

will vote as soon as the continuing resolution is received from the House.

The Senate will also convene on Sunday at 4 p.m. to consider another continuing resolution with a vote scheduled to occur at 7 p.m. A vote will also occur on Monday to continue Government funding and the vote will occur at a time to be determined. Senators will be notified as Monday votes are scheduled.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration as we work these different issues out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the House is right now voting on approval of the Journal. They should vote on the CR momentarily. We should have that shortly. I know a number of people have asked when we will complete that.

On Sunday, they are supposed to vote on their CR at 6 o'clock that night. I hope that is the case. Senator STEVENS and a number of the members of the Appropriations Committee are meeting. They met yesterday, hoping to wind up negotiations on Labor-HHS, which will be the last train moving out of the station. With the compromise that is in the air, I hope we can wrap up the tax package and the Labor-HHS bill maybe as early as Monday and Tuesday at the latest. I hope that is the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, we had put the continuing resolution on the desk hoping we could get agreement with the other side to move immediately to accommodate Senators' schedules. That is not going to happen. As I have said, we will wait for the House to vote.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m. and the time be divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, if the CR gets here sooner than that, would the Senator agree that we should begin the vote before 10, because there are people who have come to me indicating they have schedules to meet. I am sure he has the same on his side.

Mr. CRAIG. I see no objection to that. I think we are here purely dependent on the House's ability to act as quickly as they can. When it arrives at the desk, my guess is there is going to be a large number on our side who would wish the same consideration.

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

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the session is winding down. We are at a point where we are doing pro forma things.

I have neglected to do something I think is important to do and that I have wanted to do. I will take the time available to us at the moment to fulfill my obligation.

I wish to pay appropriate tribute to the senior Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, on the occasion of his retirement. I have already done this within the committee on which we jointly sit, but I think at a more formal setting it is also appropriate.

I first met PAT MOYNIHAN when I was serving in the Nixon administration. He was then a member of the White House staff. I was serving in the Department of Transportation. He was the President's primary enforcer, if you will, of improvements and efficiencies in the executive branch, particularly in domestic departments. We at the Department of Transportation were a little bit in awe, if not in terror, of the thought of PAT MOYNIHAN showing up and checking on us to make sure we were doing things right.

I remember one meeting in the White House where we were outlining what we wanted to do, that which I considered to be fairly bold, and listening to MOYNIHAN saying: Well, in a Republican administration, this is probably about the best you could expect. He wanted us to be considerably bolder than we were. He wanted to go into directions of new initiatives that would have been very good for the country.

In addition to this, he was one of the architects of Nixon's program of family maintenance which, had it been enacted over the objections of the Democrats, probably would have solved many of our welfare problems.

Mr. MOYNIHAN was well respected then. President Nixon later used him as Ambassador to the United Nations and Ambassador to India. When he was running for a seat in the Senate, even though he was a Democrat, I, for one, was rooting for him to win.

I have just finished reading a book called "The Trust," which is the history of New York City. I was interested to find that the editorial board of the New York Times almost unanimously decided that in that primary they were going to endorse Bella Abzug for the Senate seat in New York. Fortunately, the publisher of the New York Times, Punch Sulzberger, came to his senses long enough to dictate a New York Times endorsement of PAT MOYNIHAN, and this body was spared the experience of having Mrs. Abzug as the Senator from New York.

Senator MOYNIHAN and I have disagreed about a number of issues since we have been here. We have debated on many issues and clashed many times, but we have served together in many areas. He was a member of the Senate Y2K committee, a committed, active member who scheduled hearings in his home State of New York. We went there often. I was always impressed and uplifted by the amount of bipartisan support he gave to that effort. He was always well informed and completely without guile or without bitterness.

He now goes on to a career he loves, which is teaching. I have read some of his books and wish I could be one of his students.

This country will hang on to PAT MOYNIHAN as a major resource and a national treasure for the remainder of his life. But we in the Senate have been well served by having him here as our colleague.

One last thing I will say about PAT MOYNIHAN, which is little known but which demonstrates the man, there is a story going around in Washington that says when John F. Kennedy went down Pennsylvania Avenue in his inaugural parade, he saw how shabby the avenue was, and with that vision often attributed to the Kennedy clan, he said we must do something to clean up Pennsylvania Avenue, and the restoration of Pennsylvania Avenue then occurred. Well, in fact, from the scholarly writings of PAT MOYNIHAN, we find that it was not John F. Kennedy at all; it was Arthur Goldberg, who was in that parade and saw that shabbiness of Pennsylvania Avenue, who pointed it out to President Kennedy and, to his credit, the President said, "Yes, let's do something about it." But he probably gave it no more thought than that.

The assignment of seeing that something was done to the Nation's most monumental avenue ultimately fell to a young staffer named PAT MOYNIHAN. It was he who drove the effort to see to it that Pennsylvania Avenue was cleaned up from the pawnshops and the other shabby architectural edifices that were there to the monumental avenue that it is today. Interestingly enough, it was while he was chairman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, leaning on the public works side of that environment, where he led the effort within the Congress to see to it that the necessary money was appropriated to build the monumental buildings of which we are all so proud.

So we have a lasting architectural legacy to the public career of PAT MOYNIHAN right here in the District of Columbia. I, for one, shall miss him. But I look forward to staying in touch with him as he tells me that he is going to stay in the Washington area and teach. I hope that at some point, when my career in the Senate ends, he is still teaching and I can take one of his classes. It has been a great privilege to

serve in the Senate with the senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

#### THE WORK OF CONGRESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment on the pending status of the work of the Congress. Yesterday, Senator STEVENS took the floor and outlined the work of the Appropriations Committee, making it plain that nothing could be done on the last bill on appropriations for Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, until Tuesday because there had to be a reading of the bill and the other procedural matters which had to be attended to, even if the conferees came to agreement on Friday.

