with whom we have large, abiding trade deficits. We need to say that because those deficits weaken this country. Those deficits detract from our economic growth and fundamentally weaken the American economy.

There are those who, I guess, believe that whatever the interests of the largest corporations in the world are, that they are also in the common interests of the United States. Things have changed. We do, indeed, have a global economy, but the largest corporations in the world now are not national citizens. They don't get up in the morning and say, ''Well, you know, I'm an artificial person, I'm a corporation, what in law is described as an artificial person; I can sue and be sued, contract and be contracted with; I'm an artificial person and, therefore, I have allegiance to this country.'' That's not what they do.

We are not talking about American corporations anymore. We are talking about international corporations that do global business that are interested in profits for their shareholders.

How do you maximize profits for your shareholders? You access the cheapest kind of production that you can access in the world, produce there at a dime-an-hour, a-quarter-an-hour, or a half-a-dollar-an-hour wages and then ship the products to Pittsburgh, Toledo, Los Angeles, or Fargo and sell it on a shelf in a store in one of those cities. Produce where it is cheap and then access the American marketplace.

The problem with that strategy is that while it presents increased profits for international corporations it tends to undermine the American economy. I am not saying the global economy and the growth of the global economy is wholly bad; it is not. It provides new opportunities and new choices for the consumers, and in some cases lower-priced goods for the consumers. The question we have to ask ourselves is: what is fair trade and what advances this country's economic interests?

If deciding that you can produce something that you used to produce in Akron, OH, in a factory in Sri Lanka or Indonesia or Bangladesh and you can get 14-year-olds, pay them 24 cents an hour, working 13 hours a day—if you decide that is in your company's interest—is that in this country's interest? I don't think so.

Is it in this country's interest to see that kind of manufacturing job flight from this country to a low-wage country so that the same product can be produced to be shipped back into this country, and the only thing that's changed is the corporation has more profit and the United States has fewer jobs? Is that in this country's interest? I don't think so.

I was on a television program 2 days ago. When I asked this question the moderator said the conditions under which goods are produced in other countries is none of our business. If another country wants to hire kids and pay them dimes an hour, if another country wants to produce by dumping chemicals into the water and pollution into the air, if another country wants to produce having no restrictions on those companies and allows them to pollute the air and water, hire kids, pay a dime an hour, if that's what they want to do, is that none of our business? And if the production from that factory—hiring kids and polluting the air and polluting the water—if that production comes into this country and goes on the grocery store shelves, is that all the better for the American consumer because it is going to be cheaper?

I think that is a catastrophe to have that kind of attitude. This country spent 60 years debating the question of what is a fair wage? This country spent decades debating whether we ask polluters to stop polluting, and whether we demand that polluters stop polluting in order to clean our air and water. This country spent a long while debating the question of child labor and whether we should allow factories to employ 10-year-olds and 12-year-olds.

This country has debated all those issues. Yet, in the so-called global economy, fashioned in the interest of those who want to accelerate profits from it, there are those who would tell us that they can just pole vault over all of those issues. They don't have to worry about minimum wages. They do not have to worry about pollution control. They do not have to worry about any of that because they can move their factories elsewhere and ship their products back into the United States. That is not fair trade. That is not something that advances the economic interests of our country and ought not be allowed.

What we do is we pass trade agreement after trade agreement, and we don't enforce any of them. When someone hears me speak they say, ''Gee, this is just another protectionist that wants to put walls around this country.'' I do not; not at all. I am very interested in saying to other countries, first of all, you have an obligation. There is an admission price to the American marketplace. The admission price is that you must abide by certain standards with respect to clean air and clean water, and you can't hire kids, and you can't pay a nickel an hour. Yes, that is the admission price to compete in our domestic market.

And, yes, there is a requirement with other countries with whom we have a trade relationship. That requirement is if they want to access the American marketplace and dump tens of millions of dollars of products into that marketplace, then they have a responsibility to America. That responsibility is that their marketplace must be open to us. If our workers and our producers want to go to Japan and go to China to sell our goods in their marketplace, they must have their marketplace open for that. And to the extent you don't, it is unfair trade.

