

really everybody's business. If we do not stop the violence in the homes, it is going to continue to spill out into the streets and into our communities.

The problem which Senator LAUTENBERG speaks to with this amendment, of which I am so proud to be an original cosponsor, is as follows: In all too many cases, unfortunately, if you beat up or batter your neighbor's wife, it is a felony. If you beat up or batter, brutalize your own wife or your own child, it is a misdemeanor.

If the offense is a misdemeanor, then under the current law there is a huge loophole. We do not let people who have been convicted of a felony purchase that firearm. What the Senator from New Jersey is trying to do is plug this loophole and prohibit someone convicted of domestic abuse, whether felony or misdemeanor, of purchasing a firearm. For example, in my State of Minnesota, an act of domestic violence is not characterized as a felony unless there is permanent physical impairment, the use of a weapon, or broken bones.

I just want to simply say one more time to colleagues, because I can rattle off all the statistics, this is no small issue in our country. We are talking about significant violence. For any Senator who says that we do not want to prohibit any law-abiding citizen from purchasing a gun, I respond that we are not talking about law-abiding citizens. We are talking about citizens who have been convicted of an act of violence against a spouse or child and we are saying in those cases, the law should prohibit that person from purchasing gun, from owning a gun. Once again, the reason we support this law is because we know that in all too many cases, the only difference between a battered woman and a dead woman is the presence of a gun.

Mr. President, for a period of time I was coming to the floor to announce the domestic violence hotline number which was set up under a provision of the Violence Against Women Act. Since its opening on February 21, 1996, the hotline has received over 30,000 calls for help from residents in 50 States and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Let me announce that one more time. The hotline has received since February 21, 30,000 calls for help from 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. I want to announce the number one more time. The number is 1-800-799-SAFE.

We in the U.S. Senate, by adopting this amendment, will be saying three things. We will be saying we will not tolerate this violence; we will not ignore this violence; and we will no longer say that it is someone else's responsibility. All of us have a chance to make a difference.

My fellow Senators, someone's safety depends on your vote. My fellow Senators, someone's safety depends on your vote. That is usually the safety of

a woman and a child. There is no more important vote than the one that is coming up on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his eloquent reminder about what it is we are considering here. The statistics, the data do not have to be reiterated. It is very clear. The underlying problem is, in this country of ours, that domestic violence, no matter how severe the beating, is often dismissed as a squabble.

I have heard reports of judges saying, "Oh, he didn't really mean it. He didn't intend to hurt you. Can't you go home and settle it between you?" And very often, of the cases reported, there is so much trauma attached to the recipient of the abuse that she—typically it is a she—is afraid to pursue the case any further because, along with the continuing relationships, inevitably are the threats of further disassociation, which, in many cases, could mean the end of income, support, mean the end of some reassurance that there is a roof over their heads. So they sell their souls. They quit when, if they knew that the State cared more about it, they would continue to pursue it.

The other thing is, they are afraid that the guy, the fellow who first treated them to a fist in the face, may come home with a gun and take their lives.

One can only imagine what kind of rage exists within a man who would beat up a woman, and often in front of the children they have. It is an outrageous condition that exists. And this country has not yet taken it seriously enough.

We hope this amendment will send a loud and clear message that you are not going to get away with this kind of thing, because we are going to take away your gun. We are going to take away that extra chance that the woman might be killed.

You heard it from my friend and colleague, Senator WELLSTONE, the Senator from Minnesota: Four women a day will lose their lives. I can tell you this, from the research that we have done, that is a very conservative estimate. The data are not good in that situation.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor. We are ready to vote. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

GUNS AND DOMESTIC ABUSE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the Lautenberg amendment to the Treasury-postal appropriations bill, taking guns away from individuals convicted of domestic violence. I am a cosponsor of his original bill, and want to congratulate Senator LAUTENBERG on offering this important legislation in the form of an amendment today.

Just getting the gun out of the home would make the difference in so many of these horrible stories we hear about

domestic violence, in the news, or from people on the street. I don't know how many people on the floor of the Senate have heard the cries of a family in crisis; I don't know if you have ever had to dial 911 out of worry for a neighbor. But, I have.

If this amendment makes a difference for one victim of domestic violence, it will have done its job.

One woman I know told me the story of her abusive ex-husband. He was physically abusive, and had been convicted of misdemeanors. What is more, he knew he was prone to violence against his family, and did not trust himself. He purposely separated the gun and the bullets at two different ends of their house, so he would not be able to shoot her in the heat of the moment.

