

so they could explain to me how they provided for gridlock in the last session so I would be better at gridlock this session.

You are now 6 days late on the budget. In the last 2 years, we have had the budget on time. It was due April 1. It is due out here, by both Houses, on April 15. We hear all this moaning and groaning and crocodile tears as it relates to we will not do that; we want to start saving; we want to start saving—but we have a budget that is due to put us on the track to 2002 and you are 5 days late, and we are not going to get it probably until May.

I say to my friend, let us get a budget out here. Let us really start doing things.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if I could proceed for 1 moment—1 minute?

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I still hope we can work this out. We were about that close, or closer. The Democratic leader and the Republican leader worked throughout the day with other Senators on both sides. We thought we had an agreement.

We thought we had an agreement. I still hope it is possible to get the agreement. If that happens, we could finish our work very quickly today and there would be no votes tomorrow or Saturday. But if not, then I do not think we have any other choice other than to try to complete this bill tonight with or without cloture.

So I still think there is a genesis of an agreement here. I would say to the White House, I hope that you will help us reach an agreement, because, until there is an agreement, there will not be any defense supplemental taken up in this body.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2 p.m. having arrived, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Hatfield amendment No. 420, to H.R. 1158, the supplemental appropriations bill, signed by 17 Senators as follows:

Senators Mark, Hatfield, Pete Domenici, Rick Santorum, Larry Pressler, Mitch McConnell, Slade Gorton, Rod Grams, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Conrad Burns, Mike DeWine, Nancy Kassebaum, Ted Stevens, Jesse Helms, Robert F. Bennett, Spencer Abraham, Dirk Kempthorne, and Fred Thompson.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the Hatfield amendment number 420 to H.R. 1158, the supplemental appropriations bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Abraham	Gorton	Moynihan
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Packwood
Brown	Gregg	Pell
Burns	Hatch	Pressler
Campbell	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Helms	Santorum
Coats	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Inhofe	Simpson
Cohen	Jeffords	Smith
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Snowe
Craig	Kempthorne	Specter
D'Amato	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Lott	Thomas
Dole	Lugar	Thompson
Domenici	Mack	Thurmond
Faircloth	McCain	Warner
Frist	McConnell	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Feingold	Leahy
Baucus	Feinstein	Levin
Biden	Ford	Lieberman
Bingaman	Glenn	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Heflin	Nunn
Bryan	Hollings	Pryor
Bumpers	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnston	Robb
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. REID. 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. 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

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 Hatfield amendment No. 420 to H.R. 1158, the supplemental appropriations bill:

Bob Dole, Fred Thompson, Rick Santorum, Alfonse D'Amato, Chuck Grassley, Trent Lott, Larry Craig,

Connie Mack, Craig Thomas, Jesse Helms, John H. Chafee, Thad Cochran, Mark Hatfield, Pete Domenici, Dan Coats, and Judd Gregg.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate to the distinguished Democratic leader, who is on the floor, it is still my hope that we can reach some agreement. It seems to me we are not that far apart. We ought to be able to do it.

I am certainly prepared to sit down with the Democratic leader, or anyone else, if there is a problem. But, just in case we cannot work it out, then I have filed a cloture motion, because I do think it is important that we finish this bill so we can take up the defense supplemental bill and some other things after that.

But I am prepared and I think the Democratic leader is prepared and, hopefully, our colleagues are prepared. It seems to me we have one of two choices. Either we try to finish this tonight with no votes tomorrow, or we will be here tonight and tomorrow and maybe Saturday. But, that is up to our colleagues. I cannot believe any of these amendments are so critical they cannot wait until the next supplemental or until the appropriations bills start arriving.

I think there was a lot of give and take on each side in good faith. I thought we were almost there. But if we make an agreement and everybody says, "Well, I will make the agreement but I want to go back and offer an amendment to try to undo the agreement," then we do not have an agreement. Either we have an agreement or we do not have an agreement.

I can agree, if you let me have 25 chances to improve on what I have already agreed upon, but I do not think that is an agreement.

I hope that we can resolve everything so that, when it comes to the floor, I can persuade the Senator from New York to withdraw the amendment with reference to Mexico. He has not done that yet. We have the Jordan aid in this package that I know the administration is very concerned about.

So I hope there would be some way to bring it together in the next, say, 45 minutes to an hour.

I also remind my colleagues on this side of the aisle, there is a Republican conference in progress in S. 207 which will end, hopefully, at 3 o'clock.

I am happy to yield the floor or yield to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as I said before the vote, it was not our desire to hold up this bill. I will reiterate my sincere desire to work with the majority leader in finding an agreement.

What I hope we might be able to do, perhaps, is to maybe run two tracks, get some debate and offer some of these amendments. We could maybe work out some short time agreements and have a good debate, rather than just putting the Senate in a quorum call,

and then work simultaneously to see if we might not be able to address some of these concerns.

I agree with the majority leader. We are close and perhaps we can find a way to accommodate many of the concerns raised on both sides of the aisle.

But perhaps at the same time we might be able to accommodate some Senators who have been waiting patiently to be able to offer amendments. If we could do that, perhaps that might even accelerate our progress.

I reiterate my sincere desire, and I think the desire on this side, to work in earnest and try to accommodate everyone and successfully complete this bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Will the Senator yield? We are prepared to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not think we need any additional debate on that. I am for it, not that it makes any difference.

