

I think that we ought to think long and hard before we pass an amendment which, I believe, is very extreme, and I believe that its effect—I do not know about purpose—turns the clock back a good many decades. I think it would be a profound mistake for us to support the Gramm amendment. I think that the Murray/Cohen/Daschle/Moseley-Braun amendment, if we are going to have this debate tonight, should and must be the prudent middle ground for us.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, for 30 years we have had unfairness built into the law of the land. I am trying to turn the clock forward to the future, where not only do we have a goal of equal opportunity and merit as a nation, but that our laws reflect it.

In terms of what we all wish when we see our children, I think we all hope for them a society where ultimately merit triumphs. We have heard a lot tonight about problems in America's past, and there are a lot of them. But I think, also, we have to give ourselves credit. America is the greatest, freest country in the history of the world. Since our colleague brought up looking at his grandchildren and thinking about their future, let me conclude on that remark by talking about America in action.

My wife's grandfather came to this country as an indentured laborer to work in the sugarcane fields in Hawaii. I do not know whether they let him vote during that period or not. But they certainly let him work, and he worked off that contract.

His son, my wife's father, became the first Asian American ever to be an officer of a sugar company in the history of Hawaii. Under President Reagan and President Bush, his granddaughter, my wife, became chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, where she oversaw the trading of all commodities and commodity futures, including the same sugarcane her grandfather came to this country to harvest so long ago.

That is not the story of an extraordinary family. That is the story of a very ordinary family in a very extraordinary country. I want every child born in this country to have the same opportunities that my wife's grandfather had when he came to America. But we are not going to grant those opportunities by writing unfairness into the law of the land. We are not going to fix problems and unfairness in the past by writing unfairness into the law.

There is only one fair way to decide who gets a job, who gets a promotion, and who gets a contract. That fair way is merit, and merit alone.

What my amendment tries to do is go back to merit. This is not a sweeping amendment. This amendment applies to this bill, this year. What this amendment says, very simply, is this, that in letting contracts—it does not apply to contracts that already are in existence, but on the contracts that we will enter into through the funds that we appropriate this year, new con-

tracts—that the letting of those contracts will be on a fair, competitive basis, where merit will be the determining factor.

This is not a revolutionary idea. Although, I guess in a sense it is a revolutionary idea. It is the most revolutionary idea in history. It is the American idea. It is the American ideal. Merit should be the basis of selection and award. That is what my amendment says.

The amendment which is offered, the alternative, says that you should not give contracts to people who are not qualified, but that begs the question of whether someone else was better qualified. Merit is what I seek in this amendment. If you believe in it, I think you should support the amendment. If you support set-asides, I believe you should vote against my amendment and you should vote for the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY].

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has 2 minutes and the Senator from Texas, 3 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I thank the Senator from Washington. I will be very brief.

The Senator from Texas keeps referring to two wrongs not making a right. We all know that the first wrong which he refers to, the history as well as the present experience that we had in this Nation, was discrimination.

Let me submit to everyone who is listening, the second wrong is not affirmative action. It is not our effort to fix that tragic legacy. The second wrong lies in this amendment in shutting the door, closing down the small efforts, the small steps we have taken, to remedy, to provide for opportunity, to give people a shot, to give people a chance.

I say to my colleagues, as someone who is both minority and female, I am not comforted at the notion that by getting rid of affirmative action anybody is doing me a favor. So I encourage my colleagues to defeat the amendment from the Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I have a consent agreement that has been approved on both sides of the aisle on a matter other than this bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as some of my colleagues may know, I am in the process of preparing legislation that is designed to get the Federal Government out of the business of granting group-preferences. I will be introducing this legislation next week.

This legislation will stand for a simple proposition—that the Federal Government should neither discriminate against, nor grant preferences to, individuals on the basis of race, color, gender, or ethnic background.

Whether it is employment, or contracting, or any other federally conducted program, our Government in Washington should work to bring its citizens together, not to divide us. Our focus should be protecting the rights of individuals, not the rights of certain groups.

The amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Texas is consistent with the approach embodied in the bill I will be introducing next week. And of course, I look forward to working with him as well with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Rather than the piecemeal approach of amending each of the appropriations bills, I would prefer to address this very, very important issue more thoroughly and as a separate matter—and that's the point of my bill—to serve as a starting point for this discussion.

