

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Abraham	Enzi	Mack
Akaka	Feingold	McCain
Allard	Feinstein	McConnell
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Baucus	Frist	Moynihan
Bayh	Gorton	Murkowski
Bennett	Graham	Murray
Biden	Gramm	Nickles
Bingaman	Grams	Reed
Bond	Grassley	Reid
Boxer	Gregg	Robb
Breaux	Hagel	Roberts
Brownback	Hatch	Rockefeller
Bryan	Helms	Roth
Bunning	Hollings	Santorum
Burns	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Byrd	Hutchison	Schumer
Campbell	Inhofe	Sessions
Chafee	Inouye	Shelby
Cleland	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Conrad	Kerry	Specter
Coverdell	Kohl	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Thurmond
DeWine	Leahy	Torricelli
Dodd	Levin	Voivovich
Domenici	Lieberman	Warner
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden
Durbin	Lott	
Edwards	Lugar	

NAYS—2

Jeffords Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—S. 1059

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate, having received S. 1059, disagrees with the House amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. SESSIONS) appointed Mr. WARNER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms.

SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 1206

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers S. 1206, the legislative branch appropriations bill, immediately following the reporting of the bill by the clerk, I be recognized to offer a managers' amendment, and the time on the amendment and the bill be limited to 20 minutes equally divided, with no amendments in order to the managers' amendment.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the adoption of the managers' amendment, the bill be immediately advanced to third reading, and the Senate proceed to the House companion bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that H.R. 1905 be amended as follows: On page 2, after line 1, insert the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on page 2, line 2, over to and including line 7 on page 10; beginning on page 11, line 13, over to and including line 18 on page 18 be struck and the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on page 10, line 8, over to and including line 22 on page 16 be inserted in lieu thereof; and beginning on page 18, line 23, over to and including line 6 on page 40 be struck and the text of S. 1206, as amended, beginning on line 23, page 16 over to and including line 23 on page 38 be inserted in lieu thereof.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon passage of the House bill, S. 1206, be indefinitely postponed.

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

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I now call up S. 1206.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A bill (S. 1206) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, is on her way to the floor. I will wait until she is here to express to the entire Senate my appreciation for her assistance as the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee of Appropriations.

I have been delighted to have the opportunity to work with her on this leg-

islation and I will make that clear when she arrives. I understand she is in another committee meeting, and in the pattern of the Senate, finds herself torn between two equally important responsibilities. That is a situation with which we are all familiar.

I will, for the information of Senators, point out that the legislative branch bill provides \$1.68 billion in budget authority, exclusive of House items, for fiscal year 2000. This is \$114 million or 6.4 percent less than the fiscal 1999 level. It represents \$105 million or a 5.9-percent decrease from the President's budget request. So in this time of difficulty, we are coming in below last year's spending and below where the President recommended.

There are increases in the bill, of course. There always will be in an appropriations bill. You cut some places, and you increase others. The majority of the increases in the bill account for cost-of-living adjustments only, and they are estimated at 4.4 percent across the board.

The Senate portion of the bill increases funding for the Senate by only 3 percent above the fiscal 1999 level, which is less than the 4.4-percent COLA adjustment. So while the Senate portion of the bill is going up, it is going up less than the mandatory COLA that is required by law.

The bill funds 79 percent of the budget request of the Architect of the Capitol. Of the funds provided, 73 percent will fund operations, with the other 27 percent to fund Capitol projects.

I have always been one who has insisted on funding Capitol projects. As a businessman, I know that sometimes the most expensive savings you can achieve are savings that you take in the name of maintenance deferral. As things begin to deteriorate around the Capitol, it is tempting to say we can put it off for another year and look good in the short term. All you do when you do that is raise your costs in the long term. So throughout my tenure on the Legislative Branch Subcommittee and particularly my tenure as the chairman of that subcommittee, I have always been a champion of funding the Capitol projects and funding the maintenance projects to their fullest level, believing that in the long run that saves money.

