United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1999 No. 23

Senate

The Senate met at 1:05 p.m. and was called to order by the Chief Justice of the United States.

TRIAL OF WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senate will convene as a Court of Impeachment. The Chaplain will offer a prayer.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we renew our trust in You when we realize how much You have entrusted to us. We are stunned by the psalmist's reminder that You have crowned us with glory and honor and given us responsibility over the work of Your hands. We renew our dependence on You as we assume this breathtaking call to courageous leadership.

Help the Senators to claim Your promised glory and honor. Imbue them with Your own attributes and strengthen their desire to do what is right and just. As they humbly cast before You any crowns of position or pride, crown them with Your presence and power. In Your holy Name. Amen.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Sergeant at Arms will make proclamation.

The Sergeant at Arms, James W. Ziglar, made proclamation as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silent, on pain of imprisonment, while the Senate of the United States is sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States.

THE JOURNAL

The CHIEF JUSTICE. If there is no objection, the Journal of proceedings of the trial are approved to date.

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. This afternoon, the Senate will begin final deliberations on the articles of impeachment. However, pursuant to S. Res. 30, a Senator may at this time offer a motion to suspend the rules to allow the final deliberations to remain open. That motion is not amendable and no motions to that motion may be offered. Therefore, I expect at least one vote to occur shortly. Following that vote, if the motion is defeated, I will move to close deliberations. If that motion should be adopted, the Senate will begin full deliberations, with each Senator allocated 15 minutes to speak. And I note that that will be true whether it is in open or closed session, although Senator DASCHLE and I may have some further comments to make about that later on.

I note that if each Senator uses his or her entire debate time, the proceedings will take 25 hours, not including breaks and recesses. Therefore, I remind all Senators that Lincoln gave his Gettysburg Address in less than 3 minutes and Kennedy's inaugural address was slightly over 7 minutes. But certainly every Senator will have his or her opportunity to speak for up to 15 minutes, if that is their desire, and, of course, we would also need to communicate with the Chief Justice about the time of the proceedings.

I expect that we will try to go until about 6 or 6:30 this afternoon. I want to confer with Senator DASCHLE, but I think maybe we will try to begin earlier tomorrow and go throughout the day into the early evening. Again, we do have to take into consideration the fact that about 7 or 8 hours will be the absolute maximum we will probably be able to do in a single day. We will talk further about that and make an announcement before we conclude today.

I now yield the floor to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, for the purpose of propounding a unanimous consent request.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Chair recognizes Senator SPECTER.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. Chief Justice, on behalf of the leader, and in my capacity as a copresider for the Senate at the deposition of Mr. Sidney Blumenthal, I ask unanimous consent that the parties be allowed to take additional discovery, including testimony on oral deposition of Mr. Christopher Hitchens, Ms. Carol Blue, Mr. R. Scott Armstrong and Mr. Sidney Blumenthal with regard to possible fraud on the Senate by alleged perjury in the deposition testimony of Mr. Sidney Blumenthal with respect to allegations that he, Mr. Sidney Blumenthal, was involved with the dissemination beyond the White House of information detrimental to the credibility of Ms. Monica Lewinsky, and that pursuant to the authority of title II of Senate Resolution 30, the Chief Justice of the United States, through the Secretary of the Senate, shall issue subpoenas for the taking of such testimony at a time and place to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the Democratic leader, and, further, that these depositions be conducted pursuant to the procedures set forth in title II of Senate Resolution 30, except that the last four sentences of section 204 shall not apply to these depositions, provided, further, however, that the final sentence of section 204 shall apply to the deposition of Mr. Sidney Blumenthal.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chief Justice, I object.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. LOTT. On behalf of myself and Senator DASCHLE, I move to suspend the rules on behalf of Senators HUTCHISON, HARKIN, and others in order to conduct open deliberations.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that there be a 40-minute debate, equally divided, between the leaders or their designees in open session on the motion to suspend the rules.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection?

