

I want to make sure there is no misunderstanding and that we don't go into a recess with the President not understanding that we are very serious about that. It is not just me putting a hold on all judicial nominees for the remaining year of his term of service, but 16 other Senators have agreed to do that.

It would be very easy for the President to just go ahead and comply with that agreement he has in his letter of June 15, 1999, rather than feeling compelled to make judicial appointments during this recess.

I want to serve notice to make it very clear.

I received a letter from the President. He did not honor me with a personal letter. It came from John Podesta, Chief of Staff to the President. Without reading the whole letter, because it is rather lengthy, it says that they might not comply with this.

I want to make sure it is abundantly clear without any doubt in anyone's mind in the White House—I will refer back to this document I am talking about right now—that in the event the President makes recess appointments, we will put holds on all judicial nominations for the remainder of his term. It is very fair for me to stand here and eliminate any doubt in the President's mind of what we will do.

EXHIBIT I

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, DC, June 10, 1999.

Hon. WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I appreciate our conversation this morning, and our mutual desire to come to an understanding about recess appointments. We have often worked together to help promote the smooth operation of the government, and I believe that we can once again come to an agreement.

As you know, the recent recess appointment of the U.S. Ambassador to Luxembourg has caused great concern to many members of the Senate. I believe that it would be constructive for us to reach an understanding in principle on how we will now proceed to ensure that we avoid similar sparring between the Executive Branch and the Senate in the future.

I agree that we will use the understanding reached between President Reagan and Senator Byrd in 1985, cited by your Chief of Staff today. That understanding, described in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18, 1985, states "... prior to any recess breaks, the White House would inform the Majority Leader and [the Minority Leader] of any recess appointment which might be contemplated during such recess. They would do so in advance sufficiently to allow the leadership on both sides to perhaps take action to fill whatever vacancies that might be imperative during such a break."

I believe that this is both a reasonable and a constructive framework. Following this precedent will help us to proceed in a cooperative and expeditious manner on future nominees.

Mr. President, I appreciate your stated desire to work with me on this issue, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

TRENT LOTT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 15, 1999.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I was pleased to learn from your letter of June 10 that you agree with my Chief of staff on the matter of recess appointments. As Mr. Podesta indicated in his letter to you, my Administration has made it a practice to notify Senate leaders in advance of our intentions in this regard, and this precedent will continue to be observed.

I share your opinion that the understanding reached in 1985 between President Reagan and Senator Byrd cited in your letter remains a fair and constructive framework, which my Administration will follow. I also appreciate your view that our nominees merit expeditious consideration through bipartisan cooperation among Senators; I sincerely hope that this spirit will prevail in the days to come.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, November 10, 1999.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to urge your compliance with the spirit of our recent agreement regarding recess appointments and to inform you that there will be serious consequences if you act otherwise.

If you do make recess appointments during the upcoming recess which violate the spirit of our agreement, then we will respond by placing holds on all judicial nominees. The result would be a complete breakdown in cooperation between our two branches of government on this issue which could prevent the confirmation of any such nominees next year.

We do not want this to happen. We urge you to cooperate in good faith with the Majority Leader concerning all contemplated recess appointments.

Sincerely,

Jesse Helms, Wayne Allard, Michael Crapo, Michael B. Enzi, Bob Smith, George Voinovich, Pete B. Domenici, James M. Inhofe, Phil Gramm, Mitch McConnell, Craig Thomas, Rod Grams, Tim Hutchinson, Conrad Burns, Chuck Grassley, Richard Shelby.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 12, 1999.

Senator JAMES INHOFE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: Thank you for your recent letter of November 10, 1999 on the need for cooperation between the Legislative and Executive branches and the President's right to recess appoint as defined by the Constitution.

We appreciate and thank the Senate, especially the Majority and Minority Leaders, for the 84 confirmations from Wednesday November 10, which includes eight republican nominees recommended by the Majority Leader. These confirmations reduce the number of nominees awaiting confirmation to 153 for this year. While nominees wait an average of six months to be confirmed, we thank you for confirming 62% of nominees this year.

We look forward to working with you on the 153 remaining nominees and new nominations this session and next session. They are important to the public, because they include nominations critical to the safety of our citizens and the integrity of our criminal justice system (US Marshals, US Attorneys and judges).

Compared with previous administrations, the President has used his authority to make recess appointments infrequently. President Reagan made 239 recess appointments. During President Bush's four-year term, 78 persons were recess appointed. We have made only 59 in 7 years, fewer than President Bush in four years. Several of our recess appointees have been republican nominees, done with the cooperation of the Senate leadership.

Because of the importance of filling these positions and pursuant to an agreement with the Majority Leader, we continue to notify the Majority and Minority Leaders of any effort the President may make to appoint temporarily a person into a vacancy, while awaiting confirmation by the Senate.

We will continue to meet with the Majority Leader's Office to accomplish our goal of confirming and appointing these nominees. We want to cultivate a cooperative relationship with you, and ask for your continued help in expeditiously confirming nominees so important to the US public.

Sincerely,

JOHN PODESTA,
Chief of Staff to the President.

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Acting in the capacity of the Senator from Montana, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:27 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. GREGG].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in my capacity as a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999—Continued

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I should note just on the bankruptcy bill, we are making more progress. This morning we were able to clear four more amendments. I understand there is a total of 31 amendments that been accepted to improve the Bankruptcy Reform Act. These are amendments that have been offered on both sides of the aisle.

