

whether the employees can take money for "fixing" a rule. The Department has declined to do so twice.

In answering our first letter, DOI said the two had nothing to do with the rule. Senators DOMENICI, NICKLES, and I wrote back, this time providing public documents proving their involvement, and asking them, based upon the evidence, to withdraw the rule.

The response to our second letter was to acknowledge that the two apparently did have some involvement in the rule, but the decision to change the rule was made prior to their official involvement.

The Department's argument is misleading. The two federal employees worked hand-in-glove with POGO to convince the Department to craft a rule to POGO's liking. According to POGO's Executive Director, POGO even arranged for the employees to be specifically requested to testify before a House subcommittee to put pressure on the Department to start a rulemaking.

All the facts suggest that these employees were influential, if not instrumental, in the decision to issue the rule and the content of the rule. After influencing the decision to issue the rule, the employees took part in the public comment phase of the rulemaking. In other words, they were up to their elbows in this issue from start to finish.

A skeptic could conclude that the employees, working with POGO and the trial attorneys who stood to gain from out-of-court settlements, earned their "rewards." POGO, after all, admits they paid them \$350,000 each. The Department's position appears to be that POGO paid the wrong bureaucrats.

The public integrity of the public rulemaking process is at stake, even if Secretary Babbitt fails to see it.

In our nation, federal employees are not paid to push rule changes which benefit one party in a lawsuit. This is a dangerous precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, we directed the MMS to simplify the oil royalty payments so that companies would know what their fair share is. This is what MMS has come forward with as a simplification.

Companies still do not know what they will owe. They want to pay their fair share. I want them to pay their fair share. Whether they have in the past is not an issue. We are trying to have a fair setting of taxes.

The question is: Who makes tax policy in this country? Is it Congress or is it unelected bureaucrats who are not accountable to the people? We are talking about a 1-year moratorium so that this can be worked out in a way that is acceptable to Congress.

The Senator from California says this only affects 5 percent of the producers. I have a letter from the California Independent Petroleum Association, representing 450 independent oil and gas producers, which says:

It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5 percent of all oil producers. It affects every California producer on Federal land.

Madam President, I urge a vote for cloture so we can have a fair up-or-down vote on this amendment so that Congress will set the policy of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 1603 to H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 271 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bingaman	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Breaux	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Shelby
Bunning	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Burns	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Hutchison	Snowe
Chafee	Inhofe	Specter
Cochran	Inouye	Stevens
Collins	Jeffords	Thomas
Coverdell	Kyl	Thompson
Craig	Landrieu	Thurmond
Crapo	Lincoln	Voynovich
DeWine	Lugar	Warner
Domenici	Mack	
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—40

Akaka	Feingold	Mikulski
Baucus	Feinstein	Moynihan
Bayh	Harkin	Murray
Biden	Hollings	Reed
Boxer	Johnson	Reid
Bryan	Kennedy	Robb
Byrd	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Schumer
Daschle	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dodd	Leahy	Wellstone
Dorgan	Levin	Wyden
Durbin	Lieberman	
Edwards	Lott	

NOT VOTING—5

Bennett	Hatch	Sessions
Graham	Helms	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 55, the nays 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate failed to invoke cloture on the pending Hutchison amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated on the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry.

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

Mr. LOTT. I understand the Chair will now put the question on this nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MARYANNE TRUMP BARRY, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 210, which the clerk will report.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I also indicate that we will be prepared to confirm two further judicial nominations by consent before we close business this evening. Therefore, there will be no further votes this evening, and the next vote will occur at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday in relation to the Bryan forestry amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the confirmation of Maryanne Trump Barry to the Third Circuit—and I predict that she will be confirmed—will bring to 15 the total number of federal judges considered by the Senate all year.

While I am appreciative of this opportunity to consider this nomination, I note that the Republican leadership has chosen to skip over the nominations of Marsha Berzon, Judge Richard Paez, and Ray Fisher to the Ninth Circuit. These nominations have all been on the Senate calendar for as long or longer than that of Ms. Barry. The Republican leadership has, again, skipped over the nomination of Justice Ronnie White for the federal court in Missouri, as well.

All of these nominations could and should have been considered before the August recess. Indeed the nominations of Judge Paez and Justice White, should have been considered when they were first reported last year.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry to the United States Court of Appeals of the Third Circuit.

I commend Senator HATCH for moving forward with this nomination. We must ensure that the federal bench is at full strength so that our citizens will receive justice promptly and fairly. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee deserves thanks from all who believe that our court system is at the core of our precious democratic structure.

Judge Barry's reputation is well known and she has excellent credentials. In 1983, she was nominated to a federal district court judgeship by President Reagan, and since being confirmed for that post she has compiled an impressive record and become a nationally recognized expert on a wide range of criminal and civil law matters.

Her knowledge of criminal law led Chief Justice Rehnquist to appoint her to chair the Committee on Criminal Law of the Judicial Conference of the United States, a position she held from 1993–1996. Additionally, the Federal Judicial Center asked her to make an instructional videotape called "How to Try a Complex Criminal Case" and that tape is played for all new district court judges at their orientation seminar.

