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now and then. "Sure," she said. "That's no problem."

"How often can I have it, then?" I asked.

"Oh, probably two times a year."

Well, so much for steak.

I'm religious (but not fanatical) about eating meat, since I'll never smoke another cigarette. Before my attack, I knew they were bad for your lungs, but didn't know how deadly they were for the heart.

There's a wonderful community of heart patients out there. I'm now a member of their club. I can talk the language. It does us good to get to one another and swap notes. Not only is it a catharsis, but an education.

Each day, I learn something new about the people from others in "the club."

Almost daily, some perfect stranger comes up and says, "Senator, I had a triple two years ago."

Some 3,000 to 4,000 people sent me cards and letters. I read each one. A fifth grader from Conway wrote, "Senator, we heard you had died and we're glad it wasn't true. Welcome back."

A wonderful 83-year-old woman from Arkansas not only wrote me, but had her niece, one of her "Pryor" fan, one of the hand-held fans we gave out during campaigns. She thought it might cheer me up. Her niece, who is an author at New York University, being denounced for views that may be uncommon is much of the country but are in easy circulation—along with so many others—in my city, which has ever been known for diatribe of this order. Further, much was made of the author's association with that quintessential New York Journal, Commentary, a publication of the American Jewish Committee.

And so I went to the floor on July 19 and spoke my piece, thinking to merely set forth some of the cultural modes involved here. I surely meant to be good-natured.

I spoke to an empty Chamber, as is likely to be the case of a Friday morning, and did not expect any great notice to be taken. To say again, I was speaking for the sake of the record. The following Thursday, July 25, however, the Wall Street Journal had a short comment on my remarks in that portion of their editorial page which they call "Asides." They did not fail in their duty to sow discord among Democrats. They suggested that my remarks were a bellicose criticism of my good friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and noted, quite accurately in this case, that I had spoken of the intellectual difficulties that seem to plague our party just now. In all, the Journal quoted 68 words of my floor statement, which had been somewhere in the range of 2,000 words.

Even so, I was taken back by the tone of a letter which was "faxed" to me later the same day by Stanley N. Katz, president of the American Council of Learned Societies. I asked unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the Record.

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

THE NOMINATION OF CAROL IANNONE

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on Friday of the week before last, I spoke here on the floor about the rejection by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee of the nomination of Mr. Iannone to the Advisory Council for the National Endowment for the Humanities. There were simple enough reasons for having done this. I recall the early days of the Council when I met Irwin Cotler, as they are in the Johnson White House. I knew what pleasure it gave them to have begun this fine enterprise. And I know of the great expectations of the early Council members, notably Paul Horgan, that most luminous, incandescent scholar and writer. I have since followed the Council's fortunes, not always the happiest, but cumulative and on balance honorable and hopeful.

Then came this recent affair, which was at very least discordant. Language was used that I do not recognize as the language of scholarly disputation; not solely of those gathered under the broad and welcoming tent of the humanities, I am wearing the language of contemporary politics. Of which, I suppose, I am on familiar if not always friendly terms. I also heard—and here I ask the understanding of the Senate, for there are few of us who are not at times oversensitive, even prudish, on behalf of our States—I also heard the language of disapproval of New York. Very possibly, very likely, I got it wrong. But it would be disingenuous not to admit to having sensed it. Here was a New York newspaper and a New York author at New York University, being denounced for views that may be uncommon is much of the country but are in easy circulation—along with so many others—in my city, which has ever been known for diatribe of this order. Further, much was made of the author's association with that quintessential New York Journal, Commentary, a publication of the American Jewish Committee.

And so I went to the floor on July 19 and spoke my piece, thinking to merely set forth some of the cultural modes involved here. I surely meant to be good-natured.

I spoke to an empty Chamber, as is likely to be the case of a Friday morning, and did not expect any great notice to be taken. To say again, I was speaking for the sake of the record. The following Thursday, July 25, however, the Wall Street Journal had a short comment on my remarks in that portion of their editorial page which they call "Asides." They did not fail in their duty to sow discord among Democrats. They suggested that my remarks were a bellicose criticism of my good friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and noted, quite accurately in this case, that I had spoken of the intellectual difficulties that seem to plague our party just now. In all, the Journal quoted 68 words of my floor statement, which had been somewhere in the range of 2,000 words.

