motion was filed, I think it was vitiated. We did not go through with it. But we have to have that option, as we move this legislative process through.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I will be very brief. Let me just say, I appreciate the answers given by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

He did not answer my question as to the number of votes cast, or I should say the number of cloture votes taken, or the number of filibusters actually endured as we consider the motion to proceed. If I recall, there is not one.

Last year and the year before, there were many occasions when the majority leader was compelled to file a cloture petition because there was a filibuster on the motion to proceed.

I will simply restate for clarification, we had an agreement. The agreement was we go back to gifts when this legislation is finished. We are in violation of that agreement, No. 1. No. 2, I think it sends the wrong message about the desire of the majority to work with us in trying to accommodate an agenda. We were only given this a couple of minutes ago.

I am surprised and disappointed. We will work through it and we will certainly do our best to accommodate the schedule. We also would like to see a completion of a lot of these items. I think we can do so without throwing cloture petitions down prior to the time we even have some consultation as to whether it is necessary.

I thank the Senator. I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, just one further response, and I think we can move this issue along. One of the reasons we perhaps have not already finished the gift rule issue is that the majority leader wanted to accommodate the President on the Bosnian resolution question.

He deferred action from last week over to this week by agreement on both sides, and in an effort to accommodate the President and allow more time to pass so that maybe something different would change in Bosnia, or with regard to the situation in the United Nations. That is why we went back to Bosnia. Everybody understood that. We were not quite ready anyway on gift.

Plus, I might note, I do not believe there was any agreement that we would go to Ryan White before we went back to gift. We went to the Ryan White bill because there was agreement that we could take it up and hopefully complete it, and in the meantime we could continue to work on the gift rule.

We already have not done exactly what maybe was intended, but for good reason. We went to the Bosnia resolution because we did not complete it by agreement last week. We went to Ryan White because we were ready to go, and then we can keep working on the gift bill.

We will continue to work with the distinguished Democratic leader, and hopefully be able to finish all of these bills that we have scheduled before the week is out, and at a reasonable hour on Friday, also.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of S. 908, the State Department reorganization bill, immediately following the disposition of S. 641, the Ryan White bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. I object.

FOREIGN RELATIONS REVITALIZATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Therefore, I now move to proceed to S. 908, the State Department reorganization bill, and send a cloture petition to the desk on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the petition.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 908, the State Department Reorganization bill:

Dan Coats, Spencer Abraham, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, Rick Santorum, Jesse Helms, Judd Gregg, Rod Grams, Olympia Snowe, Bob Dole, Thad Cochran, Paul Coverdell, Larry E. Craig, Phil Gramm, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Don Nickles, Trent Lott.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote occur on Friday at 10 a.m. and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of S. 961, the foreign aid authorization bill, immediately following the disposition of S. 641, the Ryan White bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, for all the reasons already provided, I object.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for all the reasons cited on this side, I therefore now move to proceed to S. 961, the foreign aid authorization bill, and send a cloture petition to the desk on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 961, the Foreign Assistance Authorization bill:

Dan Coats, Spencer Abraham, Nancy Landon Kassebaum, Rick Santorum, Jesse Helms, Judd Gregg, Strom Thurmond, Olympia Snowe, Bob Dole, Thad Cochran, Paul Coverdell, Larry E. Craig, Phil Gramm, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Rod Grams, Trent Lott.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote occur on Friday, immediately following the 10 a.m. cloture vote if not invoked, and that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

RYAN WHITE CARE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the intention is to have two amendments voted on back to back as near to 6 o'clock or shortly thereafter as possible. Then we will continue with two more amendments, with no further rollcall votes this evening.

Tomorrow morning, we will vote on two additional amendments, plus final passage on Ryan White.

Did I state it correctly?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, there is a possibility of debate on another amendment that Senator GREGG has wanted to offer.

Mr. HELMS. Yes.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. That would be tomorrow morning, as well.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I talked with the distinguished floor leaders. I need 5 minutes, if possible, to be able to speak as in morning business.

I know the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has the floor. I do not want to in any way encroach upon his time. I need to do this.

Mr. HELMS. Proceed.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I would like to have the opportunity to ask——

Mr. HELMS. I still have the floor.

Mr. FORD. I apologize. I thought when you did that, you gave up the floor.

Mr. HELMS. No way, José.

Provided I do not lose my right to the floor, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada and to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BRYAN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I hope we will have an opportunity to listen to the Senator, but we are making good progress on this legislation.

I think we have just had an indication of some of the scheduling challenges and difficulties. We are trying to accommodate our Members. We would like to try, to the extent that we can, in response to the greater number of Senators, to deal with these amendments and try to dispose of them.

We are mindful that Members have matters of sufficient importance to address the Senate, but we really hope we can accommodate the greatest number of Senators, that we can try to discuss or debate these issues, and try to work them out to the extent that we can.

The only way we can do that is to have those matters up before the Senate. I will not object at the present time, but I hope, just to try to provide the greatest amount of accommodation to our colleagues, that we can have whatever time that we do have this evening focused on this bill.