Mr. GREGG. I object.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Objection is heard.

The question is on the motion to suspend the rules. The yeas and nays are automatic. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15]

[Subject: Lott motion to suspend the rules]

YEAS—59

Abraham	Feinstein	Lincoln
Akaka	Gorton	Lugar
Baucus	Graham	McCain
Bayh	Hagel	Mikulski
Biden	Harkin	Moynihan
Bingaman	Hollings	Murray
Boxer	Hutchison	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Jeffords	Robb
Byrd	Johnson	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Collins	Kerrey	Schumer
Conrad	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
DeWine	Kyl	Specter
Dodd	Landrieu	Stevens
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Durbin	Leahy	Wellstone
Edwards	Levin	Wyden
Feingold	Lieberman	

NAYS—41

Allard	Enzi	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Bennett	Frist	Roberts
Bond	Gramm	Roth
Brownback	Grams	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Helms	Thomas
Cochran	Hutchinson	Thompson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Thurmond
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Mack	Warner
Domenici	McConnell	

The CHIEF JUSTICE. On this vote the yeas are 59, the nays are 41. Two-thirds of those Senators voting—a quorum being present—not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. In the absence of objection, so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I want to make this reminder: Only those people who are properly authorized to be on the floor of the Senate should be here. The Sergeant at Arms will act accordingly.

Now, Mr. Chief Justice, there is a desire by a number of Senators that it be possible for their statements, even in closed session, to be made a part of the RECORD. Senator DASCHLE and I have talked a great deal about this. We think this is an appropriate way to proceed.

MOTION RELATING TO RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

Mr. LOTT. Therefore, I send this motion to the desk: That the record of the proceedings held in closed session for any Senator to insert their final deliberations on the articles of impeachment shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of the trial.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The clerk will read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] for himself and Mr. DASCHLE, moves as follows:

That the record of the proceedings held in closed session for any Senator to insert their final deliberations on the Articles of Impeachment shall be published in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of the trial.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, so everybody can understand this, may I be recognized?

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. It is the desire of one and all to have the opportunity for this record to be made. After the trial is concluded, Senators can have their statements in the closed session put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—in the record of the trial. There may be Senators that choose, for whatever reason, not to do it in that way at that time. Senator DASCHLE and I have talked a great deal about this. We think this is the fair way to make that record. We urge that it be adopted.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. Chief Justice, point of clarification.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. Leader, can I ask a point of clarification? Does this mean that repartee between Members will not be recorded, but just the statement as the Member submits it?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, if I could respond to that, I think that would be up to the Senators. That has been one of my points. I hope we won't just have speeches and that, in fact, we will have deliberations. As we have found ourselves in previous closed sessions, almost uncontrollably we wound up discussing and talking with each other. I hope that if we come to that, the Senators involved in the exchange would make that a part of the record and part of history. I believe they would have that right under this proposal.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the leader will yield for the purpose of clarification, I may have misunderstood what the majority leader described here. But our intent would be to allow statements to be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not into the hearing record.

Mr. LOTT. That is correct. I misstated that.

Mr. DASCHLE. So that people understand, this would actually allow you the opportunity to insert your statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, succeeding the votes on the two articles.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. Chief Justice, I have a question for the majority leader. I might not have heard this the right way. This would allow any Senator who so wishes to have his or her statements made in all of our—not just the final deliberations, but this would cover all of our sessions that have been in closed session; is that correct or not?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I believe this would be applicable only to the final deliberations.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. Chief Justice, if I could ask the majority leader whether he might be willing—it seems to me that if this is the principle, I wonder if he would amend his request to any Senator who wants to—and it is up to the Senator—this is far different than having our final deliberations a matter of public record, which is what I think we should do, but what you are saying is any Senator who so wishes can do so. Might that not apply to all of the closed sessions we had? It seems to me that the same principle applies.