Even so, I was taken back by the tone of a letter which was "faxed" to me later the same day by Stanley N. Katz, president of the American Council of Learned Societies. I asked unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the Record.

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

I am outraged by your statement. Perhaps the nine Senators who voted against her hate Italians, Catholics and working-class people? Women, too? It seems a shame.

The organization of which I am President opposed Iannone's nomination in a letter to Senator Kennedy's committee. We are concerned with the mendacious claim that the overall quality of the NEH Council, given the fact that NEH is increasingly the dominant funder in the humanities in this country.

Skepticism is neither a disease nor a disability. It is a strength. There are two problems of political correctness in this country, and probably two times a year I have publicly endorsed the version of PC espoused by Dr. Cheney, President Bush, and the Olin and Heritage Foundations. How good is the Democratic Party in this regard? Much more important, how does that aid the free exchange of ideas in a democratic society?

I have never written an angry letter to a public official before, but I have never felt so betrayed by someone I admired.

Yours sadly,

STANLEY N. KATZ.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Apart from the fact that I was not accusing anybody of anything, there are two problems with this letter which lead me to feel that it is not enough to ignore it, or to set it aside with a soft answer.

The first problem is that Mr. Katz chose to write a letter of such fierce conviction on the basis of three brief excerpts from a statement made on the Senate floor without having read the statement itself. There would have been no great problem obtaining the full text. The Congressional Record reaches New York. In the event the mails had proved deficient, I would happily have had a copy sent over from my New York office. I would even have faxed a copy!

Just what is going on here? Surely a first principle of scholarly work is to obtain all the available facts. In the humanities this is elementally a matter of getting "the text." By contrast, nothing so afflicts the politics of our time as the 30-second quote taken out of context, and in worse taste. Has the disorder spread? Evidently.

But next, what is this business of my having attacked "Something like
300,000 postdoctoral scholars belong (founding) to 114 organizations. "(El) each and every one of these think gets close to Newspeak. Evidently, I have offended The People, "each and every one of whom will now rise—alone, now—in righteous wrath. They are the lexical component mode in all this. I recall a passage of Hannah Arendt in which she writes of the tactic of the totalitarian elites in Europe in the 1920's and 1930's of turning every statement of fact into a question. I will come back to this. In any event, I certainly do not like hearing from Dr. Katz that he speaks for me. The current Amiral Report of the American Council of Learned Societies has a page headed "Organizational Structure." It begins:

CONSTITUENT SOCIETIES (WITH YEAR OF FOUNCING)
American Philosophical Society, 1743.
American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1780.
American Antiquarian Society, 1812.

It happens that I am a member of each of these distinguished bodies. Membership is by election, and brings no small advantages. Thus, there are now members of the American Philosophical Society, Dr. Franklin having seen to the matter centuries ago. Mind, he limited membership to 500. It also carries responsibility. I do not one bit care for the idea that an executive of the society would claim to speak individually for three thousand hundred American—and foreign—scholars whose irrepressible practice is to speak for themselves.

All of which leads me to ask, are things as bad at American universities as some would have us think? Years ago—it would be 18 now—I was asked to give the Sears Lectures at Andover Academy in Massachusetts in 1973. Sears was in the mid-to-late 1960's, university and college campuses across the nation had been the scene of great tumult and disorder. It seemed to many that this could only worsen. I was not inclined to think the worse the better I took a dissenting view. I said it all over. I called my lecture, "Peace"—it was later published in the Public Interest—and argued that the extraordinary demographic change of the 1960's was now a thing of the past, and would no longer sustain the ideological tumult of the period. Campus disorders were over. Here is an excerpt.

I'd like to state that most of the events that tore American society almost apart, or so it seemed in the 1960's arose from conditions unique to the decade in which they occurred. They had not ever existed before. They will never exist again. They involved the interaction of demographic and political-cultural changes. We have more complex temperamental changes at work, all derived from the Greeks, and vaguely related to philosophical doctrines of the past. We use these "theories"—the interaction of muscles, of chemicals, of philosophical doctrine, such that two events quite separate in their origin affect another one in such a way as to produce outcomes vastly different and greater than either could produce on its own, nor fundamentally in ways fundamentally different from the effect either event would have, had it occurred in isolation.