This legislation may not be perfect, but it is my hope that it can act as the basis for a serious, rational, and, yes, optimistic dialog on one of the most contentious issues of our time.

Of course, our country's history has many sad chapters—slavery, Jim Crow, separate but equal. And, of course, discrimination persists today. We do not live in a color-blind society. I understand this.

But, Mr. President, fighting discrimination should not be an excuse for abandoning the color-blind ideal. The goal of expanding opportunity should not be used to divide Americans by race, by gender, or by ethnic background. Discrimination is wrong, and preferential treatment is wrong, as well.

So, Mr. President, our goal should be to provide equal opportunity—but not through quotas, set-asides, and other group preferences that are inimical to the principles upon which our country was founded.

A relevant civil rights agenda means conscientiously enforcing the anti-discrimination laws. It means outreach and recruitment. And it means knocking down regulatory barriers to economic opportunity, including repeal of the discriminatory Davis-Bacon Act; enacting school choice programs for low income innercity families; and fighting the scourge of violent crime that is unquestionably one of the biggest causes of poverty today.

This is the agenda upon which dreams can be built—and it is an agenda that this Congress should be relentlessly pursuing.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 1944

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I have a consent agreement that has been approved on both sides of the aisle on a matter other than this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the legislative appropriations bill, the Senate turn to

the consideration of H.R. 1944 and it be considered under the following agreement:

One amendment in order to be offered by Senators WELLSTONE and MOSELEY-BRAUN regarding Education Funding/Job Training and LIHEAP, on which there be a division, and each of the two divisions be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided in the usual form with all time being used tonight except for 30 minutes under the control of Senator WELLSTONE; and that at 10:20 a.m. the managers be recognized to utilize 10 minutes for debate to be followed by Senator WELLSTONE to be recognize for his 30 minutes of debate, to be followed by a vote on a motion to table the first Wellstone division, and that following that vote, the majority leader be recognized to place the bill on the Calendar, and if that action is not exercised, the Senate then proceed immediately to a vote on a motion to table the second Wellstone division and that following that vote the majority leader be recognized to exercise the same right with respect to placing the bill on the Calendar, and if that action is not utilized the Senate proceed immediately to a vote on passage of H.R. 1944.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute, 6 seconds.

Mrs. MURRAY. I want to thank all of my colleagues who have come to the floor tonight to speak so eloquently for equal opportunity.

I yield my remaining time to the Senator from Maine, Senator COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, at the heart of the amendment of the Senator from Texas is that everything should be decided on merit. That makes the assumption that we are all starting off on a level playing field. That makes the assumption that we all have equal opportunity and we are born with that equal opportunity.

That completely ignores what is a reality of our lives—that not everybody has an equal opportunity, not everyone has equal access to education, not everyone has the same opportunity to break through various barriers.

There is the assumption that everything is decided on merit. If that is the case, why do we have laws against monopolies? Why do we just not say the company that gets the biggest, that provides the most for the least should prevail in every case? Why do we need to break up monopolies if everything is to be decided on merit?

We have law to prevent that because we understand that not everyone is treated equally in the marketplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 3 minutes and 20 seconds.

Mr. GRAMM. Let me begin with the last point. No one has ever argued, nor

does anyone believe, that any two people are born equal. No one believes that the playing field is level.

If the mother of the Senator from Maine loved him and my mother did not love me, no law can ever make us equal. I do not know how much property the father of the Senator from Maine owned when he was born as compared to any other Member. Society cannot guarantee equality, except in one way, and it is what Abraham Lincoln called a fair chance and an open way. There is no legislative remedy to an unlevel playing field other than leveling it in the future so that people can compete. Because there have been wrongs in the past does not justify making those wrongs the law of the land in the future.

I believe that merit does not hold people down. Merit liberates people.

I think we are down to a moment of decision. I want to use my final moments in defining what I have offered, a very limited amendment that says on this bill, this year in the Congress in congressional spending, that we will provide under this appropriation that contracts cannot be let on any basis other than merit.

Nothing in my amendment limits outreach, limits recruitment, nothing in my amendment overturns an existing contract, nothing in my amendment overturns a court order or prevents the court from issuing an order in the future to remedy a specific problem.