To the extent any country is involved in unfair trade, this country ought to have the will and the nerve to say that we're not going to put up with it.

Mr. President, one final point. This advent of a global economy post-Second World War has been an interesting kind of development. The first 25 years after the Second World War we could compete with anybody in the world with one hand tied behind our back. It did not matter much. Our trade policy was almost all foreign policy. Whatever we did or had with another country had to do with foreign policy. For the first 25 years we could do that easily. We did that and our incomes kept rising in this country.

The second 25 years we have had to deal with competitors who are shrewd, tough economic competitors. We now must insist on trade relationships and trade agreements that are fair to this country's interests. The conditions of trade must be conditions with rules that are fair to our workers and producers. The absence of that means that this country is the economic loser. This ought not be what we aspire to achieve in trade agreements.

Mr. President, I have more to say, regrettably, for my colleagues who do not like this message. I will say it often in the coming weeks as we discuss the trade issue. For now I will yield the floor. I see the minority leader has come to the floor. I know he is going to talk about another topic of great interest. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. I will use my leader time to talk on another matter, and I appreciate very much the Senator from North Dakota yielding the floor to allow me to do so.

## CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we just announced the signing of a letter dated September 9 by every one of our Democratic colleagues in support of some bipartisan legislation that I hope will enjoy even broader bipartisan support in the not-too-distant future.

The letter is addressed to the majority leader. Because it is brief, and I think the letter is very to the point, perhaps it would be appropriate for me simply to read it.

On July 9, we sent you a letter requesting a date certain on which comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation would be considered on the floor.

Today, we do more than simply renew this request. The purpose of this letter is to communicate to you in the clearest terms possible our specific legislative intentions in this regard.

Senate Democrats are prepared to cast 45 affirmative votes for the substitute language to S. 25, as announced by Senators McCain and Feingold on May 22, 1997. This support, coupled with the votes of the three current Republican cosponsors of this legislation, constitutes 48 votes for final passage, merely two votes shy of a majority.

While each of us might prefer to craft a bill to our individual liking, we recognize that

1997 represents an historic opportunity for comprehensive reform. We are therefore prepared to announce our unanimous support for the only comprehensive, bipartisan approach with a viable prospect of enactment in this session.

There should now be no confusion about the prospects for enactment of the McCain-Feingold bill. Your willingness to schedule S. 25 for an up-or-down vote, coupled with the support of only two additional Republican Senators, could break ten years of gridlock on this matter.

The environment for real campaign finance reform has never been more favorable. We are determined to seize this opportunity, and we ask your assistance in the effort.

It is signed, as I indicated, by all 45 Senators in the Democratic caucus.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter, as it was signed, be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
*Washington, DC, September 9, 1997.*

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

DEAR MR. LEADER: On July 9, we sent you a letter requesting a date certain on which comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation would be considered on the floor.

Today, we do more than simply renew this request. The purpose of this letter is to communicate to you in the clearest terms possible our specific legislative intentions in this regard.

Senate Democrats are prepared to cast 45 affirmative votes for the substitute language to S. 25, as announced by Senators McCain and Feingold on May 22, 1997. This support, coupled with the votes of the three current Republican cosponsors of this legislation, constitutes 48 votes for final passage, merely two votes shy of a majority.

While each of us might prefer to craft a bill to our individual liking, we recognize that 1997 represents an historic opportunity for comprehensive reform. We are therefore prepared to announce our unanimous support for the only comprehensive, bipartisan approach with a viable prospect of enactment in this session.

There should now be no confusion about the prospects for enactment of the McCain-Feingold bill. Your willingness to schedule S. 25 for an up-or-down vote, coupled with the support of only two additional Republican Senators, could break ten years of gridlock on this matter.

The environment for real campaign finance reform has never been more favorable. We are determined to seize this opportunity, and we ask your assistance in the effort.

Sincerely,

Max Cleland, Tim Johnson, Byron L. Dorgan, Bob Kerrey, D. Inouye, Herb Kohl, Barbara A. Mikulski, Ted Kennedy, Dale Bumpers, Dianne Feinstein, Frank R. Lautenberg, Max Baucus, Paul Wellstone, Paul Sarbanes, Mary Landrieu.