Mr. LOTT. That is not what is in this proposal. I would like to think about that and discuss it with the Senator from Minnesota and others. I remember making a passionate speech, but I had no prepared notes; and so I could not put it into the RECORD if I wanted to when we were in one of those closed sessions.

I honestly had not considered that. This was aimed at the closing deliberations. I think we need to give some thought to reaching back now to the other closed sessions before we move in that direction.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAIG, is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chief Justice, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. I would be glad to yield, Mr. Chief Justice.

Mr. CRAIG. Is my understanding correct that your motion would keep this session of deliberations closed, except for those Senators who would choose to have their statements become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that it would be the choice of the individual Senators, and that the deliberations of the closed session would remain closed unless otherwise specified by each individual Senator, specific to their statements; is that a fair understanding?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, that is an accurate understanding, and that is with the presumption that we will go into closed session, and such a motion will be made in short order.

I want to also clarify that this is made on behalf of Senator DASCHLE and myself. We have consulted a great deal on this and we have both been thinking about doing something like this, but we never put it on paper until a moment ago.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the leader.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL, is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. I want to make an inquiry to the leader in response to the question by the Senator from California, who alluded to actual deliberations and statements among Senators. I assume that in order to go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it would require all of the participants of the colloquy——

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Parliamentarian tells me that this is all out of order.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, if I may, in a moment I will make a motion to close the doors for deliberations. However, we have to dispose of this.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question is on the motion——

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask consent to ask the majority leader one follow-up question on his motion.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. Chief Justice, I want to make sure I fully understand the distinguished majority leader. Our vote on what we do on the record does not include a vote on closing the session itself, it simply assumes that vote carries?

Mr. LOTT. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chief Justice, again, I ask consent that I be able to ask the majority leader a question regarding the ethics.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection.

Mr. HARKIN. I have a question regarding the ethics rules. Under this proposed motion, could a Senator give his or her statement in public and then give the same statement in closed session and still not violate the ethics rules? I am concerned about how we might want to follow that.

I yield to the head of the Ethics Committee for clarification.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. If the motion carries, as has been outlined by the majority leader, you have every right to release your statement. That would not violate rule 29.5.

Mr. HARKIN. I could do whatever——

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Your statement, yours, not anybody else's.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask consent to ask the majority leader a point of clarification.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If we reference another Senator's remarks in our statements, would we have to get that other Senator's consent in order to submit our statement, then, for the RECORD?

Mr. LOTT. I am not chairman of the Ethics Committee, but I am assured by those on the committee that you would have to do so. Are we ready to move forward?

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, is recognized,

Mr. KERRY. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask consent that I be permitted to ask a point of clarification.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection.

Mr. KERRY. I ask the majority leader this: He mentioned that he hoped during the deliberations that there would be more than just speeches, that there would be a process of colloquy. I was wondering if he was contemplating how that would work because I think under the rules we are limited to one intervention of a specific time period. Does the majority leader contemplate approaching that difficulty?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I have discussed this with the Democratic leader, and there is no ironclad rule. You know, in our other closed session when we sort of got on a roll, we yielded additional time to each other, and then at some point we started to have a round robin. The Chief Justice probably thought it was all completely out of order, but he allowed us to go forward. I think we will have to deal with that when we get there. I think, as has been the case all the way along, we will be understanding of each other and try to make these deliberations genuine deliberations. I think it would benefit us all in the final result.

Before I make a motion to close the doors, I yield to the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, for a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. We have a motion, do we not?

Mr. LOTT. I beg your pardon.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. However amorphous it may be. (Laughter.)

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, for that amorphous ruling. (Laughter.)

I yield to the Senator from Texas for a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. Chief Justice, rule XX says that while the Senate is in session the doors shall remain open unless the Senate directs that the doors be closed.

My inquiry is this: If the Senate, by a majority, voted not to direct the doors to be closed, would it be in order to proceed to deliberations with the doors open?