Why then am I standing here today and saying that we are not going to do that in this bill, and we are not giving the Architect of the Capitol the funds that were requested? Well, there are several reasons for that. I think it is worth an explanation.

The subcommittee did not fund the Architect's request for \$28 million for Capitol dome renovations. I have been in the Capitol dome with the Architect of the Capitol, and I have seen firsthand how desperately in need of renovation it is. However, the full scope of the project will be determined during the paint removal process which is currently underway. The paint removal process is not expected to be completed

until next summer. Therefore, I think it prudent for us to delete the funds from this bill until we have the completion of that process and have the information available to us that will come as a result. That is why we do not recommend proceeding until the full scope of the project has been determined. That is where a large part of the savings that we referred to have come from.

I see the Senator from California has arrived. I wish to make public acknowledgment of the great contribution she has made to the Legislative Branch Subcommittee. This is her first assignment on the subcommittee as its ranking member, and I have found her not only delightful and cooperative to deal with but, perhaps even more appreciated, fully engaged. It is one thing to have a colleague who is nice to deal with but who never shows up and never pays any attention to any of the issues. The Senator from California not only shows up but comes with her homework having been done, a full agenda of her own, and complete understanding of the issues. I appreciate very much the opportunity I have had of working with her and welcome her to the subcommittee and to this particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator BENNETT, and commend him for the fair and responsible bill that has been put together. This is my first year as the ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, and I have found Senator BENNETT to be very open and willing to discuss issues. His leadership on our subcommittee is carried out in the best bipartisan spirit.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator and appreciate her comments.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, as the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Senator BENNETT, just outlined for the Senate, the fiscal year 2000 legislative branch appropriation bill was reported out of the full Appropriations Committee on Thursday, June 10, 1999, by a vote of 28-0. As reported by the committee, the bill, which totals \$1,679,010,000 in budget authority, exclusive of House items, is \$113,962,000, or 6.4 percent, below last year's enacted level and \$104,529,000, or 5.9 percent, below the President's request. For Senate items only, the subcommittee recommends a total of \$489,406,000—a reduction of \$28,187,000, or 5.4 percent, from the President's request.

For the Capitol Police, the subcommittee recommends a total of \$88.7 million for salaries and general expenses. This is an increase of \$5.8 million, or 6.8 percent, over last year's enacted level. I commend the agency for soliciting a management review which was conducted by an outside consulting firm. Since that time, the Capitol Police has been very aggressive in ad-

ressing the management deficiencies outlined in that report. First, they provided the subcommittee with a departmental response which addressed the findings of the review, and they are currently in the process of developing a strategic planning process which will provide for a systematic approach to organizational enhancements and professional growth for the future. In this regard, this bill contains the funding required for improvements to information technology and transfers this responsibilities from the Senate Sergeant at Arms to the Capitol Police. This action was recommended in the management review report. The bill also provides for cost-of-living and comparability increases for the men and women of the United States Capitol Police.

For the General Accounting Office, the subcommittee recommends a funding level of \$382.3 million, which is \$4.8 million below the budget request, but is almost \$10 million above what the House is proposing. The level proposed by the subcommittee will permit the GAO to maintain the current level of 3,275 FTEs, which is what the Comptroller requested for Fiscal Year 2000 and it will also provide adequate funds for them to meet their mandatory requirements.

Mr. President, I also want to take a minute, as I did during our full committee markup, to talk about the Senate Employees Child Care Center. As Members may be aware, the groundbreaking for the child care center began in the fall of 1996, and the center was to be completed in the fall of 1997. Here we are in June of 1999, and the center remains incomplete. I have encouraged the Architect of the Capitol to raise the priority of this project and bring this problem-plagued project to completion by the current targeted date of September 1, 1999. This new center will expand the quality of child care services available to the staff who help us.

Again, Mr. President, I want to personally thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator BENNETT, for the courtesies he has extended to me. He is, indeed, a most thoughtful and gracious chairman—a real gentleman—who has made my first year on the subcommittee a most pleasant one.

