Kempthorne	Murkowski	Thompson
Kennedy	Murray	Thurmond
Kerrey	Nickles	Torricelli
Kerry	Reed	Warner
Kohl	Reid	Wellstone
Kyl	Robb	Wyden
Landrieu	Roberts	
Lautenberg	Rockefeller	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DODD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF JANET C. HALL OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Janet C. Hall, of Connecticut, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I support this judge. I would like to make a comment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. The Senator should be allowed to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I noted several of my colleagues, a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, signed a letter this morning concerning campaign finance reform and a number of them came and spoke about the urgency of the issue. Obviously, we welcome that activity. But I want to point out, and point out in the strongest possible terms, that this issue has to be brought up in a bipartisan fashion. It is not 51 votes that are necessary in order to pass any legislation through this body on an issue of this importance, it is going to be 60 votes.

I have been working with the majority leader in a most cooperative fashion on this issue. I believe that we can reach an agreement which would be satisfactory to all parties. I do not believe it will be helpful, in any way, to divide up on party lines on this issue.

I again thank the majority leader but I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am confident we can move forward on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, A question has been raised about statistics. I would point out that during President Bush's last year, with the Democrats in the control of the Senate, by August we had confirmed 53 of the 65 nominees sent to us by the Republican President, notwithstanding the "Thurmond rule" which calls for a slowdown in confirmations during a Presidential year—53 out of 65.

In this the first year of President Clinton's second term, the Republican-controlled Senate confirmed only 9 out of 61 judicial nominees sent by the President to the Senate by August. So the relevant statistical comparison is 53 out of 65 when Democrats were helping Republicans, but when Republicans are in control and there is a Democratic President, only 9 out of 61.

I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. President, while I am pleased that we are voting today on three judicial nominees and I am supporting them, I am concerned about those whom we are not voting upon—in particular two fine nominees from California.

I am also concerned about what appears to me to be a plan to force the splitting of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by crippling its ability to do its work.

Ten of the twenty-eight judgeships on that court are now vacant—36 percent of the bench.

I will ask unanimous consent that a table showing the status of each vacancy within the ninth circuit be placed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I believe that proponents of the ninth circuit split wish to keep these seats vacant as long as possible, so that the vacant judgeships can then be transferred to the new twelfth circuit, and filled by judges who they hope will be more in line with their own political philosophy.

Unfortunately, this plan is substantially impairing the ability of the ninth circuit to do its job, and impeding justice for the millions of Americans who live within the ninth circuit—creating what the Honorable Proctor Hug, chief justice of the ninth circuit, has called a vacancy crisis.

The time has come for the Senate to end this death by attrition, and act upon these nominations, so that the ninth circuit can get on with its work.

These votes we are taking today will clear out all the judicial nominees who remain on the executive calendar, except for three, two of whom, as I have mentioned, are from California.

These two nominees, Margaret Morrow and Anthony Ishii, have had their nominations pending longer, both in the Senate and on the floor of the Senate, than have two of the three nominees upon whom we are voting today.

Margaret Morrow was first nominated almost a year and a half ago, on

March 18, 1996. She was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee on June 27, 1996, but the Senate failed to take further action upon her nomination before we adjourned.

She was nominated again in the beginning of this year, and favorably reported by the committee again on June 12, 1997.

Anthony Ishii was nominated on February 12, 1997, and has been on the floor since July 10.

In contrast, Christopher Droney and Janet Hall were nominated on June 5, 1997, and have only been on the floor since July 31.

So while I am happy that we are acting upon their nominations, I hope that we will soon act upon the older nominations of Margaret Morrow and Anthony Ishii.

Let's bring their nominations up, debate them if necessary, and vote them up or down.