Wendell Ford, Jeff Bingaman, Tom Harkin, Dick Durbin, Richard H. Bryan, Chuck Robb, John Kerry, Fritz Hollings, Daniel K. Akaka, Bob Graham, Carol Moseley-Braun, Patty Murray, Ron Wyden, Carl Levin, Chris Dodd.

Russell D. Feingold, Joe Lieberman, Jay Rockefeller, Robert Byrd, Joe Biden, Robert Torricelli, John Glenn, Barbara Boxer, Tom Daschle, Patrick Leahy, Daniel P. Moynihan, Kent Conrad, Harry Reid, Jack Reed, John Breaux.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I give extraordinary credit to our two leaders on this issue, Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD, for their persistence and diligence in the manner in which they have conducted themselves as they have sought resolution of this issue.

I have indicated on occasions, both publicly and privately, that I think Senator MCCAIN deserves great credit for having taken the initiative this year and worked as diligently as he has to bring us to where we are. Certainly the same could be said for our colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD.

The two of them have spent countless hours and an extraordinary effort to bring us to a point where for the first time in recent modern history, Democrats and Republicans can join together in the passage of truly meaningful comprehensive reform.

What I think this letter does is to reaffirm the new math on this issue, to reaffirm how close we really are to passage of a comprehensive bill. I'm not suggesting that all 48 Senators who have signed the letter have agreed to every provision in the legislation. Rather, I firmly believe this letter demonstrates that we are committed to enacting real campaign finance reform this Congress.

There have been suggestions that all we really have to do is to strip away all but a soft money ban, and perhaps we can pass something this year if it is only that. But what this letter indicates is that we have 48 Senators, 2 shy of a majority, who are willing to do a lot more than that, who are willing to take a comprehensive approach to meaningful campaign finance reform, not next year, the year after, but this year, this fall.

So I just hope that everybody understands the ramifications of a letter like this. This is unprecedented. I have looked back and our staffs have investigated the matter. We have never had an occasion where every single member of the Democratic caucus has signed on to one piece of legislation that is bipartisan, that is a direct intention or represents a direct intention to pass comprehensive campaign finance reform. It has never happened before.

So this is an unprecedented and an extraordinarily strong statement on behalf of a lot of Senators who want to see something happen this year, who believe it can happen this year, who want to deal with spending limits, who want to deal with soft money, who want to ensure that somehow we are able to deal effectively with independent expenditures and these growing problems with ''issue'' ads, who want to see stronger enforcement of disclosure rules, who want to ban foreign contributions, who want to further limit the effort to put some end to the madness in campaigns today when it comes to financing.

How tragic, how ironic it would be if, after all that we have read and all the print and all the time on television about investigations and speeches and intentions for change, and all the things that are going on currently in the Governmental Affairs Committee, after all that we said, our response is to do nothing at all, our response is to ignore the overwhelming evidence that something has to be done.

One does not have to go through campaign cycle after campaign cycle to come to the conclusion that something is wrong in the system and something needs to be done in a comprehensive way to address the system, all of the difficulties we have, in a much more constructive and effective way than we have on the books today.

That is why what Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD are doing is so laudatory. That is why what they are doing deserves not only Democratic but strong Republican support. That is why we cannot lose the momentum and let this opportunity pass us by. That is why we wrote the letter and why it is important now that we commit to an opportunity to resolve these issues this year, before we leave.

So, Mr. President, I am very hopeful that this will add renewed momentum to the effort that I know is already underway in a very diligent manner by our colleagues and by others who have worked on this issue for as long as they have.

Our history on campaign finance reform is not a good one. There have been too many lost efforts. There have been too many lost opportunities. There have been too many partisan divisions and extraordinarily confrontational fights on the floor in an effort to move something in the past.

At various times we actually did move a bill through the Senate, at one point all the way to the President's desk, only to have it vetoed. Let us not have that happen again. President Clinton has said he will sign the McCain-Feingold bill if it gets to his desk.

I have no doubt in my mind, if we ever got to a debate on the Senate floor, an overwhelming number of Senators, Republican and Democrat, would support something like this. Let us work our will. Let us come up with amendments. Let us try to find ways in which to come together rather than to be split apart on this issue in the future.

