

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) would vote "aye."

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Akaka	Feingold	McCain
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Bunning	Hollings	Santorum
Burns	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchison	Schumer
Campbell	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Conrad	Kerry	Specter
Coverdell	Kohl	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Leahy	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Voinovich
Domenici	Lieberman	Warner
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden
Durbin	Lott	
Edwards	Lugar	

NAYS—2

Jeffords Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—S. 1059

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, having received S. 1059, disagrees with the House amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS) appointed Mr. WARNER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms.

SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1206

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers S. 1206, the legislative branch appropriations bill, immediately following the reporting of the bill by the clerk, I be recognized to offer a managers' amendment, and the time on the amendment and the bill be limited to 20 minutes equally divided, with no amendments in order to the managers' amendment.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the adoption of the managers' amendment, the bill be immediately advanced to third reading, and the Senate proceed to the House companion bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that H.R. 1905 be amended as follows: On page 2, after line 1, insert the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on page 2, line 2, over to and including line 7 on page 10; beginning on page 11, line 13, over to and including line 18 on page 18 be struck and the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on page 10, line 8, over to and including line 22 on page 16 be inserted in lieu thereof; and beginning on page 18, line 23, over to and including line 6 on page 40 be struck and the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on line 23, page 16 over to and including line 23 on page 38 be inserted in lieu thereof.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon passage of the House bill, S. 1206, be indefinitely postponed.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I now call up S. 1206.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1206) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, is on her way to the floor. I will wait until she is here to express to the entire Senate my appreciation for her assistance as the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations.

I have been delighted to have the opportunity to work with her on this leg-

islation and I will make that clear when she arrives. I understand she is in another committee meeting, and in the pattern of the Senate, finds herself torn between two equally important responsibilities. That is a situation with which we are all familiar.

I will, for the information of Senators, point out that the legislative branch bill provides \$1.68 billion in budget authority, exclusive of House items, for fiscal year 2000. This is \$114 million or 6.4 percent less than the fiscal 1999 level. It represents \$105 million or a 5.9-percent decrease from the President's budget request. So in this time of difficulty, we are coming in below last year's spending and below where the President recommended.

There are increases in the bill, of course. There always will be in an appropriations bill. You cut some places, and you increase others. The majority of the increases in the bill account for cost-of-living adjustments only, and they are estimated at 4.4 percent across the board.

The Senate portion of the bill increases funding for the Senate by only 3 percent above the fiscal 1999 level, which is less than the 4.4-percent COLA adjustment. So while the Senate portion of the bill is going up, it is going up less than the mandatory COLA that is required by law.

The bill funds 79 percent of the budget request of the Architect of the Capitol. Of the funds provided, 73 percent will fund operations, with the other 27 percent to fund Capitol projects.

I have always been one who has insisted on funding Capitol projects. As a businessman, I know that sometimes the most expensive savings you can achieve are savings that you take in the name of maintenance deferral. As things begin to deteriorate around the Capitol, it is tempting to say we can put it off for another year and look good in the short term. All you do when you do that is raise your costs in the long term. So throughout my tenure on the Legislative Branch Subcommittee and particularly my tenure as the chairman of that subcommittee, I have always been a champion of funding the Capitol projects and funding the maintenance projects to their fullest level, believing that in the long run that saves money.

Why then am I standing here today and saying that we are not going to do that in this bill, and we are not giving the Architect of the Capitol the funds that were requested? Well, there are several reasons for that. I think it is worth an explanation.

The subcommittee did not fund the Architect's request for \$28 million for Capitol dome renovations. I have been in the Capitol dome with the Architect of the Capitol, and I have seen firsthand how desperately in need of renovation it is. However, the full scope of the project will be determined during the paint removal process which is currently underway. The paint removal process is not expected to be completed