United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 2001 No. 2

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Saturday, January 6, 2001, at 11:00 a.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 2001

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 3, 2001)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, thank You for Your hand upon our shoulders assuring us of Your providential, palpable presence and reminding us of Your faithfulness. It is a hand of comfort as You tell us again that You will never leave nor forsake us. It is a hand of conscription calling us to be ''Aye ready!'' servants who receive from You the orders of the day. It is a hand of courage that gives us daring to take action because You have taken hold of us. It is a hand of correction alerting us to what may be less than Your best for us or our Nation. It is a hand of confidence to press forward. Your faithfulness fails not; it meets the problems of today with fresh guidance for each step of the way. So we will be all the bolder; Your hand is upon our shoulders. We will not waver; You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable HARRY REID, a Senator from the State of Nevada, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with each speaker not to exceed 15 minutes in their presentations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Carolina.

THERE IS NO SURPLUS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, parroting Patrick Henry: Peace, peace, everywhere man cried peace, but there is no peace. Surplus, surplus, everywhere men cry surplus, but there is no surplus. That is the point of my comments this afternoon. I have to embellish it or flesh it out so you will understand the reality, that ''it is not the economy, stupid,'' rather it is the real economy.

During Christmas week, I picked up USA Today. A headline read ''Surplus soars despite the slump.'' That is dangerous. People think we have a surplus and everybody is running around: Whoopee, cut all the revenues; wait a minute, if you don't cut it, those Democrats are going to spend it. Let's have tax cuts, tax cuts.

This morning, I picked up Roll Call. It had a very interesting article by Stuart Rothenberg, one of the best of the best. Not quoting the entire article, he had a little squib about our new colleague and my friend, Senator TOM CARPER of Delaware. I quote part of the article as of this morning:

Delaware Senator Tom Carper's record in the House is not easy to pigeonhole. During a six-year period, from 1983 through 1988, his U.S. Chamber of Commerce ratings ranged from 38 to 64, his liberal Americans for Democratic Action ratings ranged from 55 to 80 and his AFL–CIO ratings ranged from 59 to 86.

The Delaware Democrat tended to be more moderate on economic issues, but that generally reflected his aggressive efforts to cut the budget deficit. Since that's no longer a problem, he will face a different set of legislative priorities on the economy, possibly altering his image.

I will repeat that: ''Since that's no longer a problem . . .'' The deficit has been solved, according to this morning's Roll Call. Not at all. We had that

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

balanced budget agreement in 1997, so you would think that the budget would have been balanced in 1998. To the contrary.

In 1998, according to the Congressional Budget Office, we had a deficit of $109 billion, not a surplus. In 1999, we had a deficit of $127 billion, not a surplus.

For the year 2000, just 3 months ago, fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, I quote from page 20, table 6 of the final monthly Treasury statement by the U.S. Department of the Treasury. It shows that the agency securities issued under special financing authorities at the beginning of fiscal year 2000 was 5 trillion 606 some-odd billion dollars, whereas on September 30, it was 5 trillion 629 some-odd billion dollars. That is a deficit, not a surplus, of $23 billion.

If there is any doubt, the distinguished Presiding Officer and I were here when we worked out the last surplus under President Lyndon Baines Johnson. That was in 1968–1969. That was before we changed the old fiscal year to October 1. It used to begin July 1. In December, early that first week, if I remember correctly, George Mahon, who was then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and all of us called over to Marvin Watson and said: Ask the chief if we can cut another $5 billion, and we did. We got permission.

Does my colleague know what the budget was for fiscal year 1968–1969 for Social Security, Medicare—go right on down the list—guns and butter, the war in Vietnam? The civil economy was $178 billion. The interest now is $365 billion, $1 billion a day; just the interest carrying charges, not for Government, just for past profligacy.