Will we have unanimity? No. But can we achieve a meaningful, overwhelming consensus on this issue? My guess is, absolutely, yes, we can.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is quite a remarkable day. I am enormously gratified by the announcement. We have 45 members of our caucus, every single member of our caucus, who signed a letter saying we support the comprehensive campaign finance reform bill called McCain-Feingold. There are three cosponsors, I think, on the other side. That brings to 48 the

number of people who have signed up to say, ''We will vote for comprehensive campaign finance reform.''

There are some around this town who I think are quitters on this issue. This is not a time to quit. They say, ''Well, it's clear you can't get much done. Just do a little piece over here.'' This is the wrong time to quit. We have 45 people in our caucus who have said they will vote for comprehensive campaign finance reform of our campaign finance system and at least three other cosponsors. We are at 48 votes just with that. And the question is, are there two other votes out there? Are there two other votes? I think there are.

So, those who say this cannot be done, I think what we are demonstrating here with this letter is a substantial reservoir of support to say this system is broken, this system needs fixing, and it ought not be done with a niche over here. Let us do it with comprehensive campaign finance reform that is embodied in the McCain-Feingold proposal.

I ask the Senator from South Dakota—I noticed we have had 3,361 floor speeches on campaign finance reform. So that is 3,362, and mine is 3,363, and we will have a couple more, I reckon. We have had 446 legislative proposals on campaign finance reform. If ever there was a demonstration of this statement that when all is said and done, more is said than done, it must certainly be on campaign finance reform.

Isn't it the case that with this news that we have one caucus with 45 people who have signed up and with several others already cosponsoring, that we are within striking distance of having the opportunity to pass comprehensive campaign finance reform?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is absolutely right. You do not have to be a math whiz to count the numbers, to figure out what it takes to get us to 50. Because if we had 50, of course, the Vice President would be there to break a tie. God forbid we would have to call upon him to do so. My guess is, as I said a moment ago, there would be an overwhelming vote.

But to get us to 50, we just need 2 more votes, two more people. If 2 Republican Senators would come forth and indicate their support publicly, that would be 50 votes. That would be, with the Vice President should he be needed, the majority necessary to pass it this year. In fact, this afternoon.

So, there is absolutely no question that we are now within striking range, within reach, of an opportunity to pass it in the not too distant future. It really is an extraordinary opportunity, one that I would not have guessed we could have reached at this point, but we have, in large measure because of the unanimity of our caucus and because of the courage and leadership of some of our Republican colleagues to date.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the minority leader yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for taking the floor on this issue. It is a very timely issue.

I am a member of the Governmental Affairs Committee, and we have been engaged in months of preparation and weeks of deliberation on the question of campaign finance. Over $4 million will be spent on this investigation. Seventy lawyers have been hired. We have issued hundreds of subpoenas for documents, and we have brought before our committee dozens of witnesses, most under oath, and some with grants of immunity, and yet it does not seem what we are doing has resonated.

I think what it suggests is that, if this committee had started off with the premise that when their deliberations had been completed we would come forward with campaign finance reform, the 1998 election would look different to the American voters and I think the public interest would have been heightened in our effort.

Unfortunately, if we just find ourselves recapitulating the sins of the past instead of talking about real reform, it does not strike a resonant cord. The recent vote in the primary in New York City, which was very low, and the vote last November, the lowest percentage turnout for a Presidential election in 72 years, should be a signal to us and to every politician: The more money we spend on campaigns, the fewer voters turn out to vote.

Now, that is a message, unfortunately, of a growing cynicism about this system. Those of us who believe in this democracy and believe in this Government and believe that we as a democracy have the capacity to change in the right direction, have to move forward in a positive way.

I want to congratulate the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE. Forty-five Democrats coming together behind us, with three Republican sponsors, puts us within striking distance. Within hours—within hours—we could have two Republican Senators this afternoon say, ''That's it, we have decided we will join.''

It is time for campaign finance reform. We could achieve it before we leave at the end of this year. If we do not, I suggest that it is only going to add to the public's cynicism. I certainly hope that is not the case.