But the measures he took were not quite enough, when he came home one night, drunk, and yelling that the house wasn't clean enough for him. Because he was able to find the bullets, find the gun, load it, and point it at his wife. That she is alive today is a miracle.

This man was not the sort of law-abiding citizen we so frequently hear about from the NRA. He had a record. He did not even trust himself. This man should not have had a gun.

If he did not have a gun, the man in the story may have used some other weapon. But we know from the research that nearly 65 percent of all murder victims known to have been killed by intimates were shot to death. We have seen that firearms-associated family and intimate assaults are 12 times more likely to be fatal than those not associated with firearms. A California study showed when a domestic violence incident is fatal, 68 percent of the time the homicide was done with a firearm.

Again, the gun is the key ingredient most likely to turn a domestic violence incident into a homicide. But the people this amendment would take guns away from—these people have already broken the law, and in a very relevant way. In the face of the reality of domestic violence and the role guns play in homicides in such situations, the Senate cannot allow convicted abusers to have guns.

Unfortunately, this amendment will not make life better for many women who are abused, even when guns are present in the home. We know that most domestic violence is not even reported, and of the cases that are reported, many do not lead to a conviction. This is a problem associated with the horrible effects of victimization, and has a different set of solutions.

But, for thousands of women and men in this country, this amendment would mean immediate results. To get the gun out of the home will mean the difference between life and death. I urge the Senate to pass the Lautenberg amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Lautenberg

amendment, because I believe it offer women a vital protection against those who might do them harm.

Every year, an estimated 2 million women are victimized by domestic violence.

Of these 2 million, nearly 6,000 die.

And 70 percent of the time, the perpetrators of the deadly violence use a gun.

Mr. President, we already prohibit convicted felons from possessing a firearm. But is an unfortunate fact that many domestic violence offenders are never convicted of a felony. Outdated or ineffective laws often treat domestic violence as a lesser offense.

Sometimes, victims are reluctant to cooperate for fear of more violence.

And sometimes victims just don't want to pull themselves through the ordeal of a trial.

And finally, plea bargains often result in misdemeanor convictions for what are really felony crimes.

As a result, Mr. President, many perpetrators of severe and recurring domestic violence are still permitted to possess a gun. Mr. President, these people are like ticking time bombs. It is only a matter of time before the violence get out of hand, and the gun results in tragedy.

Something must be done to close this dangerous loophole.

This amendment looks to the type of crime, rather than the classification of the conviction. Anyone convicted of a domestic violence offense would be prohibited from possessing a firearm. Fewer abusers will have guns, and fewer of the abused will wake up each morning wondering whether they will live through the day. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his efforts, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs an amendment No. 5241. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 289 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Campbell	Faircloth
Akaka	Chafee	Feingold
Ashcroft	Coats	Feinstein
Baucus	Cochran	Ford
Bennett	Cohen	Frahm
Biden	Conrad	Frist
Bond	Coverdell	Glenn
Boxer	Craig	Gorton
Bradley	D'Amato	Graham
Breaux	Daschle	Gramm
Brown	DeWine	Grams
Bryan	Dodd	Grassley
Bumpers	Domenici	Gregg
Burns	Dorgan	Harkin
Byrd	Exon	Hatch

Helms	Lott	Roth
Hollings	Lugar	Santorum
Hutchison	Mack	Sarbanes
Inhofe	McCain	Shelby
Inouye	McConnell	Simon
Jeffords	Mikulski	Simpson
Johnston	Moseley-Braun	Smith
Kassebaum	Moynihan	Snowe
Kempthorne	Murkowski	Specter
Kennedy	Murray	Stevens
Kerrey	Nickles	Thomas
Kerry	Nunn	Thompson
Kohl	Pell	Thurmond
Kyl	Pressler	Warner
Lautenberg	Pryor	Wellstone
Leahy	Reid	Wyden
Levin	Robb	
Lieberman	Rockefeller	

NAYS—2

Bingaman

Heflin

NOT VOTING—1

Hatfield

The amendment (No. 5241) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Senator DASCHLE and I have continued to confer, and a number of Senators have started asking about the plans for the night. I am looking at the list of amendments here. We still have a good number, somewhere between 25 and 30 first-degree amendments, but only 2 or 3 of them are relevant to this underlying bill.

Our intent is to keep working. The managers have been working, trying to get things agreed to. We have a couple of pending amendments we are trying to get to an understanding on how to vote on them. We are acting in good faith.