What my amendment seeks to do is to bring back to America, and in this particular bill, legislative branch spending, the concept of merit. The alternative which is offered by the Senator from Washington simply says that contracts have to go to qualified persons. That is not the issue, Mr. President. The issue is not that the person who gets a discriminatory contract is unqualified. The issue is that they are not the best qualified candidate. The issue is they did not submit the lowest bid or the best value.

There is only one fair way to decide who gets a job, who gets promoted, and who gets a contract. That is merit. That is what I am trying to bring back to this individual appropriation bill.

If you oppose set-asides, and a huge percentage of the American people do, then I urge Members to vote for my amendment and vote against the Murray amendment. The Murray amendment simply precludes giving contracts to people who are not qualified. My amendment requires giving contracts to people who are the best qualified. That is the test of merit. Not that the loser of the competition has no merit; it is who has the most merit. That is the issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 1827 WITHDRAWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendment No. 1827 is withdrawn.

So the amendment (No. 1827) was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on amendment No. 1825.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to use just a couple of minutes of my leader time to comment on the pending matter prior to the vote. I will be very brief.

Since the days of the New Deal, our Government's goal has been to expand opportunity, to give more Americans a fair chance to succeed, to open doors, not to close them.

Affirmative action has been a bipartisan part of that goal for 30 years, since the days of the civil rights revolution.

President Johnson issued the Executive order which authorizes programs of affirmative action. President Nixon greatly expanded and strengthened that Executive order 5 years later. For more than 30 years, Members of the Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, all supported the policy.

In 1986, when President Reagan's advisors were urging him to repeal that Executive order, 69 Members of the Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, joined in a letter to the President urging that he resist that advice.

In 1991, 4 years ago, the Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1991, reversing Supreme Court rulings which undermined fundamental civil rights—and part of the bill included the Glass Ceiling Commission, to study why women, who are 45 percent of the work force are less than 5 percent of top management in the private sector.

Just 1 year ago, the full Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, without a single dissenting voice, voted to establish a Government-wide goal of 5 percent of contracts for women-owned businesses.

If affirmative action was needed 9 years ago; if a study of women's workplace role was needed 4 years ago; if a Government-wide goal for women-owned businesses was a good idea 1 year ago—then those who now, suddenly oppose all affirmative action, all goals, all efforts to study the makeup of our work force, have a responsibility to explain to the American people what has changed.

In fact, not much as changed. Our goal is a colorblind society. But identifying a goal and reaching it are two different things.

We have not yet reached that goal, and until we do, the amendment of the Senate from Texas should be voted down. It is an effort to divide people, not to find common ground. It is a political effort, and it deserves to fail.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1825

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment No. 1825.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced, yeas 36, nays 61, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 317 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Abraham	Gorton	Lugar
Bennett	Gramm	Mack
Brown	Grams	McCain
Burns	Grassley	McConnell
Byrd	Gregg	Murkowski
Coats	Hatch	Nickles
Coverdell	Helms	Pressler
Craig	Hollings	Shelby
D'Amato	Inhofe	Smith
Dole	Kempthorne	Thomas
Exon	Kyl	Thurmond
Frist	Lott	Warner

NAYS—61

Akaka	Feinstein	Moynihan
Baucus	Ford	Murray
Biden	Glenn	Nunn
Bingaman	Graham	Packwood
Bond	Harkin	Pell
Boxer	Hatfield	Pryor
Bradley	Heflin	Reid
Breaux	Hutchison	Robb
Bryan	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Bumpers	Johnston	Roth
Campbell	Kassebaum	Santorum
Chafee	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kerrey	Simon
Cohen	Kerry	Simpson
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Daschle	Lautenberg	Specter
DeWine	Leahy	Stevens
Dodd	Levin	Thompson
Domenici	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dorgan	Mikulski	
Feingold	Moseley-Braun	

NOT VOTING—3

Ashcroft	Faircloth	Inouye
----------	-----------	--------

So the amendment (No. 1825) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, before the next vote, as I understand, there will no more amendments on this bill unless I offer the rescissions package.

Mr. MACK. It is my understanding that there are no further votes necessary on the legislative appropriations bill, that if we were to—

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do believe we will have a vote on the pending question.

Mr. DOLE. Right. I mean after this next one.

