

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to offer an amendment to the pending bill for Senators WELLSTONE and MOSELEY-BRAUN, the text of which restores the LIHEAP funding, adds back \$5.5 billion for insurance counseling, \$35 billion for education, and restores \$272 million for Job Training Partnership, and that there be 10 minutes for debate divided between Senators WELLSTONE and MOSELEY-BRAUN, at the conclusion of which time the Senate will proceed to vote; that the bill then be advanced to third reading, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object. First of all, let me, one more time, make it crystal clear, Mr. President, that I have an objection to the characterization of discovering on Friday that you can stall. I have been working on the Low-income Housing Energy Assistance Program for a long, long time, as each of my colleagues knows. This is a critically important issue to some of the most vulnerable citizens in my State of Minnesota, a cold weather State.

Second of all, Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to make it very clear that when it comes to assistance for California and Oklahoma City, in no way, shape, or form do I intend to be held hostage to that, Mr. President. We are all for that.

Mr. DOLE. I call for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President—

Mr. DOLE. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOLE. I call for the regular order.

COMPREHENSIVE REGULATORY REFORM ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the underlying pending business.

A bill (S. 343) to reform the regulatory process, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. I advise Members that there will be no more votes today. We are back on regulatory reform.

I have been given the authority by a majority of members of the Judiciary Committee and the Governmental Affairs Committee to withdraw the committee reported amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1487

(Purpose: To provide a substitute)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a substitute amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BOND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BROWN, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KYL, Mr. BREAUX, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. LOTT, proposes an amendment numbered 1487.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this will be the text which will be amended on Monday, July 10. There will be two amendments. There will be votes, starting at 5 o'clock on Monday.

THE RESCISSIONS BILL

Mr. DOLE. Let me again state this, so there will not be any misunderstanding by the Senators from Illinois and Minnesota.

The next time we bring up the rescissions bill it will be by a unanimous-consent agreement, without any amendments, and with very little debate. They can continue to frustrate this Senate on a Friday afternoon all year long. That is fine with me, because I have to be here anyway.

I think they are doing a disservice to hundreds of thousands of people across America to make a political point. They have that right. Everybody makes political points on the Senate floor. And to say they are not making a political point, I think, would be a stretch.

Where was all the debate when the conference report was passed? Where has been all the concern in the last few days? These Senators know, as well, that this has been undergoing intense scrutiny with the White House, the Democratic and Republican leadership, and they finally got together. The President says pass it. I read his statements a couple of times, the statement of the administration.

Two Senators can frustrate anything. It is too late to file cloture; it is Friday afternoon, which they knew. But that is their right. I do not want to take any rights away from anybody. The day may come when they are trying to pass something on a Friday and somebody will jump up and say they cannot do this. That is the way it goes from time to time.

So I am disappointed. I apologize that we could not pass this bill. I apologize to the many people who will be suffering in the interim because of the efforts by our colleagues. But I cannot change that. They have every right to do what they have done. They objected to the immediate consideration.

Apparently, they did not really want to vote on the amendments in the first place. They had a chance to have a vote on all the amendments. We could have had a vote, but after 3 hours of wasted time, they did not want to vote and they objected. They have that right.

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.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. DOLE. I object.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. DOLE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I have a question that I would like to propound, unless the—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot conduct debate.

Mr. DOLE. You cannot do that.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I cannot ask a question because you will not allow the quorum call to be called off.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only question in order is to ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I understand that. The majority leader objected to that, so I cannot get to my question of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot proceed.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I was just checking. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, is there any way to inquire—

Mr. DOLE. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only thing in order is for the Senator to ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Is there any way to find out when the majority leader will not object to the quorum call order being rescinded?

Mr. DOLE. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is violating the rules of debate. She cannot speak unless the quorum call is rescinded.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I understand, but I was trying to propound a question to the Chair. I ask that the quorum call—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, now?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot proceed. The only item in order is to ask that the quorum be rescinded.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would do that. I was asking the question, whether now is the time that the motion to rescind the quorum call might possibly not be objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator seeking consent to rescind the call for the quorum?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, yes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized to speak in the following order for the allotted times: Senator WELLSTONE, 10 minutes; Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN for 10 minutes; Senator ASHCROFT for 10 minutes; Senator BYRD for 10 minutes.

I further ask that following the conclusion of Senator BYRD's statement, the majority leader be recognized to speak and then proceed to various wrap-up items that have been cleared by the two leaders.

Following those items, the Senate would stand in adjournment under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 20.