If I may, Mr. President, I extend my very sincere thanks to Mary Dewald and Christine Ciccone of the staff for their excellent work on this bill. It has been very special, and we are blessed with wonderful staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California and particularly thank her for remembering the staff. We stand here before the television cameras, but we take credit for the work they do. I appreciate her doing that.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 683 AND 684, EN BLOC

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I now send to the desk a managers' amend-

ment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] proposes amendments en bloc numbered 683 and 684.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 683

(Purpose: To amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to modify service requirements relating to creditable service with congressional campaign committees)

On page 38, insert between lines 21 and 22 the following:

SEC. 313. CREDITABLE SERVICE WITH CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES.

Section 8332(m)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(A) such employee has at least 4 years and 6 months of service on such committees as of December 12, 1980; and”.

AMENDMENT NO. 684

(Purpose: To further restrict legislative post-employment lobbying by Members and senior staffers)

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ____ Section 207(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) and inserting the following:

“(1) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND ELECTED OFFICERS.—Any person who is a Member of Congress or an elected officer of either House of Congress and who, within 2 years after that person leaves office, knowingly makes, with the intent to influence, any communication to or appearance before any Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress, or any employee of any other legislative office of Congress, on behalf of any other person (except the United States) in connection with any matter on which such former Member of Congress or elected officer seeks action by a Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress, in his or her official capacity, shall be punished as provided in section 216 of this title.

“(2) CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEES.—(A) Any person who is an employee of the Senate or an employee of the House of Representatives who, within 2 years after termination of such employment, knowingly makes, with the intent to influence, any communication to or appearance before any person described under subparagraph (B), on behalf of any other person (except the United States) in connection with any matter on which such former employee seeks action by a Member, officer, or employee of either House of Congress, in his or her official capacity, shall be punished as provided in section 216 of this title.

“(B) The persons referred to under subparagraph (A) with respect to appearances or communications by a former employee are any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Congress in which such former employee served.”;

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”;

(3) in paragraph (7)(G), by striking “(2), (3), or (4)” and inserting “or (2)”;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, these amendments have been cleared on both sides. I ask for their adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (No. 683 and 684) were agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, having agreed to the managers' amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read for the third time and passage occur, all without any intervening action or debate, and that following passage the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the House bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is amended pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the Senate Budget Committee scoring of the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman and ranking member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee for bringing the Senate a bill that is within the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation. The bill provides \$1.7 billion in new budget authority and \$1.4 billion in new outlays for the operations of the U.S. Senate and joint agencies supporting the legislative branch. When House funding is added to the bill, and with outlays from prior years and other completed actions, the Senate bill totals \$2.5 billion in budget authority and \$2.6 billion in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

The bill is \$23 million in BA and \$20 million in outlays below the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation. I commend the managers of the bill for their diligent work, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

EXHIBIT 1

H.R. 1905, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2000, SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL
(Fiscal year 2000, in millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Crime	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:				
Budget authority	2,455	94	2,549
Outlays	2,464	94	2,558
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	2,478	94	2,572
Outlays	2,484	94	2,578
1999 level:				
Budget authority	2,353	94	2,447
Outlays	2,328	94	2,422
President's request:				
Budget authority	2,620	94	2,714
Outlays	2,614	94	2,708
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	2,416	94	2,510
Outlays	2,453	94	2,547
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
Senate 302(b) allocation:				
Budget authority	(23)	(23)
Outlays	(20)	(20)
1999 level:				
Budget authority	102	102
Outlays	136	136
President's request:				
Budget authority	(165)	(165)
Outlays	(150)	(150)
House-passed bill:				
Budget authority	39	39
Outlays	11	11

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, ever since I arrived here in 1993, I have supported initiatives to help restore the public's confidence in government by limiting the influence of special interests over the legislative process. It's a big task, Mr. President and along the way I have offended and even angered some people around here.

