

have to make a choice between the safety of the financial system and the free market, the financial system will win. There is no free market and there never will be. It's the height of hypocrisy to talk about the free market in one breath and bail out Long-Term Capital . . . in the next breath." Mr. President, I oppose this legislation because in this environment, we need more oversight and enforcement in our financial services, not less.

Beyond these concerns that this is not the right time to enact these sweeping changes buttressed by the follies of the free market, I have other, structural concerns with the proposed changes to our financial services laws.

First, I am concerned that if we relax the laws about who can own and operate financial institutions, an unhealthy concentration of financial resources will be the inevitable result. The savings of the many will be controlled by the few. If we relax banking regulations in this country, Americans will know less about where their deposits are kept and about how they are being used.

Marylanders used to have savings accounts with local banks where the teller knew their name and their family. We have already seen the trend toward mega-mergers, accompanied by higher fees, a decline in service, and the loss of neighborhood financial institutions. This bill accelerates that trend.

With a globalization of financial resources, the local bank could be bought by a holding company based in Thailand. Instead of the friendly teller, consumers will be contacting a computer operator in a country half-way around the globe through an 800 number. Their account will be subject to financial risks that have nothing to do with their job, their community, or even the economy of the United States. I know impersonalized globalization is not what banking customers want when we talk about modernization of the financial services.

Second, I am concerned that complex financial and insurance products will now be sold in a cluttered market by untrained individuals. Investment and insurance planning for families is a very important process, one of the most important decisions a family makes. It should be done with a professional who is certified and who is someone you can trust. By breaking down these firewalls and allowing various companies to offer insurance and complex investment products, we run the risk that consumers will be confused, defrauded, and treated like market segments and not individuals with unique needs and goals.

Finally, I believe that any modernization of our financial services law should not just retain, but expand the important consumer protections and community investment policies currently in place.

Consumers need protections and regulations to guarantee the safety of their deposits and the availability of

basic banking services and credit to help their communities grow. If we have a Consumer Product Safety Commission to protect children from flammable sleepware, I believe we should also have a strong regulatory framework to protect consumers, not just investors, in the financial services marketplace.

A strong regulatory framework will not be provided by the Federal Reserve, as is proposed in this legislation. I share the concerns of John Hawke, Undersecretary of the Treasury Department, that shifting the regulatory power from the Office of the Controller of the Currency to the Federal Reserve Board is a highly questionable regulatory protection. This would be like letting the bankers regulate themselves. The decision making of the Federal Reserve is directly linked to the banking industry that it would regulate. Bankers elect two thirds of the Federal Reserve directors. It is true that the Federal Reserve is independent of the administration, but it is not independent of the bankers and finance companies that it would regulate.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to a necessary reform of our financial services laws. But this is not the legislation and this is not the time to do it. The U.S. stock market has had one of the worst quarters since 1990 and world leaders are currently strategizing about how to stanch the global economic crisis.

The Congress will be back in 90 days. Hopefully, the world market will be calmer, it will be after the election, and we will be able to study the lessons learned from the financial events of the past three months. For all the hard work and all the negotiating and compromise, now is not the time to go forward and add more fuel to what is already a very troubling global financial firestorm.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FINANCIAL SERVICES ACT OF 1998—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 10, which the clerk will report.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 588, H.R. 10, the financial services bill.

Trent Lott, Alfonso D'Amato, Wayne Allard, Tim Hutchinson, Dan Coats, Rick Santorum, Robert F. Bennett, Jon Kyl, Gordon Smith, Craig Thomas, Pat Rob-

erts, John Warner, John McCain, Frank Murkowski, Larry E. Craig, and William V. Roth, Jr.

Mr. DORGAN. 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.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule is waived.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 588, H.R. 10, the financial services bill, shall be brought to a close? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 301 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Abraham	Enzi	Lott
Akaka	Faircloth	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Ashcroft	Ford	McCain
Baucus	Frist	McConnell
Bennett	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Grams	Moynihan
Bingaman	Grassley	Murkowski
Bond	Gregg	Murray
Boxer	Hagel	Nickles
Breaux	Harkin	Reed
Brownback	Hatch	Reid
Bryan	Helms	Robb
Burns	Hollings	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hutchinson	Roth
Campbell	Inhofe	Santorum
Chafee	Inouye	Sarbanes
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Coats	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Kempthorne	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Specter
Conrad	Kerrey	Stevens
Coverdell	Kerry	Thomas
Craig	Kohl	Thompson
D'Amato	Kyl	Thurmond
Daschle	Landrieu	Torricelli
DeWine	Lautenberg	Warner
Dodd	Leahy	Wyden
Domenici	Levin	
Durbin	Lieberman	

NAYS—11

Bumpers	Gramm	Sessions
Dorgan	Hutchison	Shelby
Feingold	Mikulski	Wellstone
Gorton	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—1

Glenn

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 88, the nays are 11. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under a previous order, the cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the