Senator STEVENS suggested that there was no point in having the Senate and the House in session on Saturday and Sunday and Monday. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding Senator STEVENS' contacts with the President and the President's men, we are here. We are here for absolutely no reason. I chair the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over that appropriations bill and we have been in negotiations with the White House for weeks. We have not been able to come to an agreement because of the intransigence of the White House. They may say it is the intransigence of the Congress. We have a way of saying the other party is intransigent. But there is no doubt that they are at least 50 percent responsible for the fact that we have not been able to come to terms on this bill.

On this bill, the subcommittee that I chair met the President's figure of \$106 billion. It was hard to do. My colleagues in this body and the Republicans in the House didn't like that figure; they thought it was too much money. But the chairman of the House committee and I prevailed to meet the President's figure so we can come to terms and have an accommodation and get the bill passed. We put \$600 million in that bill—more for education than the President did. And the President asked for \$2.7 billion for school construction and teachers. It was the view of many colleagues that that was not a Federal responsibility, but we gave this figure. We put an addendum on that if the local school boards decided they wanted it for something else, they could use it for something else, so that there would be local control, which is the essence of education in America, contrasted with the Washington, DC, bureaucratic straitjacket.

Notwithstanding that, the White House, his negotiators, wanted every semicolon their own way. So that bill is still languishing in negotiations. But it is certainly not the fault of the Congress.

We are here today and we will be here tomorrow. The Members—535 of us—had thought we would have concluded our business a long time ago. I can tell the American people—if anybody

watches C-SPAN II—that the fault is not that of the Congress that we are still here. The President has decided that we will be in session on 1-day continuing resolutions, as his way of trying to make a political point. He is not making a governmental point, he is making a political point. He is making a political point to try to blame the Congress as a "do-nothing" Congress, when that is not the fact. He is trying to blame the Congress for a situation the White House is really responsible for—at least 50 percent responsible.

We have come to a situation where the quality and parity between the Congress and the executive branch has long since evaporated. When the Government was closed down at the end of 1995, that was an enormous shift of power, so that now the Congress is really over a barrel to yield to whatever the President has to say.

Being aware of that, we structured this final bill on Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education to finish it so that it could be presented to the President in September. The Senate acted on it on June 30, which established a record, going back to 1976 for the earlier set of action on this bill. Then we finished the conference report on July 27. It should have been presented to the President in September, and that projection was made so that we would be able to present it to the President and, if he vetoed it, have a national debate; and we thought we would be in a position to make our priorities stand up because the Constitution does give the Congress the responsibility and authority to establish the priorities.

Mr. President, the essential point that I am coming to is that if we were not over a barrel in our relations with the President, we would submit to the President a continuing resolution for 3 or 4 days. But we are not doing that because it would be unseemly. We are not doing that because we don't want to engage in what might be viewed by the American people as a childish food fight.

If we sent him a continuing resolution for 4 days, which would be reasonable under the circumstances, since we can't get anything done until Tuesday, and there was a stalemate and there was a closing of the Federal Government, the American people would say a plague on both of your houses. But the reality is that the Congress is being intimidated by the President and we are, in fact, being humiliated by what the President is doing. There needs to be some semblance of good will and comity between the Congress and the President. It doesn't exist and hasn't existed.

This Senator has gone out of his way to try to work with the White House and try to find accommodations. But when you have this intimidation and what is really humiliation, it lingers. It has to be a factor considered, as we have so many delicate relationships with the executive branch of the Government. Frankly, I would like to see

us submit a continuing resolution for 4 days and lay down the gauntlet to the President, if he wants to keep us around here doing nothing. But the parity between the branches has been lost and we are here wasting the time of 535 Members of Congress.

We are wasting the time of the Congressmen, and we are also putting the people of America to a disadvantage because we have responsibilities to our constituents that will not be attended to today, or tomorrow, or Monday, or thereafter. I think it is high time that the Congress stood up and confronted the President because of this situation, which is simply intolerable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I certainly understand the frustration of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He does a good job of chairing that subcommittee. But his facts are wrong.

Here it is 9 days until the election, and we are still in session. We are here because the leadership of the majority has simply refused to move this Congress along like it is supposed to. Since the first of September, we have passed only three or four appropriations bills. We struggled through the month of September, and nothing happened.

Mr. SPECTER. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. REID. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPECTER. What facts are wrong?

Mr. REID. I was just laying those facts out.

Mr. SPECTER. Does the Senator from Nevada deny the fact that the President and the White House, or at least the people in question, are responsible for the failure to come to agreement on the one outstanding appropriations bill?

Mr. REID. We have 13 appropriations bills. This debate cannot relate around one appropriations bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania worked hard on the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. A number of us have worked on it. But the Republicans have left this bill to the last bill so they can attach everything to it that has not been done and that should have been done previously.

Mr. SPECTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. No. I will not.

I say to the Chair and to those Members listening that the President doesn't need to take any blame for what is taking place here in Congress. We have a constitutional framework that gives him separate but equal power with the Congress. He is exerting that now. Thank goodness he is able to exert that because what has gone on here, according to pundits and according to what I believe having been here for almost 20 years, is a travesty.

Here we are trying to work our way through Congress 8 days before an election. This should have been completed a long time ago. We have not been able to have debates on issues in this Congress. Why? Because the majority has