Is there any demand for a rollcall on final passage?

Mr. MACK. No. It has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. DOLE. If we cannot get an agreement on the rescissions package, I intend to offer it as an amendment and

then have the Wellstone-Moseley-Braun amendments and do it all tonight. We are not going to add any more time in the morning. We have been trying to put this together for 3 weeks. I have been here a long time. I have never been so frustrated in my life. So if they want to stay here tonight and keep everybody else here half the night, I am prepared to offer the rescissions package as an amendment as soon as we complete the next vote. If they are prepared to enter the agreement we thought we had, we are prepared to do that. So we can think it over during this vote, and I am prepared to offer the amendment right after this vote.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. I informed the manager of the bill I did have an amendment on OTA.

I would call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the bill which has come to us from the House takes the money for the OTA from the Library of Congress, something that I wish to avoid. The House voted strongly in the Chamber on that matter.

I think we have made a mistake, not correcting that situation to protect the Library of Congress. But perhaps we can do it in conference.

In view of the problems that the majority leader just announced, I will not offer that amendment now, but I want the Senate to know I think we are making a big mistake to leave this situation where the House has voted overwhelmingly to maintain OTA but to take the money out of the Library of Congress. And we have not solved that problem here, in my opinion. I disagree with the manager of the bill and his solution. It is not a solution. The GAO has informed a lot of Senators here that they can perform the role of OTA, which in my opinion is ludicrous. But I will not offer the amendment at this time.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1826

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1826, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 318 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Abraham	Feinstein	McConnell
Akaka	Ford	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moseley-Braun
Bennett	Glenn	Moynihan
Biden	Gorton	Murkowski
Bingaman	Graham	Murray
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Boxer	Grassley	Nunn
Bradley	Gregg	Packwood
Breaux	Harkin	Pell
Brown	Hatch	Pressler
Bryan	Hatfield	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Reid
Campbell	Helms	Robb
Coats	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cochran	Hutchison	Roth
Cohen	Johnston	Santorum
Conrad	Kempthorne	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Kennedy	Shelby
Craig	Kerrey	Simon
D'Amato	Kerry	Simpson
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
DeWine	Lautenberg	Specter
Dodd	Leahy	Stevens
Domenici	Levin	Thomas
Dorgan	Lieberman	Thurmond
Exon	Lugar	Warner
Feingold	Mack	Wellstone

NAYS—13

Burns	Inhofe	McCain
Byrd	Jeffords	Smith
Chafee	Kassebaum	Thompson
Dole	Kyl	
Gramm	Lott	

NOT VOTING—3

Ashcroft	Faircloth	Inouye
----------	-----------	--------

So the amendment (No. 1826), as modified, was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BINGAMAN. When it comes to controlling Government spending, nothing stands out in my mind more than the \$1 billion that the Federal agencies toss out the window every year in energy waste.

The Federal Government is our Nation's largest energy waster. This year agencies will spend almost \$4 billion to heat, cool, and power their 500,000 buildings.

Both the Office of Technology Assessment and the Alliance to Save Energy, a nonprofit group that I chair with Senator JEFFORDS, have estimated that Federal agencies could save \$1 billion annually.

To achieve these savings, agencies just need to buy the same energy saving technologies—insulation, building controls, and energy efficient lighting, heating, and air-conditioning—that have been installed in many private sector offices and homes.

I know what you may be thinking, "Here we go again with another crazy idea about how we need to give agencies more money so they can hopefully save money sometime in the future."

Well you are wrong. Why? Because there are now businesses, known as energy service companies, that stand ready to upgrade Federal facilities at no up-front cost to the Government—that's right, at no up-front cost to the Federal Government.

These companies offer what are called energy saving performance contracts which provide private sector expertise to assess what energy saving technologies are most cost effective, provide nongovernmental financing to make the improvements, install and maintain the equipment, and guarantee that energy savings will be achieved.

Agencies pay for the service over time using the energy costs they have saved—if they do not see the saving they do not pay for the service—it's that simple, that's the guarantee.

This type of contract is used every day in the private sector and State and local government facilities. For instance, Honeywell Corp. has entered into these energy-saving arrangements with over 1,000 local school districts nationwide, allowing schools to reinvest \$800 million in savings in critical education resources rather than continuing to pay for energy waste.