Mr. FORD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. FORD. Parliamentary inquiry. The distinguished majority whip has just offered a motion as it relates to cloture on a motion to proceed.

Now, on that motion to proceed, if cloture is invoked, and the Ryan White legislation has not been finished, the reform legislation has not been finished, the gift ban has not been finished, do they all go back to the calendar if cloture is invoked?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We would remain on the cloture until it was disposed of.

Mr. FORD. They would not go back to the calendar because the will of the body has been that the legislation would be that motion proposed by the majority whip.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will suspend while the precedent is checked.

Mr. BRYAN. I will proceed for about 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. I yield the floor until we hear from the Parliamentarian.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and the floor leadership, who I realize are under very difficult time constraints.

ETHICS COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I want to talk to my colleagues for a moment regarding the situation which has arisen on the question of holding public hearings on the charges brought by the Senate Ethics Committee against Senator PACKWOOD, and as a result of remarks on the floor last Friday by the Ethics Committee chairman.

First, I want to briefly tell Members of the Senate where the process now stands, in terms of the Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee rules provide for a three-tier process. The first stage, preliminary inquiry; second stage, initial review; and the investigation phases.

The Ethics Committee completed its preliminary inquiry and voted on May 16 of this year to skip the initial review phase and move into the final investigative phase.

Since the three-tier process was created, only four other cases have gone to the final investigative stage. The committee found there is substantial credible evidence that a violation may have occurred in 18 incidents of alleged sexual misconduct, intentional tampering with the evidence, and improperly soliciting financial assistance.

At that point, under our rules, the committee offered Senator PACKWOOD an opportunity to appear before the committee, and he availed himself of that opportunity on June 27–29.

As the media has reported, when the Senate returned from the July 4 recess, the committee began meeting again. At that point in the process, it was time for the committee to make a decision on what else needed to be done in the investigative phase, including the question of holding public hearings. That is where the process stood when the committee met on July 11 and 12; meetings which have been duly reported in the media.

I went to the July 12 meeting thinking we would vote that day on the question of holding public hearings. The media has reported that the committee did not vote that day and that the meeting set for July 13 was canceled. The chairman of the Ethics Committee acknowledged on the floor last Friday that no other meetings are planned.

One thing I want to make clear, without getting into a long debate at this time on the merits of public hearings, is that holding public hearings in this case would be consistent with a long and well-established precedent. Those of us who are advocating public hearings are not trying to change the rules of the game. All four other cases which went into the final investigative phase had public hearings. Indeed, every major ethics case this century has had public hearings. This would be the first case to be the exception.

The process needs to move forward. I know of no reason the Ethics Committee has not met nor any reason why the committee has not voted on the question of holding public hearings. I am fully prepared to do so. We have now gone 2 weeks without a committee hearing.

Today I wrote the chairman, appealing to him to call a meeting of the Ethics Committee this week for the purpose of voting on the question of holding public hearings. Whatever may happen or not happen on the floor is a separate issue. There is simply no reason for the committee to delay further, and I hope the chairman will establish a meeting time this week so the committee can proceed with its business.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor. And I thank my colleagues for their accommodation.

RYAN WHITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 1854

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of amounts made available under this act for the promotion or encouragement of homosexuality or intravenous drug use)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment. I send it to the desk and ask it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 1854.

At the end, add the following new section:

SEC. . PROHIBITIONS AND LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

(a) PROMOTION OR ENCOURAGEMENT OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—No funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be used to promote or encourage, directly or indirectly, homosexuality, or intravenous drug use.

(b) DEFINITION.—As used in subsection (a), the term 'to promote or encourage, directly or indirectly, homosexuality' includes, but is not limited to, affirming homosexuality as natural, normal, or healthy, or, in the process of addressing related 'at-risk' issues, affirming in any way that engaging in a homosexual act is desirable, acceptable, or permissible, or, describing in any way techniques of homosexual sex.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as the distinguished clerk has just indicated, this amendment is simple. Forest Gump could understand this one.

I do not intend to take up a lot of time. I just say it is just a simple act of responsibility on the part of the Senate to make sure that no taxpayers' money—not a cent, not a farthing—distributed under the Ryan White legislation, shall be used in the promotion of homosexuality as being natural or normal—or that poppycock about just another lifestyle. None of the above is the case.

This amendment, therefore, takes another important step toward removing the Ryan White Act from politics. It provides a safeguard to make sure that Federal funds—that is to say the American taxpayers' money—ostensibly provided to help victims of the AIDS virus, these funds shall not be used to push the radical agenda of the homosexual activists.

I have said many times—and a lot of people do not like my saying it; that suits me all right. I do not like them not liking it. But, if the proponents of this bill really want to help those in need, let us make sure that we help those in need and not let the Ryan White funds be used for such outrageous, extraneous things.

This is not the first time I brought up this subject. About 8 years ago, I think it was, I submitted an amendment that prevented any funds used by the Centers for Disease Control for