As I look at this list, so many of these amendments, really, should not be offered. We should go ahead and get this work done. We are in agreement now, the leadership on both sides of the aisle, that we are going to get it done tonight. We are going to keep working and dealing with these amendments. We are going to keep voting until we get this bill completed. Then we will be able to advise Members when we get it done tonight, we will have debate tomorrow but no votes.

We are now coming close to getting an understanding on what we can do on Monday, with votes early Tuesday morning. Members can do what needs to be done, fulfill commitments and religious holidays, but to get that done we must finish this bill tonight.

So, please, we should not offer these amendments that are not serious. We should the job done. Our intent is to keep going tonight.

We are honoring my colleague, SONNY MONTGOMERY, after 30 years of service in Congress. I will be there for 3 minutes to introduce him. Other than that, I would love to be here the rest of the night.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I echo what the majority leader said. There

are many evenings where we arrive here at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, and then we start to do the sorts of things that we could have done at 5 o'clock in the evening.

We know what needs to be done. We have put out contacts to offices. There are many amendments that we are prepared to accept, but we need Members to come to the floor and offer the amendments up or notify us if they are willing to take the amendments down. Otherwise we will be here until 2, 3, or 4 o'clock in the morning. We could wrap this thing up quickly.

The substantive disagreements, at least on the bill itself, have all been taken care of. We have some disagreements on some amendments we are working on right now that we think we can work out, as well as getting a managers' amendment to wrap this up.

I hope those who would like to get out of here at a relatively nice hour tonight, or those who desire not to have votes tomorrow, will get down here as quickly as they can. Both Senator SHELBY and I are willing to work with Members to see whatever reasonable differences there are and we will work them out.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 5313 AND 5314, EN BLOC

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I have several managers' amendments. I send two amendments to the desk which have been cleared on each side. I ask unanimous consent these amendments be considered and approved en bloc and that any statements be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] proposes amendments en bloc numbered 5313 and 5314.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 5313

(Purpose: To provide funding for the review of trade issues)

On page 19, line 2, before the period add the following new provision: "Provided further, That of the funds appropriated \$2,500,000 may be made available for the review of trade issues authorized by Public Law 103-182".

AMENDMENT NO. 5314

Insert at the appropriate place: "Provided further, That from funds made available for Basic Repairs and Alterations, \$2,000,000 may be transferred to the Policy and Operations appropriation".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments (Nos. 5313 and 5314) were agreed to.

Mr. KERREY. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SHELBY. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the pending amendments so that I may call up an amendment at this time.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5234

(Purpose: To remove inequities between congressional and contract employees regarding access to health insurance)

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], for himself, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. SIMON, proposes an amendment numbered 5234.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

TITLE—HEALTH INSURANCE EQUITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL AND CONTRACT EMPLOYEES

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE OF TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Contractor Health Insurance Equity Act".

SEC. 02. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term "contract" means any contract for items or services or any lease of Government property (including any subcontract of such contract or any sublease of such lease)—

(A) the consideration with respect to which is greater than \$75,000 per year,

"(B) with respect to a contract for services, requires at least 1000 hours of services, and

(B) entered into between any entity or instrumentality of the legislative branch of the Federal Government and any individual or entity employing at least 15 full-time employees.

(2) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" has the meaning given such term under section 3(6) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(6)).

(3) ENTITY OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—The term "entity of the legislative branch" includes the following:

(A) The House of Representatives.

(B) The Senate.

(C) The Capitol Guide Service.

(D) The Capitol Police.

(E) The Congressional Budget Office.

(F) The Office of the Architect of the Capitol.

(G) The Office of the Attending Physician.

(H) The Office of Compliance.

(4) GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—The term "group health plan" means any plan or arrangement which provides, or pays the cost of, health benefits that are actuarially equivalent to the benefits provided under the standard option service benefit plan offered under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

(5) INSTRUMENTALITY OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH.—The term "instrumentality of the legislative branch" means the following:

(A) The General Accounting Office.

(B) The Government Printing Office.

(C) The Library of Congress.

SEC. 03. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING CONTRACTS COVERED UNDER THIS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any contract made or entered into by any entity or instrumentality of the legislative branch of the Federal Government shall contain provisions that require that—

(1) all persons employed by the contractor in the performance of the contract or at the location of the leasehold be offered health insurance coverage under a group health plan; and

(2) with respect to the premiums for such plan with respect to each employee—

(A) the contractor pay a percentage equal to the average Government contribution required under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, for health insurance coverage provided under chapter 89 of such title; and

(B) the employee pay the remainder of such premiums.