In the area of civil law, Judge Barry has issued many important rulings including a decision that Blue Cross was required to pay for a bone marrow transplant for a terminally ill young girl who would have died without the procedure.

New Jersey residents are particularly proud of her decision holding New York City responsible and in contempt for failing to obey a court order designed to prevent garbage and medical waste from New York's Fresh Kills Landfill from drifting onto New Jersey's shore. Not only do her judicial colleagues hold her in high regard, Judge Barry is also well-respected by the many attorneys who have appeared before her. They praise her command of the law, her professional demeanor, and her razor-sharp wit.

As a result of her tenure in the U.S. attorney's office, her 16 years of outstanding service at the district court level, and her legal expertise, Judge Barry is well-prepared for elevation to the circuit court. In fact, she has already sat on the Court of Appeals—by designation—and has written several opinions.

Mr. President, I highly recommend Judge Barry for elevation to the third circuit. As some of my colleagues may know, the third circuit is currently facing a judicial emergency, and the appointment of Judge Barry will help.

To further address this crisis, I hope that the Judiciary Committee will soon take up the nomination of another excellent candidate for the third circuit, Judge Julio Fuentes. I would also be remiss if I did not point out that the elevation of Judge Barry will create another vacancy on the District Court of New Jersey, and so it would be essential that the committee move forward with the nomination of Faith Hochberg to that court.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Maryanne Trump Barry's confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have followed Judge Barry's nomination closely as it has moved through the confirmation proc-

ess. During this time, I have been impressed by her candor, intelligence, and qualifications for the position. She has moved through the process quickly, and I believe the overwhelming support for her nomination is evidence of her ability to ultimately fulfill the obligations of serving on the Third Circuit.

Those who know Judge Barry, and have had the pleasure of working with her, have spoken openly of her integrity and thorough knowledge of the law. Some have highlighted her decency, while others have focused upon her razor-sharp wit. However, everyone has agreed on one point—Judge Barry has developed a reputation as a skilled jurist with a judgment and temperament that are highly respected by her peers. The other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee agreed with this assessment, and I was pleased that Judge Barry's nomination was passed out of the Committee by voice-vote on July 29th.

For those who are unfamiliar with Judge Barry's distinguished career, she has graduated with Master's and law degrees from Columbia and Hofstra Universities respectively. Judge Barry first worked for the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey and quickly rose through the ranks. She served as Chief of the Appeals Division, and then as a first assistant to the U.S. Attorney. At the time, Judge Barry was the highest-ranking female prosecutor in any major U.S. Attorney's Office in the country.

In 1983, Judge Barry was appointed to the U.S. District Court by President Reagan. For almost 16 years, she has served as a pragmatic and vocal presence on the bench in Newark, New Jersey. As a former President of the Association of the Federal Bar of the State of New Jersey, Judge Barry has had a tremendous impact on policy across the State. She currently serves on its advisory board, and continues to be highly regarded for her insights and opinions. Judge Barry has consistently impressed me as an extraordinary woman, and one who will continue to distinguish herself. I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The Senator from Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, with respect to the Interior appropriations

bill, there will be a vote on or in relation to the Bryan amendment and the second-degree Wyden amendment tomorrow morning at 10:30.

It may well be that that will be the last contested matter in connection with this appropriations bill other than the disposition of the Hutchison amendment. I am not entirely certain of that at this point. But we are close to having agreed-upon managers' amendments both with respect to legislative matters and with respect to money matters, with the exception of the motion to reconsider the invocation of cloture.

For that reason, this is a notice and a request to Members that if they have other matters they wish debated, or if they have other matters they wish brought to the managers' attention, they should do so very promptly. We will not in the managers' amendment dispose of all the amendments which were reserved, but I think we probably will be able to take care of all of those that look as if they would be otherwise brought up and voted on.

We are tantalizingly close to finishing. But, of course, we will not finish or go to third reading under the present circumstances at least until after disposition of the motion to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture, and that motion will certainly pass, and there will be at least one more vote on cloture itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I would just like to comment upon the vote the Senate has just taken on whether to shut down debate on the Hutchison amendment. I thank very much those colleagues who voted against that cloture motion. I think it is very important that the light and the truth be shone upon this matter. I think the way to do it is to have more discussion.

I just want to say to the Senate that when I made my 2½-minute presentation, it is always very difficult to say everything in your heart in 2½ minutes. But I said the reason I am doing this—there is no other reason in the world for me to be delaying a vote on an amendment—is that I love the Senate too much to see it be a party to such a scheme by just 5 percent of the oil companies to essentially rob this Treasury of millions and millions of dollars.

This is the fourth time that Senator Hutchison has attempted to pass this rider. It never had a Senate vote before. This is the first vote in any way about the Hutchison amendment.

By the way, I know that some people who voted aye on the cloture motion will vote with me on the substance. I am looking forward to that.

But the bottom line is, when we look at this closely, we see a number of things—that most of the oil companies are doing the right thing on their royalty payments. Ninety-five percent of