The proposition I'm going to put to you is this: let us suppose that we start a discussion of just what did happen. I'm going to say to you that the 1960's saw a profound change in American society which was a one-time change, a growth in population faster than any that had ever occurred before or any that could occur in the future. In short, with respect to a particular subgroup in the population, namely those persons fourteen to twenty-four years of age in 1960, a population interested in a synergistic sense with a whole series of other events which occurred, if you will, in the world of ideas, as distinct from the physical world in which populations increase or decrease. In the best-known example of the 1960's, people changed in sympathy company—I recall his forerunners of the aftermath of that period. He felt, as best I understood him at the time, that an already deep division in American culture had grown even deeper, and that there was bad feeling and degradation of democratic dogma. Here is a passage from Noel Annan's remarkable memoir, "Our Age," just now published in the United States:

"There is something else I do not like in the title of Our Age (an) American. Lionel Trilling was par excellence a New York intellectual, but his works on Arnold and E.M. Forster and his sympathy for English culture gave him a special place in the affections of Our Age. His referents were Freud and Marx, but the conclusions he drew from them were very often to the contrary. The Parisian Review expected when he looked at the wheelbarrow of progressive conclusions that should have been gathered in planting ideas. Trilling defended Whittaker Chambers and shocked his liberal friends by accepting that Alger His had been a spy. The theme of his first volume of essays, The Liberal Imagination, was that liberals had no imagination. He used the word 'liberal' in the American sense as the educated class or of the intellectual class, with a profit motive, a belief in progress, science, social legislation, planning and international co-operation. That no major great writer had ever celebrated these beliefs and he wondered how liberals could admire those who rejected these beliefs so decisively. He questioned whether the heroes of American modern literature in the 20th century—Debey, Woolf, Dos Passos—were heroes or plodders bereft of subtlety or ideas. He said that sociologists such as David Riesman told us more about society than the liberal in the English sense—or rather of those Englishmen who were suspicious of the good intentions of the enlightened.

These are matters of profound concern to the American intellectuals everywhere, and at all times. But having read Jonathan Yardley's withering comment about this most recent "battle between the spent, irrelevant old left and the elephantine" I wonder whether we might all look to our manners just a bit. Mind, many of the adversaries on both sides were impeccable in this regard. I would urge Dr. Katz that he need not indulge any insurrectionary citations in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index and the Social Science Citation Index. It was also alleged that her principal publications have appeared in the most things esthetic, and should cause some confusion to me whether the objection to Dr. Iannone was that she had ever published in Commentary, or that she had done so insuffi- ciently. No matter. I express my disappointment on behalf of Dr. Iannone, and melancholy acknowledgement of the majority's censure of the Democratic Party. I almost said demise, but will leave bad enough alone.

A curious allegation: merely a Professor Pillar-ary writer. And in ways, a revealing one about our capital. Just to say it out loud is to realize that just possibly Washington is the only capital in the Western world in which such an allegation would be made with intent to harm. In London, Paris, Rome, Stockholm, to say of a professor of literature that his or her principal work has appeared in Commentary is—well—to say that this is a critic of the first rank. In the tradition, say, of Lionel Trilling.

My lawyer and friend, Leonard Magid, says, "Published By The American Jewish Committee." It was founded, as I recall, in 1945—thereabouts—by the legendary Elliot R. Abraham. Abraham died in 1959. He was thereupon succeeded by Norman Podhoretz, who remains editor in chief. He was succeeded by Leon Wieseltier, Norman Mailer, and Brenda Brown. They have equal, one should not doubt, in the world of literary criticism. But that said, the matter rests. None surpasses them.
Ours is a political world down here, and these ideas do not routinely enter our thoughts, much less our conversation. This despite the fact that from the first, Comment- 
ary writers have had pronounced polit- 
ic thought. It may be more pervasive than an American style, but then New

York has always had a special association with European trends and the rest of the world. But I just failed to notice.