I salute the Senator for his leadership and thank him for bringing this matter to the forefront.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his eloquence and his comments. He is absolutely right. I think this failure, should we experience it again, would add to the cynicism. On the other hand, if we could pass it, it would do so much to instill new confidence and new admiration for the legislative process, and I think restore hope in democracy itself.

This is a rare opportunity. We have the momentum. We have demonstrated the votes now are there. I think it is simply a matter of continuing to ensure that we strike an agreement with regard to scheduling this legislation in the not too distant future. We can do it this week. We can do it within a very short period of time. We do not need a lot of time for debate. We can make this happen. We just need a commitment that we will make it happen. I do not know that the country could be any more pleased with the results of what I would consider to be one of the most consequential accomplishments of this session of Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, let me thank the Senator from South Dakota, our Democratic leader, for this initiative.

I think you have to understand that the momentum is there because people are concerned, Senators are concerned, politicians are concerned with the turnout, with the cynicism, with all the problems we are facing in this political arena.

In 1974, when I ran for the U.S. Senate the first time, the average cost of a Senate race in this country was $425,000. In 1996, it was $4.4 million. The race in Kentucky would probably be a $5 million race on each side—$10 million or more, to run for the U.S. Senate from a small State like Kentucky.

There is not a Senator that I know of, not a Senator, that enjoys raising money—enjoys raising money—making calls, calling people they have never heard of before. Some group organized to help with a fundraiser gives you a list to call. These are what we referred to as ''cold calls'' when I was growing up. A cold call is calling somebody you never heard of and asking for money so that you can run your race.

I think we ought to take the M and M's out of politics—money and meanness, money and meanness. The more money you have, the meaner you can become. I listened to a Senator who was defeated who had a lot of mean ads run against him. He said by the end of the campaign he did not like himself. It gets pretty rough, so we need to take the money out.

We hear a lot about free speech. I understand it. I can go outside and start talking. That is free speech. I can go over to Courthouse Square in my hometown and make a speech to nobody. That is free speech. I can do all of those things. But what we are talking about here is paid speech, paid speech. The more money you have, the more speech you have, but it is paid speech. It is television, it is radio, it is newspapers. Why, some places they make more money off of a political campaign—they want one every year, every 6 months, because we will raise the money to be competitive. Let's be competitive as individuals. Let's be competitive on the issues. Let's be competitive by seeing people and convincing them that your position and what you want to do is right, that you represent a party of principles—families first. Get out there and talk to people.

In Kentucky, we had our first election last year in the Governor's race where you had a limited amount of money you could spend. With all of its warts, the two candidates stayed on the road. They did not fly in airplanes because it cost too much. They were looking for every Kiwanis Club, every Rotary Club, every Jaycees, every Lion's Club they could get to. There were an unprecedented 41 joint appearances. We used to have a joint appearance on television. It was on Kentucky educational television. It was a night Kentucky played for the championship of the NCAA basketball. They even sent the cubs out there to cover it, so no one really watched it. But when we limited the amount of money and limited what they could do, they had to see people, they had to talk about issues, they had to believe in what they were saying.

Mr. President, now is the time to say to this country, ''Let us get back to the people. Let us get back to issues. Let us get back to shaking hands and saying, 'I want your vote.''' Look them in the eye and they can ask you questions. That is the way we ought to run political campaigns. That is the kind of political campaign I like to run.

Now we have that opportunity. We can touch it with our fingernails. We can touch it with our fingernails. If only two more Republicans will join, we will have the 50 votes necessary to say we have a comprehensive campaign finance reform bill that will be so important not only to the American people but to us as representatives of the American people. We will not be beholden to people we have never known.

Mr. President, I hope we will join together now and give the American people what I believe they want—less money in politics, more personal contact.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Let me briefly commend our leader, the Democratic leader, for soliciting the support of the 44 others of us who make up this caucus, the Democratic caucus. There are 45 members of this caucus, and all 45 members have signed this letter urging the adoption of the legislation introduced by our colleague, JOHN MCCAIN, from the Republican side and RUSS FEINGOLD from our side.