I commend the distinguished deputy Democratic leader, the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, for his help. He has

been, as I described him in the caucus, indefatigable in his efforts to move this through. He and I and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. TORRICELLI, and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, and the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, have all worked to clear amendments or to set rollcalls on those we cannot clear.

I have urged Members to have short time agreements, and they have agreed to that. I think we have gone from some 300 or more potential amendments down to only a dozen or so, if that, that are remaining.

When you are dealing with a piece of legislation as complex as this, as important as this, when we are only 2 to 3 weeks before the end of this session—when we are only 2 to 3 weeks before the end of this session—I was hoping somebody would jump up and disagree on that “2 to 3 weeks” bit—or possibly a few days before the end of this session, it shows how well we have done.

But as I said earlier, before he came on the floor, I commend the Senator from Nevada, who has worked so hard to bring down those numbers on the amendments.

Frankly, I would like to see us wrap this up. I would like to go to Vermont.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, of course.

Mr. REID. I just talked to someone coming out of the conference. They said: What about this bankruptcy bill? I said: It is up to the majority whether or not we have a bankruptcy bill this year. We have worked very hard these past few days on these amendments. We need time on the floor to begin to offer some of these amendments.

As the Senator knows, we have maybe 8 or 9 amendments total out of 320, and we could have a bill. And the contentious amendments—on one that is causing us not to move forward, the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, has agreed to a half hour. That is all he wants. I just cannot imagine, if this bill is as important as I think it is and, as I have heard, the majority believes it is, why we cannot get a bill.

Does the Senator from Vermont understand why we are not moving forward?

Mr. LEAHY. I am at a loss to understand why we cannot.

I say to my friend from Nevada, yesterday morning—and I normally speak at about an octave higher than this; I am coming out of a bout of bronchitis—I came back to be here at 10 o'clock because we were going to be on the bill. Instead, we had morning business, I believe, until about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. That is 6 hours. That is what it would have taken to finish the bill, especially after the work of the Senator from Nevada, and others, in clearing out so many of the Republican and Democratic amendments to get them accepted or voted on.

I understand we are waiting for the other body to get the appropriations bill over here. I would think between now and normal suppertime today we

could finish this bill, if people want to. We are willing to move on our side. We are willing to have our amendments come up.

I see the distinguished Senator from California on the floor. She has waited some time. She has been here several days waiting with an amendment. She has indicated she is willing to go ahead with a relatively short period of time. The Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, has said the same. We are ready to go, and I wish we would.

As I stated earlier, I would have liked very much to get this done. I would actually like very much to finish all the items we have. I wish we could have finished a couple weeks ago. I want to go to Vermont. I want to be with my family. It was snowing there yesterday, as I am sure it was in parts of the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer. I see the distinguished Senator from Maine on the floor. I expect it did in her State.

Mr. REID. It was 81 degrees in Las Vegas yesterday.

Mr. LEAHY. Eighty-one degrees in Las Vegas. How about snow in the mountains?

Mr. REID. Oh, there was snow in the mountains.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from Nevada has the good fortune as I do: We both represent two magnificent and beautiful States. He has the ability, however, in his State to go far greater ranges in climate, in temperature, over a distance of 100 miles or so than just about anywhere else in the country. We sometimes do those ranges in temperature and climate in one afternoon in Vermont, but we are not always happy about it.

I would like to see us get moving and get out of here. I see the distinguished Senator from California, who has asked me to yield to her. I am prepared to do that, but I also note that we will not start on any matter until the distinguished floor leader on the other side is on the floor. So I am at a bit of a quandary. I wanted to yield to the distinguished Senator from California with her amendment, but the distinguished floor leader on the Republican side is not here.

So I ask that the Senator from California withhold a bit. I see the Senator from—I may be a traffic cop here. I see my good friend and neighbor from New England, the Senator from Maine.

I ask, could she indicate to me just about how much time she may need?

Ms. COLLINS. It was my understanding that there was an agreement that at 2:15—and we are a little late in getting here—Senator SCHUMER and I were going to be able to introduce a bill as in morning business. We would need approximately 15 minutes, I would guess.

Mr. LEAHY. Then I ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent that after the distinguished Senator from Maine and the distinguished Senator from New York have been heard, it would then be in order to go to the distinguished Sen-

ator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, so she could go forward with her amendment.

Ms. COLLINS. Reserving the right to object, I believe that—Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senator from Maine and the Senator from New York be recognized, and then the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. KOHL, and the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS, be recognized for 5 minutes each after the Senator from Maine and the Senator from New York, and then the floor go to the Senator from California—now that I see the Senator from Iowa on the floor—so she could then go back to the bankruptcy bill.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, it would be 25 minutes: 15 minutes and 5 for each of the two Senators as in morning business.

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

The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. SCHUMER pertaining to the introduction of the legislation are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that, under the previous order, the Senator from North Carolina will speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 5 minutes, and the Senator from North Carolina has 5 minutes.

Ms. COLLINS. Will the Senator withhold for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 80, the continuing resolution, and that Senators KOHL and EDWARDS be recognized for up to 5 minutes each, and at the conclusion of their remarks, the resolution be read the third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in addition to the 5 minutes, I be granted an additional 3 minutes.