I distinctly recall, and knowing his great good nature, I am sure he will not object to me mentioning, that in 1977 with Then Vice President Mondale. The spring recess was about to begin and he was off to one of his beloved Minnesota lakes where his tackle box and bass gear awaited him. He had been asked to stop in New York on his way home to speak at the dedication of a new facility at Sloan-Kettering Hospi-
tal. Hubert Humphrey had been treated there the previous year and there was, of course, nothing he or any other Member of the Senate would not do for Hubert. I assume it is correct to refer to the Vice President as one of us. He is, after all, our Presiding Officer. The Vice President, as was his great courtesy—which I could wish had become a custom of that office—asked if I would like to ride with him. I was happy to oblige, but would not want to be on hand at Sloan-Kettering. Anyway, I got out to Andrews a few minutes before he did and bought a lunch at an abandoned Air Force Two with a cup of coffee and the new Commentary. The cover fea-
tured a major article on Soviet politics by a friend of mine who was then teaching at Harvard. I thought it first-rate, and men-
tioned it to the Vice President when he got aboard. He said he would take lunch with him on his vacation, to which, of course, I agreed. That afternoon I called Norman Podhoretz. I said:

Many are the good news and some bad news. The good news is that the Vice President of the United States is taking the new issue of Commentary with him to read over his vacation. The bad news is that until this morning the Vice President of the United States had never heard of Commen-
tary.

I have to believe that things have not much changed in the intervening 15 years. In the Senate, that is. Mind, the Washing-
ton Post is such matters. It is not so long ago that the Post called Comment-
ary “America’s most consequential journal of opinion” and largely redefined the standards of the Toronto Daily Star, which once declared:

[It] (Commentary) is the best monthly in the English-speaking world.

This is the Journal Professor Iannoone is accused of writing for. Well, there you are. Well, no, there is more. My distinguished friend, the Senator from Utah, touches upon the matter in a remark that appeared in yesterday’s Post. In an exchange in the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, he defended Professor Iannone’s qualifications stating: She’s from a first-generation, immigrant, working class family. * * * And she’s only 43 years old.

Senator Hatch may know more than even he does in this list of qualifications of Commentary that to a degree that I cannot imagine has any contemporary or historical equivalent, Commentary has pub-
lished some amazing writers over the years and/or raised among the working classes of New York City. Many of them were and are Jewish, as is now natural for a journal pub-
lished by the American Jewish Committee. Many had grown up in the Marxist milieu that was so common in New York in the years 1920-50. Some had been Marxists, fre-

quently Trotskyites. Others had been anti-

intelectuals. Indeed, some are used to it. The Confidenthips writer in the 1940’s—who died much too young—observed, either way your life was caught up with that subject. And so the issue and its contributors have always been more than the tone in the 1940’s—’50’s, where his tackle box and bass gear awaited him. He had been asked to stop in New York on his way home to speak at the dedication of a new facility at Sloan-Kettering Hospital. Hubert Humphrey had been treated there the previous year and there was, of course, nothing he or any other Member of the Senate would not do for Hubert. I assume it is correct to refer to the Vice President as one of us. He is, after all, our Presiding Officer. The Vice President, as was his great courtesy—which I could wish had become a custom of that office—asked if I would like to ride with him. I was happy to oblige, but would not want to be on hand at Sloan-Kettering. Anyway, I got out to Andrews a few minutes before he did and bought a lunch at an abandoned Air Force Two with a cup of coffee and the new Commentary. The cover featured a major article on Soviet politics by a friend of mine who was then teaching at Harvard. I thought it first-rate, and mentioned it to the Vice President when he got aboard. He said he would take lunch with him on his vacation, to which, of course, I agreed. That afternoon I called Norman Podhoretz. I said:

Many are the good news and some bad news. The good news is that the Vice President of the United States is taking the new issue of Commentary with him to read over his vacation. The bad news is that until this morning the Vice President of the United States had never heard of Commentary.

I have to believe that things have not much changed in the intervening 15 years. In the Senate, that is. Mind, the Washington Post is such matters. It is not so long ago that the Post called Commentary “America’s most consequential journal of opinion” and largely redefined the standards of the Toronto Daily Star, which once declared:

[It] (Commentary) is the best monthly in the English-speaking world.

This is the Journal Professor Iannone is accused of writing for. Well, there you are. Well, no, there is more. My distinguished friend, the Senator from Utah, touches upon the matter in a remark that appeared in yesterday’s Post. In an exchange in the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, he defended Professor Iannone’s qualifications stating: She’s from a first-generation, immigrant, working class family. * * * And she’s only 43 years old.

