

what great things might happen once we start moving things forward?

Mr. FORD. Don't bet on that.

Mr. LOTT. Don't bet on that? The Senator from Kentucky will make sure that doesn't happen. I yield the floor so Senator DASCHLE can comment on his own time, and then I will move to stand in recess after that.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comments and applaud him for making the effort that he has over the last several days in working with us to see if we can't find a way with which to resolve this impasse.

I want to clarify a couple of matters that I think ought to be understood as we work our way through the impasse. The first is that a cloture vote, a victory on cloture on the Chafee amendment may move the ball ahead slightly, but there are scores of Chafee amendments, all of which will be subject to the same cloture vote process, each taking 30 hours. So if you multiply 30 hours times 30 amendments, that is a lot of time, and we don't have a lot of time.

It is not only the amendments, but it is the titles themselves, the banking, the finance, the commerce titles that have to be added to the trunk of the bill. They, too, will be subject to cloture and will require a substantial amount of time.

So unless we get an agreement, even if the caucus, even if our Democratic caucus would vote for cloture, there are Senators who would oppose moving the ISTEA bill forward without an agreement, which brings us to the need to vote for cloture in any case.

So it is with unanimity the Democrats are hoping that we can work with our friends in the majority to see if we can't reach that agreement.

As to the agreement, the clarification I wish to make goes along the lines of what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has just noted, and others. What do we want? Well, we want a date certain. We would like the assurance that the so-called parliamentary tree is not filled; that we have an opportunity, as Senator MCCAIN noted, to offer amendments. We would like to take the bills in sequence—the McCain-Feingold and then perhaps the Lott bill having to do with the labor unions. That would be the desirable approach, a sequence of consideration, first of McCain-Feingold and then of the Lott bill.

We recognize that every amendment and the bill itself would be subject to the rules of the Senate which means you have to have 60 votes. It would seem to me that if you don't get 60 votes, you pull the amendment and would move on to another one. If we filed cloture on an amendment or required a 60-vote threshold, you could get through these amendments pretty quickly. If you don't get it, it falls, and we just keep going. Ultimately, if we don't get 60 votes on McCain-Feingold, it falls; it is over.

I do not think it would take that long. I think we could work through a procedure that would bring us to some closure on this bill. That is all we can ask. We cannot do anything more than make our best effort to persuade and come up with a parliamentary process that will allow us the right to protect Senators as Members of the minority, whatever the minority may be, on a given issue. And I believe a process like that would work.

Senator LOTT has been, I think, fair in his willingness to consider almost anything. We have Senators who are unable to agree at this point. But like others before me, I am hopeful that we can get an agreement, that cloture votes will not be necessary, that we can then finish ISTEA, that we can then move on to nominations and another array of issues next week. That is within our grasp, but it will take an agreement.

I think it is fair to say that it will not matter how many cloture votes we take, I do not think the votes will be different. A majority of the Senate voted against cloture this morning—a majority. Forty-five Democrats and seven Republicans voted against cloture. A majority, it seems to me, now want to resolve this matter.

So I am hopeful, Mr. President, we can do that. I think we can do it. I will stand ready to meet with anybody to come to some conclusion on how we might proceed. But I hope we do not give up.

Under the rules, as I understand them, we will go into a recess until 3 o'clock?

RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move now that the Senate stand in recess until 3 p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to, and at 12:16 p.m., the Senate recessed until 3 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KEMPTHORNE).

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—S. 830

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of October 9, 1997, the Chair appoints the following conferees on Senate bill 830.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, and Ms. MIKULSKI conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from Idaho, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ABRAHAM. 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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant 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 modified committee amendment to S. 1173, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act:

Trent Lott, John Chafee, Paul Coverdell, Christopher Bond, Jesse Helms, Mike Enzi, John Ashcroft, Don Nickles, Craig Thomas, Mike DeWine, Richard Lugar, Pat Roberts, Ted Stevens, Wayne Allard, Dirk Kempthorne, and Larry Craig.

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 debate on the modified committee amendment to Senate bill 1173, a bill to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] and the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 277 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Abraham	Enzi	Kyl
Allard	Faircloth	Lott
Ashcroft	Frist	Lugar
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Murkowski
Brownback	Grams	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Roberts
Campbell	Gregg	Roth
Chafee	Hagel	Sessions
Coats	Hatch	Shelby
Cochran	Helms	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Craig	Hutchison	Stevens
D'Amato	Inhofe	Thomas
DeWine	Jeffords	Thurmond
Domenici	Kempthorne	Warner

NAYS—50

Akaka	Feinstein	Mack
Baucus	Ford	McCain
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Bumpers	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kerrey	Santorum
Collins	Kerry	Snowe
Conrad	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden
Feingold	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—2

Mikulski Sarbanes

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 48, the nays are 50.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for up to 5 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order. The unanimous-consent request has been made.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. I simply ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to follow for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. SHELBY. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I thought there was some kind of order here. Am I misinformed?

How much time does the Senator from Massachusetts want?

Mr. KERRY. Five minutes.