I think, as the leader has said, this is not a perfect bill. I have disagreements with it. I do not applaud every single dotted ''i'' and crossed ''t,'' nor do I assume anyone else does, but it is a common vehicle to embrace most of the positions we would like to see adopted as campaign finance reform. The fact that 100 percent of those of us on this side have joined in this letter, I think, is a strong indication of our commitment to this issue.

It would not have happened had it not been for our leader on this side. I want to commend him publicly for his leadership on this issue as he has demonstrated in so many other areas and urge that his words be heeded and we try to get some additional sponsors here and see if we cannot bring this up.

## NOMINATIONS OF JANET HALL AND CHRISTOPHER F. DRONEY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to briefly say to my colleagues, we will vote in a few minutes on two nominees for the Federal district court bench, Janet Hall and Christopher Droney.

Senator LIEBERMAN and I have appeared before the Judiciary Committee on their behalf. I see our colleague from Alabama here on the floor, who is a member of that committee and who very graciously heard the two nominees.

They are two very highly confident, very qualified nominees. Janet Hall has superlative work experience, both in government service and in private practice. She has worked in the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department from 1975 to 1979. She later joined one of the finest law firms in the State of Connecticut, Robinson and Cole, where she has been a partner since 1982. She has appeared before Federal, State, and appellate courts, and even the U.S. Supreme Court, and her work has focused primarily on complex commercial litigation. In short, she is a very, very fine nominee.

She is a graduate of Mount Holyoke College and the New York University School of Law. She has received numerous awards and recognitions including Mount Holyoke's Alumnae Medal of Honor, and she has served on the Board of the Connecticut Bar Foundation since 1993. She also serves on the Parents' Advisory Committee of her hometown high school and has volunteered in numerous other activities in her community.

She is a very fine lawyer, a very fine person, very community oriented, and she brings wonderful legal knowledge and expertise to this nomination. I am confident that my colleagues across political lines here will be very proud of their vote in casting it this afternoon for Janet Hall to be a district court judge in Connecticut.

The other nominee is Christopher F. Droney. Some of our colleagues know Christopher Droney. He has been our U.S. attorney in Connecticut for the last 4 or 5 years and a very successful one. He is known as one of the leading U.S. attorneys in the country for his anticrime efforts, and in particular for fighting juvenile crime.

I might point out that he also knows something about what it is like to be in elective office. He served as the mayor of West Hartford, CT, and did a wonderful job there. He is a graduate of the University of Connecticut Law School, where he was on the Law Review. He was named Citizen of the Year by the Connecticut District of the Boy Scouts of America, and he received the Distinguished Law Enforcement Award from the Hartford Police Union. He also received special recognition award from the Spanish-American Merchants Association. He is very community-oriented and very successful in his community activities. He is a member of the Federal Bar Council, a member of the St. Timothy Roman Catholic Church in his community, and very involved in the YMCA and YWCA in our State, as well.

Again, given his background experience as a U.S. attorney, I think my colleagues can feel very, very proud, Mr. President, in casting a vote this afternoon to confirm the nomination of Christopher Droney, as well, to be a district court judge in Connecticut. I urge support for these nominees. I think they will do us all proud. The Senate can be proud of the work they will perform on behalf of all of us. I yield the floor.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session to consider a series of nominations.

## NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. BATAILLON OF NEBRASKA TO BE U.S DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Bataillon of Nebraska to be U.S District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

Mr. GORTON. Have the yeas and nays been requested with respect to either this nomination or either of the two succeeding nominations?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to make one request that the yeas and nays be ordered and it apply to all three nominees.

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

Mr. GORTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered on the three nominations.

There are 2 minutes of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. GRAMS]. Does any Senator wish to speak on the nomination?

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I just rise to offer my strong support for Joe Bataillon, a man who I have known for a number of years, and the Chair does as well. He served in the Judge Advocate Corps. He has been a lawyer in Omaha. He has gotten high marks from anybody who has interviewed him, on both sides of the aisle. The judges like him. He is a crucial appointment. I appreciate very much the majority leader scheduling this vote. I encourage my colleagues to vote for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators who wish to speak?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of our time on the first nomination.