Senator Hatch may know more than even he does in this list of qualifications of Commentary that to a degree that I cannot imagine has any contemporary or historical equivalent, Commentary has published some amazing writers over the years and/or raised among the working classes of New York City. Many of them were and are Jewish, as is now natural for a journal published by the American Jewish Committee. Many had grown up in the Marxist milieu that was so common in New York in the years 1920-50. Some had been Marxists, frequently Trotskyites. Others had been anti-intelectuals. Indeed, some are used to it. The Confidenthips writer in the 1940’s—who died much too young—observed, either way your life was caught up with that subject. And so the issue and its contributors have always been more than the tone in the 1940’s—’50’s, where
Nebraska, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, as Senators will know from the long and careful reports in yesterday’s press, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee on Wednesday rejected by one vote the controversial nomination of Carol Iannone to the advisory council for the National Endowment for the Humanities. The view of the majority appears to have been that Dr. Iannone had insufficient citation in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index and the Social Science Citation Index. It was also alleged that her principal publications have appeared in Commentary magazine. It was never dear to me whether the objection to Dr. Iannone was that she had ever published in Commentary, or that she had done so insufficiently. No matter. I rise merely to express my disappointment on behalf of Dr. Iannone, and melancholy acknowledgement of the further intellectual decline of the Democratic Party. I almost said demise, but will leave bad enough alone.

A curious allegation: merely a Commentary writer. And in ways, a revealing one about our capital. Just to say it out loud is to realize that just possibly Washington is the only capital in the Western world in which such an allegé can be made with intent to harm. In London, Paris, Rome, Stockholm, to say of a professor of literature that his or her principal work has appeared in Commentary is—well—sad. This is a critique of the first rank. In the tradition, say, of Lionel Trilling.

Commentary is, as its cover states, “Published By The American Jewish Committee.” It was founded, as a recall, in 1945—thereabouts—by the legendary Elliot E. Cohen who was editor until his death in 1959. He was thereupon succeeded by Norman Podhoretz, founding editor, later assisted by Neal Kozodoy, Marion Magid, and Brenda Brown. They have equals, one should not doubt, in the world of literary criticism. But that said, the matter rests. None surpass them.

Ours is a political world down here, and these matters do not routinely enter our thoughts, much less our conversation. This despite the fact that from the start, Commentary writers have had pronounced political views. This again may be more a European than an American style, but then New York has always had a special association with European thought which the rest of the Nation has not failed to notice.

I distinctly recall, and knowing his great good nature, I am sure he will not object to my relating, a trip to New York with my father in May 1945, after then Vice President Marshall. The spring recess was about to begin and he was off to one of his beloved Minnesota lakes where his tackle box and bass gear awaited him. He had been asked to visit New York on his way home to speak at the dedication of a new facility at Sloan–Kettering Hospital. Hubert Humphrey had been treated there the previous year and there was, of course, nothing he or any other Member of the Senate would not do for Hubert. I assume it is correct to refer to the Vice President as one of us. He is, after all, our Presiding Officer, and it is my casual courtesy—which I could wish had become a custom of that office—asked if I would like to ride up with him. I was heading home as well, and what I normally would hand at Sloan–Kettering. Anyway, I got out to Andrews a few minutes before Fritz arrived, and settled down aboard Air Force Two with a cup of coffee and the new Commentary. I recall once visiting W.H. Auden in the Village. He was living in the building from which Trotsky had published Novy Mir before the Russian revolution, a thought which gave the great British poet much satisfaction. As it was, Harry oxonisky, as was, after all, a literateur. A bohemian. He would never, however, have made a Commentary writer. Too refined.