(b) OPTION TO PURCHASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 8914 of title 5, United States Code, a contractor to which subsection (a) applies that does not offer health insurance coverage under a group health plan to its employees on the date on which the contract is to take effect, may obtain any health benefits plan offered under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, for all persons employed by the contractor in the performance of the contract or at the location of the leasehold. Any contractor that exercises the option to purchase such coverage shall make any Government contributions required for such coverage under section 8906 of title 5, United States Code, with the employee paying the contribution required for such coverage for Federal employees.

(2) CALCULATION OF AMOUNT OF PREMIUMS.—Subject to paragraph (3)(B), the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall calculate the amount of premiums for health benefits plans made available to contractor employees under paragraph (1) separately from Federal employees and annuitants enrolled in such plans.

(3) REVIEW BY OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—

(A) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall review at the end of each calendar year whether the nonapplication of paragraph (2) would result in higher adverse selection, risk segmentation in, or a substantial increase in premiums for such health benefits plans. Such review shall include a study by the Director of the health care utilization and risks of contractor employees. The Director shall submit a report to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President pro tempore of the Senate which shall contain the results of such review.

(B) NONAPPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (2).—Beginning in the calendar year following a certification by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under subparagraph (A) that the nonapplication of paragraph (2) will not result in higher adverse selection, risk segmentation in, or a substantial increase in premiums for such health benefits plans, paragraph (2) shall not apply.

(4) REQUIREMENT OF OPM.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall take such actions as are appropriate to enable a contractor described in paragraph (1) to obtain the health insurance described in such paragraph.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The office within the entity or instrumentality of the legislative branch of the Federal Government which administers the health benefits plans for Federal employees of such entity or instrumentality shall perform such tasks with respect to plan coverage purchased under subsection (b) by contractors with contracts with such entity or instrumentality.

(2) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Waiver of the requirements of this title may be made by such office upon application.

SEC. 04. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This title shall apply with respect to contracts executed, modified, or renewed on or after January 1, 1997.

(b) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall not apply on and after October 1, 2001.

(2) TRANSITION RULE.—In the case of any contract under which, pursuant to this title, health insurance coverage is provided for calendar year 2001, the contractor and the employees shall, notwithstanding section 03(a)(2), pay 1/3 of the otherwise required monthly premium for such coverage in monthly installments during the period beginning on January 1, 2001, and ending before October 1, 2001.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, every Member of Congress and every permanent Federal worker has access to comprehensive health insurance. This is true from the Senate cleaning crew, to the staff director of a committee, to Members of Congress and their families. We get insurance the way most working Americans do—through our employer, with a shared contribution between employer and employee. Our coverage is secure, comprehensive, and affordable.

This is not true, however, for employees of firms contracting with Congress. Many of these individuals, who work side by side with Federal workers, have no such guarantee. In fact, about 1,900 employees of companies that contract with the Congress have no insurance. Current efforts to privatize services previously performed by Federal Government workers exacerbate this situation. Who are these contractors? They include House restaurant and mailroom staff, electronics technicians, day care providers, accountants, data processors, and construction and maintenance workers.

They work hard, pay taxes, and play by the rules; yet, they don't have the same kind of health security that we take for granted. I know such people here in the Congress. One in particular is a person whom I go to every so often to have my hair cut. She has worked in the House Beauty Shop for 14 years. For 12 of those 14 years, she was a Federal Government employee and had health insurance. When the House privatized the House haircut facilities in 1995, this particular individual lost her insurance. She purchased a private health plan, but had to drop it 3 months ago because she could not afford the \$187 per month premium. She asked the company who runs the shop—a large firm in San Francisco that operates hundreds of shops—if they would pay 50 percent of the premium. Her employer, so far, has refused, and she is now without coverage.

She recently had a serious case of food poisoning but, because of her lack of coverage, could not afford to go to the doctor for treatment.

This kind of situation cannot and should not be tolerated. As we devise new ways to extend health coverage to the uninsured, it just doesn't seem fair to me that we in Congress could allow these contractors, working side-by-side with Federal Government employees who we call upon every day to do the work of the Congress, to go without any coverage at all.

How can we enjoy subsidized comprehensive insurance while people who fix our computers, maintain our buildings, or cut our hair have no coverage at all? It seems to me that, in fairness, we just can't do that.

That is why I have introduced this amendment, which would require firms that contract with Congress—and only Congress—to offer health insurance to their employees. This requirement would apply to firms that employ 15 or more workers and that have Federal contracts worth at least \$75,000. These contractors could buy a private health plan or could select a plan from the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program that currently is available to all permanent Federal employees. In either case, they would be required to contribute to their employees' premiums, just as the Federal Government contributes to its workers' coverage. This would ensure that everyone working full time for Congress has access at least to the comprehensive coverage that is now available to congressional employees.