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Chair is of the view that it would not be in order for this reason: On the initial reading of rules XX and XXIV of the Senate impeachment rules, it would not appear to mandate that the deliberations and debate occur in closed session, but only to permit it. But it is clear from a review of the history of the rules that the committee that was established in 1868 to create the rules specifically intended to require closed sessions for debate and deliberation. Senator Howard reported the rules for the committee and clearly understated his intention, and Chief Justice Chase, in the Andrew Johnson trial, stated in response to an inquiry, ''There can be no deliberation unless the doors are closed. There can be no debate under the rules unless the doors be closed.''

I understand from the Parliamentarian that it has been the consistent practice of the Senate for the last 130 years in impeachment trials to require deliberations and debate by the Senate to be held in closed session. Therefore—though there may be some ambiguity between the two rules—my ruling is based partly on deference of the Senate's longstanding practice.

In the opinion of the Chair, there can be no deliberation on any question before the Senate in open session unless the Senate suspends its rules, or consent is granted.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you.

MOTION TO CLOSE THE DOORS FOR FINAL DELIBERATION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, with that record now having been made, I now move that the doors for final deliberations be closed, and I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. Chief Justice, the majority leader is trying to get the floor, but I wonder whether I could not move that any Senator be allowed, if he or she makes it their choice, to have our statements that have been made and passed in closed session left entirely up to us to also be a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, if I could respond, give us an opportunity to discuss this with you. We will have another opportunity to do that. I think maybe we can work something out. I would like to make sure we thought it through, if that is appropriate, Mr. Chief Justice.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chief Justice, I object.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Objection is heard.

The yeas and nays are automatic. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 16]

[Subject: Motion to close the doors]

YEAS—53

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Brownback	Grassley	Santorum
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burns	Hagel	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Snowe
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Enzi	McCain	

NAYS—47

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

The motion was agreed to.

CLOSED SESSION

(At 1:52 p.m., the doors of the Chamber were closed. The proceedings of the Senate were held in closed session until 6:27 p.m., at which time, the following occurred.)

OPEN SESSION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume open session.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow. I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following the prayer on Wednesday, the Senate resume closed session for further deliberations of the pending articles of impeachment.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. All Senators please remain standing at your desk.

Thereupon, at 6:27 p.m., the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, adjourned until Wednesday, February 10, 1999, at 10 a.m.

(Pursuant to an order of January 26, 1999, the following was submitted at the desk during today's session:)

REPORT CONCERNING THE AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF ROMANIA ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT–PM 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b) and (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Romania Concerning Peaceful uses of Nuclear Energy, with accompanying annex and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement, and the memorandum of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement. The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and various other attachments, including agency views, is also enclosed.

The proposed agreement with Romania has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation act of 1978 and as otherwise amended. In my judgment, the proposed agreement meets all statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States. The agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and Romania under appropriate conditions and controls reflecting our common commitment to nuclear nonproliferation goals. Cooperation until now has taken place under a series of supply agreements dating back to 1966 pursuant to the agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The Government of Romania supports international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries. Romania is a party to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has an agreement with the IAEA for the application of full-scope safeguards to its nuclear program. Romania also subscribes to the Nuclear Suppliers Group guidelines, which set forth standards for the responsible export of nuclear commodities for peaceful use, and to the guidelines of the NPT Exporters Committee (Zangger Committee), which oblige members to require the application of IAEA safeguards on nuclear exports to nonnuclear weapon states. In addition, Romania is a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, whereby it agrees to apply international standards of physical protection to the storage and transport of nuclear material under its jurisdiction or control. Finally, Romania was one of the first countries to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I believe that peaceful nuclear cooperation with Romania under the proposed new agreement will be fully consistent with, and supportive of, our policy of responding positively and constructively to the process of democratization and economic reform in Central Europe. Cooperation under the agreement also will provide opportunities for U.S. business on terms that fully protect vital U.S. national security interests.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1999.*

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–1619. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Passaic River, NJ'' Docket 01–97–134) received on February 5, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1620. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Explosive Loads and Detonations Bath Iron