

can find and then put it on a web site that can be used in a campaign speech on the part of the challenger.

I agree with the Democratic leader that this cheapens the institution. I agree with the Democratic leader that it threatens the institution. But I disagree with him as to the solution.

I think all Senators need to back away from the idea that the primary purpose of being in the Senate is to give campaign speeches, and back away from the idea that the primary function of coming to the floor is to do things that will give you an advantage in November and so you can misrepresent and attack an incumbent. There is a time for partisanship, and there is a time to be very firm about the position that you take. But there is also a time to recognize that the institution is threatened if you let partisanship get out of hand.

It reminds me of the signature comment that comes to us out of the Vietnam War where, I believe, a captain was quoted as saying after a particular battle that it was "necessary to destroy the village in order to pacify it." If it is necessary to destroy the institution of the Senate in order to make it part of my party's control, I want no part of that activity. In my own campaign, I have refused to engage in negative advertising. I want no part of what I call "Carville-ism"; that is, the politics of personal destruction that has become so prevalent in the last 8 years. I want no part of it.

I remember a man saying to me: If you do not go negative, you will not win the nomination.

I said to him: The nomination is not worth it. I would rather retain my self-respect than gain a seat in the Senate. Fortunately, I have both.

I say to all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—because Republicans campaign just as vigorously as Democrats—let's stop using the Senate as an institution solely for campaign purposes. Let's stop using the rules of the Senate that can allow votes and that can call up amendments solely for the purpose of creating campaign records. Let's recognize that the purpose of the Senate is for legislation, not campaigning.

If we can do that, we will not get back to the days that I have described, but we will at least get towards them in the sense that this institution will survive, as we like to call it, "the greatest deliberative body in the world" and not "the greatest campaign forum in the world."

I thank the Chair for his patience. I thank my colleagues for their indulgence as I have taken this memory trip. But I hope that all of us will recognize that we have something to learn from the past and from the kind of institution this once was, and we have a responsibility to see to it that it does not degenerate into what it could be.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I listened to Senator CRAIG's remarks

about Senator Mitchell's use of cloture in the 103d Congress. As to the cloture numbers the Senator mentioned, yes Senator Mitchell filed cloture 23 times on the first day of an item's consideration but what he failed to mention was that only one of those instances was on a bill. Let me repeat that—in only one instance in the entire 103d Congress did Senator Mitchell file cloture on the first day a bill was considered, and in that instance it was with the bill sponsor's permission. It was Senator ROCKEFELLER and the bill was product liability. In all but four of the other instances the Senate was not in an amendable situation, they were on motions to proceed, conference reports, or attempts to go to conference.

There were two instances where Senator Mitchell filed on amendments on their first day, the first was on Senator KENNEDY's substitute amendment to the national community service bill and the other was on the Mitchell-Dole Brady gun amendment, in each case a true filibuster was going to be waged. In other words members of the minority had indicated a willingness to try and kill the legislation by extended debate. This has not been the case this Congress', cloture is filed in attempt to stifle the ability of individual Senators to offer amendments and that is the crucial difference that I pointed out last week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before we do the closing remarks, we are waiting to see if Senator DASCHLE has any remarks he would like to make at this point.

Just so Senators will be aware of the likely schedule this week, of course this is the week before the Memorial Day recess. We have a number of conferences that are completed or nearing completion, so we could have votes on a number of conference reports this week, including but not necessarily limited to bankruptcy reform, crop insurance, the satellite loan conference report, and the e-commerce digital signature conference report. Not all of those have been wrapped up, but we are hopeful that one or all four of those will be available during the process of the week's schedule.

We also are expecting to receive from the House early in the week the Agriculture appropriations bill. We had hoped to go to that bill tomorrow and then, of course, as soon as it was received from the House we would go to

the House-passed bill. If the House is not able to complete action on the Agriculture appropriations bill on Tuesday, then we will need to confer with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and decide exactly how we can go to that bill and have its consideration completed before the week is out. But I want to emphasize before we go home for Memorial Day, we must complete the Agriculture appropriations bill.

We are still hoping that the House will be able to act on the legislative appropriations bill and we will be able to complete action on it also before we leave.

So we will be having votes possibly into the night on Tuesday. We could very likely have a late session Thursday. Members should expect a session on Friday. If we are not through with the Agriculture appropriations bill, then we will keep going until we complete it. We could be in session Friday night or Saturday. This is work that has to be done. For reasons which I need not repeat at this point, we are behind schedule in getting that done. We need to complete it.

I am not going to propound a unanimous consent request at this time on nominations, but so everybody will know, we have now been discussing the possibility of an agreement to take up as many as 72 nominations. There may still be some objections to one, two, or three of those. Somewhere between 65 and 72 nominations have been offered by the majority that we could take up and consider. Most of them would be confirmed, without the need for debate, in wrapup or on a unanimous voice vote. In at least four or five cases, some time would be required, with regard to the FEC nominees and at least a couple judges, with recorded votes necessary on somewhere between four and six at the most.

We could complete up to as many as 72 nominations in the next 24 hours, including 16 new Federal judicial nominations. Again, three or four of those nominations for judgeships could require recorded votes, but I believe we could get them all done.

There has been objection from the minority. I discussed the situation with Senator DASCHLE this morning, and he is still working on it. We hope we can get this resolved shortly without having to spend the whole week just on nominations. This really should be done in 5 or 6 hours with five or six votes and the rest of them done without any objections. There are a variety of nominations: U.S. marshals, U.S. attorneys, IRS oversight board members; Administrator, drug enforcement; two National Transportation Safety Board members; one Nuclear Regulatory Commission member; eight various Department of State positions, including the special negotiator for chemical and biological arms control issues, and a number of other nominees.

I want it on the record that we are prepared to go to those at this point.