

NAYS—26

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Bryan	Glenn	McCain
Bumpers	Harkin	Mikulski
Byrd	Hollings	Pryor
Conrad	Kennedy	Reid
Daschle	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRESIDIO PROPERTIES ADMINISTRATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative 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 Kennedy amendment No. 3573.

Edward M. Kennedy, Paul Wellstone, Joe Biden, J.J. Exon, Chuck Robb, Carol Moseley-Braun, Christopher Dodd, Bryon L. Dorgan, Claiborne Pell, Kent Conrad, John F. Kerry, Ron Wyden, David Pryor, Russell D. Feingold, Paul Sarbanes, Patrick Leahy, Dianne Feinstein, Frank R. Lautenberg.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are ordered under rule XXII.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—55 yeas, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Akaka	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Baucus	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Harkin	Nunn
Boxer	Hatfield	Pell
Bradley	Heflin	Pryor
Breaux	Hollings	Reid
Bryan	Inouye	Robb
Bumpers	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Byrd	Johnston	Roth
Cohen	Kennedy	Santorum
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
Dodd	Lautenberg	Specter
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Exon	Levin	Wyden
Feingold	Lieberman	
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—45

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Bennett	Gorton	McCain
Bond	Gramm	McConnell
Brown	Grams	Murkowski
Burns	Grassley	Nickles
Campbell	Gregg	Pressler
Chafee	Hatch	Shelby
Coats	Helms	Simpson
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith
Coverdell	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Kassebaum	Thomas
DeWine	Kempthorne	Thompson
Dole	Kyl	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 55, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1996 AND 1997—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 1561, the State Department Authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1561), a bill to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of March 8, 1996.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call off the quorum call for 5 minutes to speak as in morning business.

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

NO GIFT BAN EXEMPTION

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today in the Washington Post, and yesterday in the Congress Daily, there were some articles suggesting that Senator MCCONNELL, Chair of the Senate Ethics Committee, was talking about a blanket exemption on the gift ban—and there may be changes to this,

and I hope so—for the upcoming political conventions in San Diego and in Chicago.

Mr. President, I want to speak very briefly—and I suspect that I speak on behalf of other colleagues, Senator MCCAIN from Arizona, Senator FEINGOLD from Wisconsin, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator LEVIN—after more than 2½ years of negotiations and several hard-fought battles, just as the ink is drying, for a major change like this to be proposed, I think would be a serious breach of faith with the people in our country.

Mr. President, a friend and former Senator, Eugene McCarthy, who, by the way, will be 80 this weekend, has joked with me about being a “Calvinist” on congressional gift rules, but the reason many of us Senators worked very hard on this reform is that we want people to have more confidence and more trust and more faith in the political process. I just want to say that I really think if there is any kind of blanket exemption here, it would be a terrible mistake.

I can see the headlines now: “Members of Congress Take a Holiday from New Ethics Rule;” or “Pressed By Special Interests, Members Backslide to Provide Access;” or another headline, “Safe Harbor From Ethics Rules Members Let Their Hair Down at the Conventions.”

Mr. President, I just want to make it clear to colleagues that we would be making a terrible mistake. It is one thing if there are specific issues that have to be resolved, specific problems where maybe there could be minor clarifications. I say just maybe because I think this gift ban legislation is very reasonable.

But, quite frankly, people do not want to see us go into these conventions and having special interests pay for our hotels or having them pay for various kinds of outings or having them pay for fancy dinners. It is just simply out of the question, Mr. President.

We have a \$50 limit on a gift. You can take one up to \$50. I say if somebody is thinking about eating more than \$50 worth of shrimp at a gathering, this is becoming more a health care issue, not an issue of gift reform.

I do not mean to be just talking about this with a twinkle in my eye, but I want to say to colleagues, I do not know what was intended by these comments, but those who worked very hard on this certainly would be out on the floor. If there was any broad or blanket exemption, we would oppose it with all our might. And, more importantly, people in this country would not stand for it.

Mr. President, let me just say one more time: The ink is barely dried on these new gift rules, and some are now proposing to relax them. All of a sudden we hear about possible exemptions from the gift rules while Members are at the conventions. For Democrats and Republicans alike—let me be bipartisan—it would be a huge mistake to go