

Bingaman—Energy savings.

Boxer—(1) Junk guns; (2) Pensions.

Bryan—(1) COLA for judges; (2) White House Travel (w/Levin/Reid); (3) Congressional pension.

Byrd—(1) Telecommuting center/W.VA; (2) Relevant.

Daschle—(1) Congressional employees health insurance; (2) Education; (3) Arson & Explosive repository; (4) Relevant; (5) Relevant; (6) Presidential immunities; (7) Welfare.

Dorgan—Indian Housing.

Feingold—Committee amdt p 129.

Feinstein—(1) Hate crimes (w/Wyden); (2) Relevant; (3) Tagents.

Graham—(1) Medicare receipts using emergency care; (2) Welfare formula fairness.

Hollings—Death benefits.

Kennedy—(1) Physicians gag (w/Wyden); (2) Education; (3) Workers protection; (4) Legal services.

Kerrey—(1) Managers package; (2) IRS review; (3) Relevant.

Kerry-Feinstein—(1) Relevant; (2) Tagents.

Kohl—Gun free school zones.

Lautenberg—Domestic abusers guns.

Levin—(1) White House travel (w/Reid); (2) SoS U.S./Japan auto.

Moseley-Braun—Age discrimination.

Reid—(1) White House Travel (w/Levin); (2) Judges' pay.

Simon—(1) Desalinization; (2) Pension auditing.

Wyden—Physician's gag (w/Kennedy).

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to say right here that if there are any additions made to this list, it will be only after consultation and agreement between the two leaders.

That is the request.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the leader for his cooperation. It is a rather lengthy list, unfortunately, but now we have, at least, a list we can work on. Hopefully, we will both be able to work through getting these amendments removed if they are not really relevant to this bill.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me just say, the majority leader and I have had the opportunity in the last couple hours to talk to our Members and to urge their cooperation in coming forth with prospective amendments. I would emphasize that they are prospective. I hope that in many cases Senators would not feel compelled to offer them. Our hope is that we can resolve this bill some time in the not-too-distant future.

I hope that all of our colleagues can work with us to limit the list of amendments, to limit the debate on the amendments, once they are called up, and to see if we cannot complete our work. I have asked Members of our leadership to work with our caucus in order to put this list together now in a realistic fashion. And I hope that only in those cases where Senators truly felt that it was essential that the amendment be offered on this bill, that it be done so.

So I am urging cooperation, in concert with the majority leader, in the hope that we can come to some comple-

tion successfully on this bill some time in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, did we get unanimous consent agreement on that? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3662

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have another one. Showing full faith and effort to be accommodating to the Senators, and to get agreements that they really desire, I ask unanimous consent that during the Senate's consideration of the Interior appropriations bill, that it not be in order to consider any amendment relative to Ward Valley prior to Tuesday, September 17, 1996. This has been requested by the Senator from California, Senator BOXER. We would like to accommodate that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant legislative clerk continued to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 5224, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, it is my understanding we will each use about 5 minutes, and then I think the two leaders want to propose a unanimous-consent request after that. So if we can proceed on that basis, would that be satisfactory with my colleague?

Mr. THOMAS. That is fine.

Mr. GLENN. I ask unanimous consent that we have 5 minutes on a side to wrap this up, and then we will probably go to a vote after that.

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

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I want to respond briefly to the comments my colleague made a moment ago. This is a broad act. He said the Economy Act of 1982 is really not working and that is one reason we are putting this in. I don't like putting other legislation that might not work on top of legisla-

tion he says is already not working. Let's make work the legislation that is in law now. I am all for that.

Basically, it does what we are proposing here. In fact, I have a copy of that Economy Act of 1982 here, and one of the things provided under section 1335 under "agency agreements," part 4 of paragraph (A) says: "The head of the agency decides ordered goods or services cannot be provided as conveniently or cheaply by a commercial enterprise already required."

I agree that should be lived up to. So then we come in with the legislation that my colleague and friend, Senator THOMAS, says is not as broad as I am interpreting it to be, and yet the words in it say that "except as provided in subsection (B)"—which I will get to in a moment—"none of the funds appropriated under any other act may be used by OMB or any other agency to publish, promulgate or enforce any policy, regulation, circular or any rule or authority in any other form that would permit any Federal agency to provide a commercially available property or service to any other Department of Government unless the policy, regulation, circular or other rule meets the requirements in subsection (B)."

Subsection (B) says 120 days after this OMB will prescribe regulations as required, subject to the following, which shall include the following: A requirement for comparison between the costs of providing the property or service concerned through the agency concerned and the cost of providing such property or service through the private sector.

That is a mammoth requirement for any law or regulation to come out under. The (B) part of that, which is the last part, is a requirement for cost and performance benchmarks relating to the property or service provided relative to comparable services provided by other Government agencies and contractors permitting the oversight of this—and so on—agency concerned with the Office of Management and Budget.

That is a very, very broad-reaching, extremely broad-reaching, amendment.

I would say it is true, it is already covered under the Economy Act of 1982, as I quoted just a moment ago, and the best thing I would advise is we bring this to the attention of Mr. Koskinen, who is going to appear before the committee next week, that we ask his opinion about how broad-gauged this is and why he is not already enforcing the Economy Act of 1982. That is the way to proceed, as I see it, in good Government, not just to automatically pass something that does the same thing that is not being adhered to in earlier legislation.

Mr. President, I suggest we have that as our method of procedure. I am all for efficiency in Government, but I am not just for passing one law and covering up deficiencies in carrying out a law that is already on the books and should be adhered to.