

from South Dakota, the closest friend I have ever had, the distinguished Democratic leader, and the kind words he had to say; my good friend from Mississippi, the distinguished majority leader; and, of course, my colleague who I have known for longer than anybody in this body, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, JIM JEFFORDS.

These comments mean a great deal. That Vice President GORE, presided at the time of the vote meant a lot to me. I will note that the Vice President said earlier today: Boy, that guy LEAHY must be awfully old.

I point out the Vice President and I have the same birthday, March 31—about 8 years apart.

I have served here with so many. I see my dear friend and aisle mate, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, who has cast the most votes in history—over 15,000 votes, and my good friend, the President pro tempore, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, who has the second most votes ever cast in this body.

I think of the people with whom I have served during the 25 years I have served, people such as Scoop Jackson and Mike Mansfield, Jacob Javits, John Stennis, Hubert Humphrey, and Bob Dole. The two closest friends I had in my class were a Republican and a Democrat: Paul Laxalt and John Glenn; and so many others who I served with including two colleagues from Vermont, Bob Stafford and JIM JEFFORDS.

How fortunate I am to serve with the men and women of this body; every one of whom is a close friend—those such as the distinguished Senator from Utah with whom I work on the Judiciary Committee; those with whom I work on the Appropriations Committee, the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, the chairman of the committee—he and Senator BYRD have taught me so much as I have served on that committee—those with whom I serve on Agriculture, my good friend, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, DICK LUGAR, and others. There are so many of you.

When I came here the country was very much at risk and the Senate was in good bipartisan shape. Today the country is doing very well, and we sometimes break down too much along partisan lines. I think this is unfortunate. Those of us who have served here a long time know it does not have to be that way. We know the country is better when we work together. I think of traveling with my friend from Mississippi, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi, THAD COCHRAN, when we went to our home States. We find, even though we are of different philosophies, there are so many things in common, so we can work together.

I hope we can do more and more of that. If I may say to all my friends, nothing I can ever do in life will give

me greater pleasure or humble me more than serving in this body. There are only 100 of us who might be here at any given time to represent a great nation of a quarter of a billion people. Think of the responsibility that is for all of us. These are the finest men and women, in both parties, I have ever known.

When Marcelle and I came to this city, we didn't know how long we were going to be here. I was the junior-most Member of this body, the junior-most Member—No. 99 in then a 99-Member Senate, because of a tie vote in New Hampshire. I sat way over in that corner.

I looked at Senators, people such as TED KENNEDY or Frank Church or Barry Goldwater, who would walk in here—people I knew from Time magazine covers or from the news—and suddenly realized, I am here. I remember that day in January when I stood up to cast my first vote and then quickly sat down. I also remember what Senator Mansfield, our leader, told me: Always keep your word, he said, and don't worry if you think you cast a vote wrong; the issue will come back. It does. I have found that is true after 10,000 votes.

So I think now I have been here long enough that this week I will finally do something I have been putting off for 25 years. I will carve my name in my desk.

I yield the floor.
(Applause, Senators rising.)

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1999—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Reid amendment No. 2299.

Tom Daschle, Chuck Robb, Barbara Boxer, Joseph I. Lieberman, Jack Reed, Richard Bryan, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Harry Reid, Blanche L. Lincoln, Dianne Feinstein, John D. Rockefeller IV, Richard J. Durbin, Daniel K. Akaka, Ron Wyden, Byron L. Dorgan, Tom Harkin, and Barbara A. Mikulski.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory call of the roll under the rules has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Reid amendment No. 2299 to S. 1593, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 331 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka	Feingold	Lincoln
Baucus	Feinstein	McCain
Bayh	Graham	Mikulski
Biden	Harkin	Moynihan
Bingaman	Hollings	Murray
Boxer	Hutchinson	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Brownback	Jeffords	Robb
Bryan	Johnson	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Roth
Cleland	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Collins	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Daschle	Landrieu	Thompson
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Dorgan	Leahy	Wellstone
Durbin	Levin	Wyden
Edwards	Lieberman	

NAYS—47

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Campbell	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Chafee	Hatch	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Helms	Specter
Coverdell	Hutchison	Stevens
Craig	Inhofe	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Voinovich
Domenici	Lugar	Warner
Enzi	Mack	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of H.J. Res. 71, the continuing resolution. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (H.J. Res. 71) was read the third time and passed.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that after we get an agreement on the time, Senator HATCH be allowed 5 minutes to speak on behalf of his ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, all I was asking was that he have an opportunity to speak very briefly about the 10,000 votes his colleague on the Judiciary Committee has achieved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCAIN. Reserving the right to object, if I am allowed to speak on the

results of this vote before then, then I will agree to a unanimous-consent request.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1999—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me go ahead then. This will be a little disjointed, but I think I can accommodate all Senators.