I have a list of the Presidents from Truman through Clinton and their corresponding budget information; these are Congressional Budget Office figures. I ask unanimous consent this table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

[In billions]

President and year	U.S. budget	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
Truman:						
1946	55.2	−5.0	−15.9	−10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	−9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	−0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	−3.1	−4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	−1.5	−3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	−6.5	−6.9	266.0	
1954	70.9	3.6	−1.2	−4.8	270.8	
Eisenhower:						
1955	68.4	0.6	−3.0	−3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.7	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	−2.8	−7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	−5.0	−12.8	−7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	−3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	−1.2	−3.3	−2.1	292.6	
1962	106.8	3.2	−7.1	−10.3	302.9	9.1
Kennedy:						
1963	111.3	2.6	−4.8	−7.4	310.3	9.9
1964	118.5	−0.1	−5.9	−5.8	316.1	10.7
Johnson:						
1965	118.2	4.8	−1.4	−6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	2.5	−3.7	−6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	−8.6	−11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	−25.2	−28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
1970	195.6	12.3	−2.8	−15.1	380.9	19.3
Nixon:						
1971	210.2	4.3	−23.0	−27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	−23.4	−27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	−14.9	−30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	−6.1	−17.6	483.9	29.3
1975	332.3	4.8	−53.2	−58.0	541.9	32.7
Ford:						
1976	371.8	13.4	−73.7	−87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	−53.7	−77.4	706.4	41.9
Carter:						
1978	458.7	11.0	−59.2	−70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	−40.7	−52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	−73.8	−79.6	909.1	74.8
1981	678.2	6.7	−79.0	−85.7	994.8	95.5
Reagan:						
1982	745.8	14.5	−128.0	−142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	−207.8	−234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.9	7.6	−185.4	−193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	−212.3	−252.8	1,817.5	178.9
1986	990.5	81.9	−221.2	−303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,004.1	75.7	−149.8	−225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.5	100.0	−155.2	−255.2	2,601.3	214.1
1989	1,143.7	114.2	−152.5	−266.7	2,868.3	240.9
Bush:						
1990	1,253.2	117.4	−221.2	−338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,324.4	122.5	−269.4	−391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,381.7	113.2	−290.4	−403.6	4,002.1	292.3
1993	1,409.5	94.2	−255.1	−349.3	4,351.4	292.5
Clinton:						
1994	1,461.9	89.0	−203.3	−292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,515.8	113.3	−164.0	−277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.6	153.4	−107.5	−260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.3	165.8	−22.0	−187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,652.6	178.2	69.2	−109.0	5,478.7	363.8
1999	1,703.0	251.8	124.4	−127.4	5,606.1	353.5
2000	1,769.0	234.9	176.0	−58.9	5,665.0	362.0
2001	1,839.0	262.0	177.0	−85.0	5,750.0	371.0

*Historical Tables, Budget of the U.S. Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO's 2001 Economic and Budget Outlook.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this shows how when President Clinton came to office in January of 1993, in fiscal year 1992, the last year of President George Herbert Walker Bush's term, according to the Congressional Budget Office, there was a deficit of $403,600,000. We were spending $400 billion more than we were taking in that year.

Since Clinton has taken office, we have reduced that deficit from $403 billion to $23 billion. We were headed in the right direction.

I hope Mr. Rothenberg, Roll Call, USA Today, and the free press will finally get the truth to the American people. That is all we want. We have to

be talking and singing from the same hymnal. Everybody is running around saying: Yes, I am for a tax cut, but not quite as big; I am for this; I am for that. We don't have any taxes to cut. To put it another way, the best tax cut is to reduce the deficit.

If one reads the Internet site of the U.S. Treasury—publicdebt.treas.gov—the public debt to the penny, as of 11 o'clock—which is when they changed it—is 5 trillion 728 some-odd billion dollars. At the close of fiscal year 2000 on September 30, it was $5.674 trillion, and it has gone up to $5.728-some-odd trillion.