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

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

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

THE RESCISSIONS BILL

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief and will be followed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, let me try to give the morning and part of this afternoon some context. We had a bill, which was about 120 pages long, come over from the House at about 9 o'clock today. This was the rescissions package voted on about 10 o'clock last night in the House of Representatives. It is my really strong view as a Senator that it is important to be able to review legislation, especially when we are talking

about the cuts that directly affect people's lives. Sometimes, Mr. President, we get into the statistics and numbers and we forget the faces.

I had voted for the rescissions package passed out of the Senate earlier. I voted against the conference report because of changes that had been made. It is no secret to any Senator in here that I feel especially strongly, as do many other Senators feel very strongly, about several programs—but it is not programs. It is really about people.

I spoke about the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and I had an amendment and wanted to introduce an amendment that would have restored about a 20-percent cut in the LIHEAP. In my State of Minnesota there are 110,000 households and 300,000 people who are depending on this. I come from a cold weather State. It is a small grant, but for many people it is the difference between heating and eating.

I say to the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Idaho, because I know what kind of Senator he is and I think we respect each other whether we agree or disagree, I met with people in their living rooms. I saw the fear in their eyes. I know how strongly these people depend on this assistance, especially in such a cold weather State. And I said I would fight for these people, and that is what I have done. Because what happened last night in this final package is that we did not have the original Senate version, but we cut it 20 percent, some \$315 million.

In addition, I fought for a counseling program for elderly people, to make sure they could not be ripped off. It was consumer protection. This was coverage that people asked for in addition to Medicare, to fill in the gap.

Then I discovered there were some additional cuts in dislocated worker programs. The Senator from Illinois spoke eloquently, of course, about a program she had worked on, just a small amount of money for school infrastructure, for kids.

So what I said today was I wanted the opportunity to go through this bill. I wanted an opportunity to talk about it. I wanted an opportunity to introduce amendments. The first amendment would have been offset, and I gave examples of some of the waste in the travel administrative budget in defense. That money would have been transferred so we would not have the same cut in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

I must say, Mr. President, looking at this in a slightly larger context, I find it unconscionable. Really, what we might be talking about, as we extend this rescissions bill into the future—this is a grim precedent of where we are going, since this is where the rubber meets the road. We could be seeing the cuts in the outyears for low-income energy assistance, for children, for education, for counseling for seniors to make sure they do not get ripped off with health insurance—all used to fi-

nance tax cuts that go in the main to wealthy, high-income people. Cuts in programs for dislocated workers, job training, you name it. All in the name of tax cuts? We do not go after any of the subsidies for the oil companies but we cut low-income energy assistance? We do not go after any of the military contractors, any of the waste there, but we make cuts in low-income energy assistance, job training programs for kids, counseling programs for elderly people, for consumer protection.

To me it was unacceptable.

I just want to respond to one or two points that the majority leader made, and then I will conclude my remarks.

This was not something just done on Friday. I just got this bill. I am not going to be bulldozed over as a Senator. I want to look and see what is in this piece of legislation. That is the responsible thing to do. And it certainly is true that those people, be they elderly people with disabilities, be they children, working poor people who are affected by low-income energy assistance may not have all the clout and make all the money and make all the contributions, deserve representation here in the U.S. Senate.

The cuts, I believe, are unconscionable. So this was not something I just come to on Friday. This has been a priority issue for me as a Senator from a cold weather State where many people are affected by these cuts for a long, long time. And will continue to be so.

Second, I care fiercely about the assistance for people in Oklahoma and California. We will be back to this bill. We all know it. Of course, we will be back to this bill. And, of course, there will be relief, and I have voted for that relief and will continue to do so. We all know we are going to be back on this piece of legislation—and we must. I hope there will be some discussion in the meantime and we can work out some reasonable compromise.

Finally, I have the utmost respect for the manager of the bill, the Senator from Oregon, and certainly for the Senator from West Virginia. But as to what happens in the future, we cannot be bound by the priorities and the parameters of what the House of Representatives is doing in these kinds of budget resolutions. We can make changes next year. I just simply tried to say today, and I will say it over and over again—I will shout it from the mountain top, from the floor of the Senate, if that is what is necessary—that these are distorted priorities. To ask some of the most vulnerable citizens in this country to tighten their belts when they cannot, to cut low-income energy assistance for people in my State, a cold weather State, and not even look for offsets? Not to restore that kind of funding? That is unacceptable to me.

So, I have no doubt that we will be back on this.

My final point would have been that by amendment, I would have on the first amendment talked about other