I urge the distinguished majority leader to do this, I thank the chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent a table regarding the ninth circuit vacancies be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Court and vacancy created by—	Reason	Vacancy date	Nominee	Nomination date
NINTH CIRCUIT				
CCA:				
Breezer, Robert R.	Senior	7/31/96		
Canby, William C. Jr.	Senior	5/23/96		
Farris, Jerome	Senior	3/4/95	McKeown, M. Margaret	1/7/97
Hall, Cynthia Holcomb	Senior	8/31/97		
Leavy, Edward	Senior	5/19/97	Graber, Susan	7/30/97
Noonan, John T.	Senior	1/1/97		
Norris, William A.	Senior	7/7/94	Fletcher, William A.	1/7/97
Poole, Cecil F.	Senior	1/15/96	Paez, Richard A.	1/7/97
Wallace, J. Clifford	Senior	4/8/96	Ware, James S.	6/27/97
Wiggins, Charles E.	Senior	12/31/96		
CA-N:				
Aguilar, Robert P.	Senior	6/24/96		
Jensen, D. Lowell	Senior	6/27/97	Breyer, Charles R.	7/24/97
Lynch, Eugene F.	Senior	3/14/97	Jenkins, Martin J.	7/24/97
CA-E:				
Coyle, Robert E.	Senior	5/13/96	Ishii, Anthony W.	2/12/97
Garcia, Edward J.	Senior	11/24/96	Damrell, Frank C.	2/24/97
CA-C:				
Gadbois, Richard A. Jr.	Disabled	1/24/96	Morrow, Margaret M.	1/7/97
Hupp, Harry L.	Senior	1/1/97		
Rafesdie, Edward	Senior	1/6/96	Snyder, Christina A.	1/7/97
Takasugi, Robert M.	Senior	9/30/96	Moreno, Carlos R.	7/31/97
CA-S: Rhoades, John S. Sr.	Senior	11/4/95	Lasry, Lynne R.	2/12/97
HI: Fong, Harold M.	Deceased	4/20/95	Mollway, Susan Oki	1/7/97
OR:				
Frye, Helen	Senior	12/10/95		
Redden, James	Senior	3/13/95	Aiken, Ann L.	1/7/97
WA-E: McDonald, Alan A.	Senior	12/13/96		

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Ms. Hall is one of the premier litigators in the State of Connecticut, and I know that her impressive work experience, both in Government service and in private practice, along with her intelligence and character, will enable her to become an excellent Federal judge.

After working in the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department from 1975 to 1979, Ms. Hall joined the Hartford law firm of Robinson & Cole, where she has been a partner since 1982. Since returning to private practice, she has handled numerous matters before both Federal and State appellate courts, and her work has focused primarily on complex commercial litigation.

Ms. Hall is respected throughout Connecticut's legal community for her intelligence and sense of fairness, but she is best known for her dedicated work ethic. More than one associate at her firm described her as the hardest working, most prepared lawyer that they had ever known. Not only does Ms. Hall push herself, but she also expects a lot from those around her. Her former secretary said that the only time that she was bored during 14 years of working with Ms. Hall was when she was on maternity leave with her third child. However, while Ms. Hall can be tough on others, she always demanded even more from herself.

Part of me is actually relieved that I'm no longer an attorney in Connecticut, because I anticipate that trying a case before Ms. Hall would not be an easy day's work.

Janet Hall is unquestionably an excellent attorney, but she is also a person of great character and integrity. While Ms. Hall always worked hard to fulfill her responsibilities at her firm, she always managed to keep her career in perspective, and her family was always her top priority.

After successfully arguing a case before the U.S. Supreme Court, she was discussing the case with a group of associates. When asked to describe what was the most important thing to remember about arguing the case before the highest Court in the land, she said, "The most important thing was to bring my family."

In closing, Janet Hall is an honest, forthright, and intelligent individual, who is highly qualified to serve on the Federal bench, and all of my colleagues should be proud to vote in support of her nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Janet C. Hall, of Connecticut, to be United States district judge for the District of Connecticut? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced, yeas 98, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Feingold	Lugar
Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Ford	McCain
Ashcroft	Frist	McConnell
Baucus	Glenn	Mikulski
Bennett	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gramm	Murkowski
Bond	Grams	Murray
Boxer	Grassley	Nickles
Breaux	Gregg	Reed
Brownback	Hagel	Reid
Bryan	Harkin	Robb
Bumpers	Hatch	Roberts
Burns	Helms	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hollings	Roth
Campbell	Hutchison	Santorum
Chafee	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cleland	Inouye	Sessions
Coats	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
D'Amato	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Enzi	Lott	

NAYS—1

Faircloth
Not VOTING—1
Hutchinson

The nomination was confirmed.
Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.