

Gramm	Levin	Sarbanes
Grassley	Lieberman	Schumer
Gregg	Lincoln	Sessions
Hagel	Lott	Shelby
Harkin	Lugar	Smith (NH)
Hatch	McCain	Smith (OR)
Helms	McConnell	Snowe
Hollings	Mikulski	Specter
Hutchinson	Miller	Stabenow
Hutchison	Murkowski	Stevens
Inouye	Murray	Thomas
Jeffords	Nelson (FL)	Thompson
Johnson	Nelson (NE)	Thurmond
Kennedy	Nickles	Torricelli
Kerry	Reed	Voinovich
Kohl	Reid	Warner
Kyl	Roberts	Wellstone
Landrieu	Rockefeller	Wyden
Leahy	Santorum	

NOT VOTING—2

Ensign Inhofe

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAUCUS). Without objection, the President will be notified of the Senate's action.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to the Jorgenson nomination be vitiated; that immediately following the first vote today with respect to the amendment to S. 565, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Cindy Jorgenson; that once the nomination is reported, the Senate, without further intervening action, proceed to a vote on confirmation; that upon confirmation the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to request the yeas and nays on the nomination.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will return to legislative session.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have just received the Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform bill from the House. As I have said before, this bill gives us the first real chance in a generation to limit the access of special interests to the political process.

I had intended to ask consent to take up and pass this bill immediately. However, the Republican leader has indicated to me that he was making progress on reaching an agreement on how to proceed with campaign finance reform. Therefore, I am willing to withhold my unanimous consent request at this time, pending an update

from the Republican leader on how discussions on this issue in his caucus are proceeding.

As my colleagues will recall, we tried to reach an agreement to take up the House-passed bill before the President's day recess. Opponents of reform objected, saying that they wanted time to look over the bill.

They have now had more than a week. What they have found, I am sure, is a bill that is very similar to the McCain-Feingold bill that the Senate passed last spring.

At the time, we spent 2 weeks on McCain-Feingold. We had a full, fair, and open debate, and we passed that bill with a strong bipartisan majority. I see no reason why we can't take this bill up and pass it quickly.

In fact, the only reason I can think that anyone would oppose consent would be to take one more shot at keeping this bill from becoming law—either by filibustering or by trying to send this bill to a conference.

And so I say to them: Look what happened in the House. Opponents of reform used every conceivable argument and excuse—every imaginable ploy to stop this. They failed.

This is going to be the year that we pass strong campaign finance reform, and put the reins of government back into the hands of all of the people. The sooner we pass this bill, the sooner we can get it to the President for his signature. I look forward to revisiting this issue in the near future.

I will not, as I say, ask consent at this time, and I appreciate very much the consultation I have had with the Republican leader in this regard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator DASCHLE for his comments. While there are some similarities between the two bills—McCain-Feingold, which passed the Senate, and Shays-Meehan, which has passed the House—there are some fundamental differences between the two bills. Normally, what you do under the circumstances is go to conference. But this week we have had to review what was actually in the bill that passed the House. We have now received the conference report. The Senators did just return yesterday—or even this morning. There are discussions among those who are interested in getting a result, not trying to create a problem. If we went right to it at this point, I am sure there would be Senators on both sides who would feel inclined to offer amendments, and it could take considerable time.

We had indicated we would try to wrap up election reform as soon as possible—hopefully today—and that we would get on energy and stay on energy as long as it took to get that completed. I think giving us a little time for discussions to take place between the interested Senators would be constructive and would allow us to go for-

ward with election reform and even get started on the energy bill, recognizing that the majority leader could interject this at any point along the way. There is no need and no desire to delay this indefinitely. I think a little time—a couple days—would be constructive. Maybe we can find a way to do it in an acceptable way and quicker by doing that.

I appreciate the patience of the majority leader. I have found from past experience that sometimes patience gives great rewards; other times, it does no good at all. I hope this time it will be positive in its result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEVIN). The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I can respond to the Republican leader, I appreciate his report and agree there are times when patience has shown its reward. I am hopeful this is one of those times. I will work with him.

Obviously, patience at some point runs out. That will necessitate taking action as we had originally contemplated, but we certainly want to work with the Republican leader and his colleagues in an effort to see whether patience can be a productive experience in this case.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I certainly thank the majority leader for his comments, and I thank the Republican leader for his comments. It sounds as if we may be moving toward a resolution of the campaign finance issue without a filibuster in the Senate. I am actually confident we will prevail if such a tactic is actually employed against us, but I do not think the American people will be well served if we have to take a significant amount of time to further debate an issue that we dealt with and essentially resolved last year during a very good 2-week debate process.

We passed the McCain-Feingold bill by a vote of 59 to 41. The House passed the Shays-Meehan bill by a vote of 240 to 189. These are wide bipartisan margins in both Houses.

Actually, I disagree with the minority leader. The differences between the bills are actually very slight. It is not enough to justify a conference committee which very well may never report a final bill. So Senator MCCAIN and I have endorsed the House-passed bill and will ask our colleagues to vote for it, rejecting all attempts to amend it, however meritorious, so we can send this bill to the President. Should there be technical amendments necessary on which we could agree, we will be glad to consider supporting a technical corrections bill after the bill is enacted.

I hope the leader's discussion bears fruit and we can come to agreement on terms of final debate and a vote on this legislation very soon. We have waited many years for this moment, as you know well because you have been one of the key leaders on this. The time to