I ought to declare my interest here. I first appeared in Commentary—Lord save us—30 years ago this May. My article, which Norman Podhoretz features on the cover, was entitled “Bosses and Reformers: A Profile of the New York Democratic Party.” It had been written over the intervening 15 years. It is to be announced, and a new group of middle or upper middle class, mostly Protestant and Jewish, professionals who were challenging the old-time leaders. Derigulated, of course, as “bosses.” This was something new. What is rare exceptions, such as Herbert Claiborne Pell, Jr., father of our revered senior Senator from Rhode Island, a Member of Congress from Manhattan, and from 1921–48 chairman of the State Democratic Committee. As New Yorkers moved into the middle classes, they left the Democratic Party in this century. The Irish were even then departing, as Glazer and I wrote in “Beyond The Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City.” But something in the Jewish tradition said otherwise. Middle-class professionals they may be, or may have become, but they—
manded Democrats. But, as Bernard Shaw might say, with different tastes. The truth was adumbrated in the disfigured President's race of 1953 and 1956. But all hell broke out over the nomination of John F. Kennedy for President in 1950. Kennedy was a Catholic; Kennedy was brother—well. The first statement was a fact, the second a perception. But among New York liberals perceptions are facts. And so the word went forth from Eleanor Roosevelt, Thomas K. Findeer, and yes, our beloved Governor Herbert Lehman, that Kennedy would not do. The reformers hated and feared him. Not least because the "bosses" supported him. Now these bosses were, generally speaking, perfectly democratic Democrats, such as Charlie Buckley of the Bronx, our grand old colleague Gene Kech of Brooklyn, even the legendary Dan O'Connell of Albany. Well, in the latter part of the century a real rose as well as an alleged one. Kennedy was the overwhelming favorite in our party. But not of the reformers. The scenes in the Los Angeles Convention were tumultuous, often painful. Even if it is 1½ votes. And all agreed, the reformers had only 2½ votes, all pledged to Stevenson. I was a Kennedy delegate in Los Angeles—an alternate "delegate, actually, but I have in my Senate office a small framed, green badge that says "Delegate for Kennedy," with my name written below. But I had friends in the reform camp. When it was all over and the wounds, if anything, were still open. It seemed to me a useful thing to try to explain this to the respective parties, neither of which really understood the other. There was no better place to publish such an article than Commentary, and I was thrilled when Norman Podhoretz accepted. Mr. President, I haven't got that quite right. It was not just that Commentary was the best place to publish it. It was also the only place that would. A foururnal that its editors believed that would not just be interested in what working class Democrats thought.

That is the point I would like to make. My good friend from Utah was absolutely right. I very much fear Professor Iannone's troubles arose, not from the quality of her work, but from her social, ethnic and otherwise. She is an Italian, Catholic ethnique with a working class background.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried an absorbing review by David Broock of Aaron Wildavsky's new book, "The Belaboured Presidency." Professor Wildavsky, lest now amongst the lotus eaters of Berkeley, recalls the street-wise toughness of a native New Yorker. And he can spot what is going on among Democrats. What is going on is the logical extension of the President's race in Commentary 30 years ago. To wit, the Democrats are becoming a party that delegitimized the Nation's second largest constituency—white, working, Christian males.

I suppose the second largest such group would be the female of that species. In any event, Professor Iannone has had a setback on account of it. But I dare to hope that she will not take it personally. I do not know her, but I know some of her work. From Commentary, obviously. I sense that quality William James described as tough-mindedness. Actually, the future should be bright. She has been banned in Boston. No greater fortune ever attended the struggling novelist of the 1930's. Sales would soar outside of Boston. Professor Iannone has now been banned in the Democratic Party. What greater fortune could befall an American intellectual in this decadent fin de siecle? I wish her well.

Mr. President, I wish her well.

Seeing no Senator seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENTING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDENTING OFFICER (Mr. Rusk). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 113

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Concurrent Resolution 113, a concurrent resolution regarding the use of driftnets, just received from the House, be placed on the calendar.

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

COMMITTEE DISCHARGED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION AND BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR 114

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 884, the Driftnet Moratorium Enforcement Act of 1991, and that the measure then be placed on the calendar.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathron, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presidenting Officer laid before the Senate the message of the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from the further consideration of the following bill which was placed on the calendar:

S. 884. A bill to require the President to impose economic sanctions against countries that fail to eliminate large-scale driftnet fishing.

The following concurrent resolution, previously received from the House of Representatives for concurrence, was read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H. Con. Res. 113. A concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President should seek an international conference on the use of large-scale driftnets called for in United Nations Resolution 44-225, while working to achieve the United States policy of a permanent ban on large-scale driftnets.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, without amendment:

S. 1058. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a center for tobacco products, to inform the public concerning the hazards of tobacco use, to provide for disclosure of additives to such products, and to require that information be provided concerning such products to the public; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 101-112).

By Mr. NUNN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1507. An original bill to authorize appropriation for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal years for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 102-115).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 1502. A bill to extend until January 1, 1993 the suspension of excise taxes on imported glass fibers, to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NUNN (for himself Mr. ROTH, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 1503. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide more stringent requirements for the Robert T. Stafford Student Loan Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 102-116).

By Mr. INOUYE (for himself Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. KANEN, and Mr. BURSEN):