Mr. KENNEDY. We are quite prepared to vote. I do not think we need additional time. We wanted to do that at the earliest possible convenience. We welcome the opportunity to have a rollcall vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I think the distinguished Senator from New York will be interested in speaking to the amendment prior to the time we vote, but I am sure there could be some relatively brief time agreement that we could work out to accommodate him, and others, who may yet want to speak. But I do not think it will take that long. I suggest we do that.

Mr. DOLE. Why do we not agree to have the time between now and 3 o'clock equally divided and then vote at 3 o'clock? I think the Senator from West Virginia also wants to speak on some other issue.

Mr. BYRD. I can wait.

Mr. DOLE. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. DASCHLE. If the majority leader will let me consult with the distinguished Senator from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, to see how much time he may require, we can resolve this matter very soon.

Mr. DOLE. While the minority leader is checking, 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. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FIRST 100 DAYS OF SO-CALLED REVOLUTION

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, tomorrow we will hear about the first 100 days of the so-called revolution, and about the success of the misnamed contract with America. I call the contract misnamed because so many Senators on both sides of the

aisle claim never to have signed it, and many Americans have no idea what it is, much less any idea of its various provisions. The term "contract" is usually reserved for binding documents which two or more parties have agreed to and signed. But, not so with this so-called contract with America. It is simply the wish list of the extreme faction of one political party, packaged to sell better by giving it the legitimacy of the word "contract." It is clever, essentially meaningless ad-man lingo, probably conjured up by some pollster.

But, in any event, the Nation will, no doubt—at least part of the Nation—be glued to the TV sets on Friday evening to hear the 100-day report on the progress of the so-called contract, as promised. But everything about this made-for-TV drama will be somewhat of a fantasy.

First, as I have already indicated, the contract is merely a made-up device. Second, the so-called 100-day report is not occurring after 100 days. Friday, April 7, will only be the 94th day since the convening of the 104th Congress. The real 100th day will occur on Thursday, April 13th, smack in the first week of the April congressional recess. So we will be getting the report on the so-called contract, which is not really a contract, on the so-designated 100th day, which is really only day 94. But, then of what import are messy details when one is busy manufacturing non-news while conducting a pseudo revolution?

We will undoubtedly hear of the wild success of the so-called contract when, in fact, only two of its provisions have been enacted into law, and these two were relatively noncontroversial. In reality, two of the contract's major tenets, the balanced budget amendment and the term limits proposals have gone down to defeat, while a third, a misnamed proposal being loosely called line-item veto which, by the way, may be found to be unconstitutional, may be stuck in a House/Senate conference for perhaps a long time. Only in Washington would this type of report card be touted as successful. Rather than a 100-day report on the progress of the contract, this coming performance might be better billed as a 94-day alibi for the failure of an extremist agenda.

The truth of the matter is that the so-called contract is pretty much of a flop. And just like a bad play in the theatre, a bomb is a bomb. You can punch up the dance numbers, spice up the dialog and gussy up the costumes a little bit, but in the end a flawed script will flop and nothing on God's green earth will save it.

Likewise, at the end of this particularly bad show this so-called contract will also be judged a flop and a failure. That will happen because the contract is a giant gimmick comprised of other lesser gimmicks, and it does not address real problems in our Nation. It merely packages several old canards which are holdovers from the last popular Republican administration and

calls them reform. It reruns a lot of 1980's political bumper sticker slogans and calls them a program for change. The Revolution has come to Washington! Rejoice all mad-as-hell citizens! Well, if this is a revolution, it must certainly be called the retread revolution. Term limits, balanced budget amendment, line item veto, enhanced rescission, separate enrollment, tax cuts—there is a tough one; there is a tough one—all of these old bald tires have been around for years.

And what about those tax cuts? Mr. President, earlier this year the House of Representatives passed the balanced budget constitutional amendment in just 2 days—2 days. A similar measure failed to pass the Senate by only two votes. During the debate on these proposals, Republicans nearly drowned the American people in a sea of rhetoric proclaiming the need for such an amendment.

Deficit reduction, it was claimed, was the most pressing issue facing Congress today. We heard a lot about our responsibility to future generations, about the need for fiscal discipline, and about the need to make tough choices. The American people were told that there would be shared sacrifice among all for the good of the Nation. Everyone was going to do his fair share to beat back the economic dragon of deficit spending.

For weeks we heard lofty speeches in this body over the need to reduce deficits. Now, for the House to come right along behind that debate and enact a huge tax cut financed by cuts in general spending makes a mockery of all the hot air we heard in this body about deficit reduction. To suggest squandering our budget savings on tax favors for the well to do and for big corporations is just plain crazy. For the House of Representatives to pass a tax cut giveaway which will cost the American people \$189 billion over 5 years and approximately \$700 billion over 10 years is clearly walking away from any serious attempt to reduce the deficit.

We will hear a lot of talk about the winners and the losers under the so-called contract in the coming days. But, in my view, there are no winners when what should be a serious attempt to address the Nation's problems is replaced with glitzy media shows, overblown rhetoric, one-line solutions, and junk legislation enacted in a rush to meet a phoney deadline, and huge tax cuts designed to benefit the well to do. We all lose. We all lose when that kind of superficial excuse for leadership is offered to the people as a substitute for the real thing.

The truth is that Barnum and Bailey's is not the only show in town this week. All of this touting of a revolution and praising of a nonexistent contract with America is nothing more than a less entertaining version of the same sort of circus.

This contract is a sham and it will ultimately be judged a failure because the American people will never choose