I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 300, S. 1692, the partial-birth abortion bill, and a vote occurring immediately following 80 minutes of debate, with 30 minutes under the control of Senator LEVIN, and 10 minutes each for the following Senators: FEINGOLD, BOXER, MCCAIN, SCHUMER, and SANTORUM, all occurring without any intervening action or debate. I also ask unanimous consent that Senator HATCH have 5 minutes after the vote to speak on behalf of his colleague, Senator LEAHY.

I further ask consent that it be in order for me to ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. There are two parts to the majority leader's request. The first is that he move to proceed to Calendar No. 300, S. 1692, which is the partial-birth abortion bill. The second is the unanimous-consent agreement involving the request by a number of Senators to be heard. I have no objection to Senators being heard. I question why we need to move to proceed to Calendar No. 300, when we simply could do so by a unanimous-consent request, thereby not taking off the table and off of consideration the campaign finance reform bill. I will, therefore, ask unanimous consent that we simply allow the partial-birth abortion bill to be taken up, thereby precluding the need to vote on the motion to proceed and thereby protecting the current position of the campaign finance reform bill.

I personally would love to have the full debate that we were promised on campaign finance reform. The amendments are pending. There ought to be a vote on the Reid amendment. I would like to have a vote on my amendment. Even though we did not get cloture, we ought to have that debate.

There are other Senators who have yet to be heard on this issue. We have not had the 5 days committed. We have not had the opportunity to vote on these issues.

I ask unanimous consent that we simply take up partial-birth abortion so we can return to this issue once that issue has been resolved.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. By doing this, the campaign finance issue is put back on the calendar. We can have the debate that is needed on the motion to proceed to

the partial-birth abortion bill, and Senators can be heard to express their concerns about the campaign finance issue, as well as the time Senator HATCH asked for after the vote. So I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Object.

Mr. KERRY. Object.

Mr. GRAHAM. Object.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. KERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request. The leader has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, is the motion to proceed pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader's motion is pending.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed is debatable.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am very troubled by the majority leader's decision. There is no reason why we have to move to proceed to the partial-birth abortion bill. It is a bill that I will probably end up supporting. So this decision about whether or not we support or oppose partial-birth abortion, we will have a good debate about that and amendments will be offered. This is a question of whether or not we are going to keep our word, whether or not we are going to have the opportunity to finish the debate on campaign finance reform, whether or not we are going to have the opportunity to offer amendments. That is what this is about.

So nobody ought to be misled. Do we finish our business? Do we follow through with commitments? Do we have a good debate or not? The majority leader said no. No, we won't have a debate on campaign finance reform. No, we won't keep the commitments made with regard to how long this bill will be debated. That is wrong. A number of us—unanimously on this side and some on that side—want to make sure the RECORD clearly indicates our anger, our disappointment, and our determination to come back to this issue.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to my Democratic leader, does he not believe this is part of a pattern of taking issues that are important and rejecting them out of

hand and not giving a chance for these issues to be fully heard? Does he believe this is part of it?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from California raises a good point. The attitude appears to be: I am going to take my ball and go home anytime it doesn't go my way. I will just take my ball and go home. Well, I think that is wrong. We ought not to go home. This is too important an issue. We ought to be here, have the debate and the votes, and get this job done right. The American people expect better than this. They are not getting it with this decision; they are not getting it with the motion to proceed; they are not getting it with our denial to have a good vote and debate about some of these pending amendments.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes.

Mr. LEVIN. I want to clarify what the Democratic leader has done. He has offered unanimous consent to go to partial-birth abortion because if we go to it that way, after it is disposed of and resolved, we would automatically then come back to campaign finance reform and resolve that issue; is that correct?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Michigan is exactly right. If we would proceed to the partial-birth abortion bill by unanimous consent, the pending issue would continue to be campaign finance reform. By moving to proceed to the partial-birth abortion bill, we then relegate the campaign finance reform bill back to the calendar. That is what we want to avoid. That is unnecessary.

I think the American people are trying to sort this out and figure why we are doing this. The reason we are doing this is not because they want to take up partial-birth abortion alone; it is because they don't want to continue the debate on campaign finance reform. That is what this action actually telegraphs to the American people.

Mr. LEVIN. If I may further ask the Democratic leader, even though many of us oppose the bill relative to partial-birth abortion, we have nonetheless agreed that we would go to it by unanimous consent because, after it was then disposed of, however it was disposed of, we could then come back to this critical issue of campaign finance reform; is that correct?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Michigan is exactly right. We are not passing judgment on the issue of partial-birth abortion; there will be people on either side of it. But what we are united about, regardless of how one feels on partial-birth abortion—at least on this side of the aisle—is that every single Democrat believes we ought to stay on this bill. Every single Democrat wants to assure that we don't violate the understanding that the Senate had about how long we would be on this legislation, and whether or not we would be able to proceed with amendments and have a good debate. So you are absolutely right. There is no question, by going to unanimous consent,