This kind of action is certainly not without precedent. Several years ago, concern over high turnover among Senate day care employees led the Senate to give these contract workers the Federal health benefits coverage that we now enjoy. And Congress has a long-established history of taking action to guarantee fair working conditions for its contract workers. For 65 years, Davis-Bacon and other similar measures have guaranteed competitive wages to Federal contract workers. This bill complements these efforts.

The introduction of this amendment is not just a humanitarian gesture. It is, frankly, a very practical one. Health costs for uninsured workers who become ill are simply shifted onto others; shifted onto public programs like Medicaid, or shifted onto doctors and hospitals in the form of charity care.

In addition, the uninsured forgo preventive care and later need expensive emergency room treatment. We should not tolerate this kind of inefficient cost shifting. We should be setting an example for the rest of the Government, and certainly the private sector.

Some may say this measure will reduce cost savings from privatization. I believe Congress should contract out services performed more efficiently by the private sector. But, certainly, Congress should not save money by denying workers a basic benefit that is

guaranteed to all other Federal workers. We want services that are leaner, but not meaner.

Outsourcing may be the wave of the future and, frankly, I generally support this trend. But we need to make sure that those workers caught in the transition have basic benefits to which other Federal workers are entitled.

For many years now, Members of Congress have spoken on the floor about the need to extend coverage to the uninsured. We all recognize there can be no financial security without health security. Let us simply put our money where our mouth is. Let us show our country that what is good for Members of Congress and their employees is also good for the contractors who work with us.

My hope is that my colleagues will join me in support of this amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, my view is that this is a reasonable amendment. I understand there is no budget cost.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska will yield, there is no budget cost to this. It is completely paid for. There is a negligible cost that is completely offset. So there is no increase in the deficit that is the result of this amendment.

The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERREY. I certainly support the amendment.

We are waiting for Senator STEVENS' view on this amendment. Both he and the chairman are right now at a defense appropriations conference committee. They should be back momentarily. Once they are back, we should be able to wrap this up and get a vote.

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

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

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I urge Senators who would like to get out of here tomorrow to get to the floor and offer their amendments. There are no more than seven or eight amendments on either side. We have worked this down to a relatively small amount, and now all we are doing is waiting.

There are a number of Senators who would like to have rollcall votes. It takes time to have rollcall votes. We have been working as diligently as we can. I want nobody to be surprised when it comes to 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning around here, if we wait until 7, 8, 9 o'clock before somebody comes down and offers amendments.

This is an age-old problem, and we are heading to a very predictable point here. We have done about all we can from the floor. Now we have to have Members come down and offer their amendments.

Mr. SHELBY. As the Senator from Nebraska said, we made a lot of progress. We are getting down to what we hope is the beginning of the end tonight. If people who have some amendments pending come over here and try to work with us, we might work some of them out. If we cannot work them out, maybe they can offer them and keep the process moving. It is 10 minutes to 6 now. We could be out of here in a couple of hours, maybe less, if people would cooperate. I know the Senator from Nebraska has been pushing it all day, and so have I. This is our third day on this bill.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for not to exceed 10 minutes as in morning business. And if we need to, I will be glad to yield the floor back.

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

THE DOLE ECONOMIC PLAN

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, as the Democrat leader on the Senate Budget Committee with a long and established record as a fiscal conservative, as Governor of my State longer than any other in its history, and proud of continuing that record for 18 years in the Senate, I begin today a number of statements on sound budgeting.

These will be based on fact and proven or provable economic theory, or just common sense, in a hope that I might divert America from careening again down a path that will certainly lead our Nation to new irresponsible depths—new depths indeed—of national debt, if not depression.

Alarming, the latest "Follow The Yellow Brick Road" path of wizardry blends \$550 billion in tax breaks, unspecified spending cuts, and rosy economic scenarios into one shameless political ploy. When the unsuspecting Dorothys of the world pull back in wonderment the curtain, they discover a huffing and puffing candidate Bob Dole as the wizard. This is the same wizard who for the first 72 years of his life foreswore such economic nonsense.

Bob Dole's transformation from a deficit hawk into a carrier pigeon for supply-side economics is a great loss and disappointment to fiscal conservatives of both parties.

In my 18 years in the Senate, I often stood shoulder to shoulder with then Senator Dole. Although we have had different priorities when it came to spending cuts, we were both strong advocates of a line-item veto, a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, and a no-nonsense approach to economic policy.