I have worked to require greater disclosure of the expenses and activities of lobbyists. I pushed to put in place new gift restrictions that stopped Senators and staff from accepting free vacations and fancy dinners from lobbyists as used to be the norm around here. And finally, I have argued that we need to reform the woefully loophole-ridden campaign finance system that we currently live under. Reforming Congress is a crucial issue for me because the electorate has grown to view this institution with cynicism and disdain, and even to fundamentally distrust their own elected representatives.

Now Mr. President, a crucial part of the culture of special interest influence that pervades Washington is the revolving door between public service and private employment. But by putting a lock on this revolving door for some period of time, we can send a message that those entering government employment should view public service as an honor and a privilege—not as another wrung on the ladder to personal gain and profit.

There are countless instances of former members of Congress who once chaired or served on committees with jurisdiction over particular industries or special interests now lobbying their former colleagues on behalf of those very industries or special interests. Former committee staff directors are using their contacts and knowledge of their former committees to secure lucrative positions in lobbying firms and

associations with interests related to those committees.

There have been some very interesting studies showing just how regularly the revolving door swings. Of the 91 lawmakers who left Congress at the end of 1994, at least 25 later registered to lobby. A 1995 study of 353 former lawmakers showed that one in four had lobbied for private interests after leaving office. In fact, there were more than 100 former Members of Congress who appear on the lobbying reports filed in August 1997, and that doesn't count Members who left office in 1996, since they could not yet register without violating the current revolving door law. I could go on, Mr. President, and on and on and on. The problem of revolving door lobbying is quite clear.

The amendment I am offering today is designed to strengthen the post-employment restrictions on Members of Congress and senior congressional staff that are currently in place. Keep in mind, post-employment restrictions are nothing new. There is currently a one year ban on former members of Congress lobbying the entire Congress as well as a one-year ban on senior congressional staff lobbying the committee or the Member for whom they worked. And by Senate rule, we prohibit all departing Senate staff from lobbying their former employing entity for one year. Members and senior staff are also prohibited from lobbying the executive branch on behalf of a foreign entity for one year.

The amendment would double the current restriction and prohibit members of Congress from lobbying the entire Congress for two years. Thus, in most cases, an entire two year Congress will intervene before a former Member can be back lobbying his or her former colleagues. Perhaps the longer period will encourage those who leave the Congress to seek opportunities for future employment outside of the lobbying world. Perhaps it will discourage big business from putting former Members on their payroll right after they leave office. But in any event, this longer "cooling off period" will give the public more confidence in the integrity of this body.

With respect to staff, the amendment makes some changes as well. Here we are talking only about those staff who make three quarters or more of the salary of a member of Congress. In other words, this amendment would change the post-employment restrictions only on staff making over \$102,000 per year. These senior staff work closely with us, at the committee level, or with the leadership, or in our personal offices. This amendment would prohibit these very senior staffers from lobbying the House of Congress in which they work during the same 2-year period as we are prohibited from lobbying the entire Congress. So senior Senate staffers couldn't lobby the Senate and senior House staffers couldn't lobby the House.

Now here we have struck a balance, Mr. President. It seems clear to me

that the current restrictions which prohibit lobbying contacts only with the former employer, whether Member or committee, are inadequate. High level staffers have contacts and work closely with people throughout the body, not just with the other staff or Members on their committees or in their Member's office. These are people making \$102,000 or more. They are highly in demand in the lobbying world, not just for their expertise but for their contacts. If the cooling off period is to mean anything with respect to these senior staff, it must cover more than the individual committee or member of Congress for whom they worked.

Some senior staff undoubtedly have contacts with their counterparts in the other body. But their day to day work, and therefore their closest contacts will be in the house of Congress in which they work. So this amendment leaves an outlet for the use of a former staffer's expertise in lobbying the other body. To me, that is a reasonable balance, and not an unreasonable restriction on a staffer's future employment.

Now some might argue that we are inhibiting talented individuals from pursuing careers in policy matters on which they have developed substantial expertise. It may be asked why a former high-level staffer on the Senate Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee cannot accept employment with a telecommunications company? After all, this person has accumulated years of knowledge of our communication laws and technology. Why should this individual be prevented from accepting private sector employment in the communications field?