Unfortunately, even though Congress first authorized Federal agencies to take advantage of this innovative business approach in 1986, agencies have been dragging their heels.

To help get things moving, the Department of Energy recently prepared streamlined procedures to encourage their use.

Now is the time for Congress to put the agencies feet to the fire on financial reform of Government energy waste. Agencies must enter into these partnerships with the private sector.

That's why, today, I am introducing an amendment calling for the agencies to reduce Government energy costs by 5 percent in 1996. I'm also asking that agencies report back to us by the end of 1996 to ensure that they have actually taken action to reduce their energy costs.

You know, we are often called upon up here to make really hard controversial decisions that please some and anger others. This is a winner for everyone. If 1,000 local school boards have examined it and are reaping the savings, I say it's about time we got our Nation's biggest energy waster on track too.

With this one, simple reform, we will create thousands of job and business opportunities in every one of our States, improve the environment by reducing air pollution, and save ourselves hundreds of millions of dollars every year, at no up-front cost to taxpayers.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1944

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to propound a unanimous-consent agreement relating to a rescission package that has been here before the Senate. I understand that it has been agreed to by the parties involved and the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the legislative appropriations bill, the

Senate turn to the consideration of H.R. 1944 and it be considered under the following agreement:

One amendment in order to be offered by Senators WELLSTONE and MOSELEY-BRAUN regarding education funding, job training, and low-income energy assistance, on which there be a division, and each of the two divisions be limited to 1 hour each, to be equally divided in the usual form and with all time being used tonight except for 30 minutes under the control of Senators WELLSTONE and MOSELEY-BRAUN; and that at 10:10 a.m. the managers be recognized to utilize 20 minutes for debate to be followed by Senators WELLSTONE and MOSELEY-BRAUN to be recognized for their 30 minutes of debate, to be followed by a vote on a motion to table the first Wellstone division, and that following that vote, the majority leader be recognized to place the bill on the calendar, and if that action is not exercised, the Senate then proceed immediately to a vote on a motion to table the second Wellstone division, and that following that vote, the majority leader be recognized to exercise the same right with respect to placing the bill on the calendar, and if that action is not utilized, the Senate proceed immediately to a vote on passage of H.R. 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MACK. It is my understanding that there has been a request for a recorded vote. So I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, before we go to that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1803

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, No. 1803, as amended, is agreed to.

So the amendment (No. 1803), as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NOS. 1806, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831, AND 1832

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Specter amendment and the following five amendments, which I have sent to the desk on behalf of Senators DOLE, SIMON, LIEBERMAN, BINGAMAN, and myself be considered agreed to, en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc.

So the amendment (No. 1806) was agreed to.

So the amendments (No. 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831 and 1832) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1828

(Purpose: To retain the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office)

On page 27 of the bill, strike all between lines 1-25, and insert the following:

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service, \$1,628,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: Provided, That none of these funds shall be used to employ more than thirty-three individuals: Provided further, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Special Services Office, \$363,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1829

(Purpose: To repeal the prohibitions against political recommendations relating to Federal employment, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . REPEAL OF PROHIBITIONS AGAINST POLITICAL RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 3303 of title 5, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 3303.

(2) Section 2302(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) solicit or consider any recommendation or statement, oral or written, with respect to any individual who requests or is under consideration for any personnel action unless such recommendation or statement is based on the personal knowledge or records of the person furnishing it and consists of—
“(A) an evaluation of the work performance, ability, aptitude, or general qualifications of such individual; or
“(B) an evaluation of the character, loyalty, or suitability of such individual.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1830

At the end of Sec. 308(b)(2) insert:

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect only if the Administrative Conference of the United States ceases to exist prior to the completion and submission of the study to the Board as required by Section 230 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1371).

AMENDMENT NO. 1831

(Purpose: To add a general provision)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . (a) The head of each agency with responsibility for the maintenance and operation of facilities funded under this Act shall take all actions necessary to achieve during fiscal year 1996 a 5-percent reduction in facilities energy costs from fiscal year 1995 levels. The head of each such agency shall transmit to the Treasury of the United States the total amount of savings achieved under this subsection, and the amount transmitted shall be used to reduce the deficit.

(b) The head of each agency described in subsection (a) shall report to the Congress