Mr. SHELBY. I have no objection to that because I am looking for about 20 or 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for up to 5 minutes, followed by the Senator from Massachusetts for 5 minutes.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

HONG KONG STOCK MARKET DECLINE

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, last night, the Hong Kong stock market lost 10 percent of its value. In the past week it has dropped 25 percent of its value. Panic stock selling has taken over the Hong Kong market. All stock markets around the world are declining very heavily. And as of 2:30 this afternoon the Dow Jones industrial average was down 215 points.

This is no coincidence. This is not just the normal fluctuation of the stock market. This is a warning sign of what could be yet to come in Hong Kong now that the Communist Chinese have taken over.

I have spoken out before on this floor about the dangers of the Communist takeover in Hong Kong and, regretably, my fears appear to be coming true. There is a simple but profound lesson here for Americans and for all freedom-loving people around the world. Until recently, Hong Kong was an oasis of economic vibrance and freedom surrounded by the Communist dictatorship on the Chinese mainland. Hong Kong was economically strong because Hong Kong was free.

Freedom knows no boundaries. Whether it is in America or Europe or

Africa or Latin America or Asia, freedom is what creates the opportunity for people and ideas to prosper, but wherever the Communists have ruled freedom dies.

Mr. President, the collapse of communism in Russia and Eastern Europe is one of the epic stories of our time, a true triumph of the human spirit against the forces of oppression. Unfortunately, the brave people of Hong Kong are suffering a reversal. It is tragic to see a free people come under the yoke of Communist rule.

There is still freedom of Hong Kong today, but the warning signs are ominous. We Americans, as the world's foremost champions of freedom, must remain vigilant in our efforts to prevent the Chinese Communists from imposing the full force of their dictatorship on the people of Hong Kong. I pledge to do that, and I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in this noble effort to be vigilant and not to permit the compromise of freedom on the altar of greed and profits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

THE CLIMATE CHANGE TREATY

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the United States is currently engaged in negotiating a climate change treaty. This is a negotiation that we have literally only just really engaged in, in the sense that we have only now made clear to the world what our negotiating position will be, the critical elements from which we will proceed. I was somewhat troubled this morning to hear a number of our colleagues come to the floor of the Senate and, frankly, either considerably misstate or considerably misrepresent the very straightforward words of the President yesterday with respect to this subject. The following is the position that the President articulated yesterday.

No. 1, it is the goal of the United States to find a binding treaty which includes not just developed nations but developing nations as well.

No. 2, the U.S. goal is a binding treaty that seeks to bring greenhouse gases to 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012, so as to minimize economic costs to the United States.

And, finally, No. 3, the United States now will undertake policies to fully leverage market mechanisms, innovation, technology, and American ingenuity to make achieving emissions reductions less costly.

I remind my colleagues that all of these positions are completely within the framework of the resolution that the Senate passed, the Byrd-Hagel resolution. That resolution specifically said it must "mandate new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the annex I parties, unless the protocol or other agreement"—and I want to emphasize here, "other agreement." The President in

his proposal has made allowance for the very "other agreement" potential that was contemplated in the resolution we passed. It specifically requires that other agreement, or the principal agreement, mandate new, and specific scheduled reductions for the developing countries within the same compliance period.

The second requirement that the Senate passed was that whatever agreement we reached would not result in serious harm to the economy of the United States. Let me emphasize, the term is "serious harm to the economy of the United States." Any fair reading of the President's remarks outlining our position would find that the President is completely within the framework of the Senate resolution. And yet, today, we really heard Senators completely misrepresenting that position and asserting that it is somehow outside of the Byrd-Hagel resolution.

I ask unanimous consent the full text of the President's comments be printed in the RECORD so people can judge for themselves the degree with which we are in compliance.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT ON GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE BEFORE THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY

The PRESIDENT. Thank you very much. Mr. Murphy, Mr. Vice President, to all of you who are here. I thank especially the members of Congress who are here, the leaders of labor and business who are here, all the members of the administration, and especially the White House staff members that the Vice President mentioned and the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the EPA, and the others who have helped us to come to this moment.

On the way in here we were met by the leaders of the National Geographic, and I complimented them on their recent two-part series on the Roman Empire. It's a fascinating story of how the Empire rose, how it sustained itself for hundreds of years, why it fell, and speculations on what, if any, relevance it might have to the United States and, indeed, the West.

And one of the gentlemen said, well, you know, we got a lot of interesting comments on that, including a letter referencing a statue we had of the bust of Emperor Vespasian. And one of our readers said, why in the world did you put a statue of Gene Hackman in a piece on the Roman Empire? (Laughter.) And I say that basically to say, in some senses, the more things change, the more they remain the same. (Laughter.)

For what sustains any civilization, and now what will sustain all of our civilizations, is the constant effort at renewal, the ability to avoid denial and to proceed into the future in a way that is realistic and humane, but resolute. Six years ago tomorrow, not long after I started running for President, I went back to my alma mater at Georgetown and began a series of three speeches outlining my vision for America in the 21st century—how we could keep the American Dream alive for all of our people, how we could maintain America's leadership for peace and freedom and prosperity, and how we could come together across the lines that divide us as one America.

And together, we've made a lot of progress in the last nearly five years now that the