But my amendment does not bar anyone from seeking private-sector employment. Staffers can take those jobs with the telecommunications company, but what they cannot do is lobby their former colleagues in the house of Congress for which they worked for two years. They can consult, they can advise, they can recommend, but they cannot lobby their former colleagues.

I considered an even longer cooling off period for staffers to be barred from lobbying their former employer, be it a member or a committee, but decided that the two year, house of Congress limitation strikes the best balance. Two years is the length of an entire Congress. That period of time should be enough to mitigate to a great extent the special access that the staffer is likely to have because of his or her former position. At the same time, it allows the staffer who is intent on pursuing a lobbying career to concentrate on the other body for two years, and then return to the side of the Capitol in which he or she worked after that period.

Mr. President, this amendment is not an attack on the profession of lobbying. The right to petition the government is a fundamental constitutional right. Simply attacking lobby-

ists does not address the true flaws of our political system. Lobbying is merely an attempt to present the views and concerns of a particular group and there is nothing inherently wrong with that. In fact, lobbyists, whether they are representing public interest groups or Wall Street, can present important information to Members of Congress that may not otherwise be available.

I strongly believe that there is no more noble endeavor than to serve in government. But we need to take immediate action to restore the public's confidence in their government, and to rebuild the lost trust between members of Congress and the electorate. This amendment is a strong step in that direction because it addresses a perception that too often rises to the level of reality—that the interests that hire former Members or staffers from the Congress have special access when they lobby the Congress. We need to slow the revolving door to address that perception, and this amendment will do just that.

I am pleased that the managers have agreed to accept my amendment and that it has become part of the bill that will go to the President for signature. I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. BENNETT. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Abraham	Domenici	Kohl
Akaka	Dorgan	Kyl
Allard	Durbin	Landrieu
Ashcroft	Edwards	Lautenberg
Bayh	Enzi	Leahy
Bennett	Feingold	Levin
Biden	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Lincoln
Bond	Frist	Lott
Boxer	Gorton	Lugar
Breaux	Graham	Mack
Brownback	Grams	McCain
Bryan	Grassley	McConnell
Bunning	Gregg	Mikulski
Burns	Hagel	Moynihan
Byrd	Hatch	Murkowski
Campbell	Helms	Murray
Chafee	Hollings	Nickles
Cleland	Hutchinson	Reed
Cochran	Hutchison	Reid
Collins	Inhofe	Robb
Coverdell	Inouye	Roberts
Craig	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Crapo	Johnson	Roth
Daschle	Kennedy	Santorum
DeWine	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Schumer

Sessions	Stevens	Voinovich
Shelby	Thomas	Warner
Smith (OR)	Thompson	Wellstone
Snowe	Thurmond	Wyden
Specter	Torricelli	

NAYS—4

Baucus	Gramm
Conrad	Smith (NH)

NOT VOTING—1

Harkin

The bill (H.R. 1905), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 1905 having passed, the Senate insists on its amendments, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. ABRAHAM) appointed Mr. BENNETT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE Y2K LIABILITY BILL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss S. 96, the McCain bill concerning Y2K litigation. It is unfortunate that this bill has, to some extent, been utilized by those on both extremes of the tort reform debate: with proponents arguing that opposition to the bill reflects contempt for our economy and a few opponents accusing the bill's supporters of contempt for consumers' rights. The truth, as usual, is somewhere in between these two poles.

As our economy evolves, becoming national and international in scope, situations will arise that demand procedural and substantive changes to our legal system. Moderate, balanced tort reform is an issue on which I have worked for some years. I approach each issue with the same question: can our legal system be made more efficient while continuing to provide adequate, just protections to consumers? This approach has led me to support reforms which have been validated by the test of time.

Mr. President, in 1994, I supported one of the first tort reform measures to pass Congress, the Aviation Revitalization Act of 1994. At that time small plane manufacturers had been almost extinguished by costly litigation. This narrowly-tailored legislation limited the period, to eighteen years, in which manufactures could be sued for design or manufacturing defects. In the six