So you can see, not only did we end fiscal year 2000 with a deficit—not a surplus—of $23 billion—but in 3 months of this fiscal year, President Bush is going to be submitting his budget, talking about tax cuts, loss of revenues; and the deficit is already $54 billion. And that is without factoring in the $30 billion we appropriated before we went home for Christmas.

So don't give me all of this talk about fiscal responsibility and everything else. The only responsible thing we had, of course, was President Clinton's and the Democrats' 1993 economic program that cut spending, that increased taxes, and cut the size of Government.

Yes, I stand on the floor and publicly acknowledge I voted for an increase in taxes on Social Security. We were told by my distinguished colleague from Texas, Senator GRAMM, that they would be hunting us down in the street, us Democrats, and shooting us like dogs if we increased the Social Security tax.

We increased the tax on gasoline. We cut, as I say, the size of Government. But they want to keep talking, particularly the media. We politicians do a little liberality, and, well, they call it spin. They even have a program called ''Spin'' now on national TV. But we are entitled to a little spin. We run for public office, and we have to explain a lot of things we do—but not the media; they are supposed to give us the exact truth.

There is a recent book called ''Maestro'' by Bob Woodward about Alan Greenspan. I refer to page 95. I am not going to read the whole thing, obviously, but I quote at the bottom of page 95, about our Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Alan Greenspan. I am quoting from the Woodward book:

> The long-term rates—the 10-year and longer rates—were an unusual 3 to 4 percent higher than the short-term Fed funds rate, at about 7 percent. The gap between the short-term rate and the long-term rate, Greenspan lectured, was an inflation premium being paid for one simple reason. The lenders of long-term money expected the federal deficit to continue to grow and explode. They had good reason, given the double-digit inflation of the late 1970s and the expanding budget deficits under Reagan. They demanded the premium because of the expectation of new inflation. The dollars they had invested would, in the near and distant future, be worth less and less.
>
> Perhaps no single overall economic event could do more to help the economy, businesses and society as a whole than a drop in the long-term interest rates, Greenspan said. The Fed didn't control them. But credible action to reduce the federal deficit would force long-term interest rates to drop, as the markets slowly moved away from the expectation of inevitable inflation. Business borrowing costs, mortgages and consumer credit costs would go down. Clinton was so sincere and attentive, and full of questions and ideas, that Greenspan continued. Establishing credibility about deficit reduction with the markets would lower rates and could trigger a series of payoffs for the economy, he said.
>
> Greenspan outlined a blueprint for economic recovery. Lower long-term rates would galvanize demand for new mortgages, refinancing at more favorable rates and more consumer loans. This would in turn result in increased consumer spending, which would expand the economy.
>
> As inflation expectations and long-term rates dropped, investors would get less return on bonds, driving investors to the stock market. The stock market would climb, an additional payoff.

That is the end of the quote. You can read on.

I am for a tax cut, too, but how do you get it? Not estate taxes. Giving millionaires' heirs millions of dollars, tax free, is not going to recover the economy and have a good effect.

Interestingly, the one thing that really is being spent on Social Security—the payroll tax—nobody wants to cut. That is the crowd that is really getting ripped off. Otherwise, you do not hear anything about the Social Security taxes, that they were going to hunt us down in the street like dogs and shoot us for increasing. They do not say, cut Social Security taxes. But they come with things like the estate tax, marriage penalty, and everything else of that kind. They talk of a $1.3 trillion tax cut that would return us back to where we were in 1993.

Yes, the Federal Reserve, Greenspan, they reduced the Fed rate a half a percent yesterday. That was fine business. That is the short-term rates, but that does not affect the overall economy.

The long-term, we cannot tinker with that except to set generally fiscally sound policy, put the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis.

I have been up here 34 years, and we did it in 1968, 1969. We had a balanced budget. I got the first AAA credit rating for the State of South Carolina from Standard & Poor's and Moody's back in 1959, 1960—40 years ago. But it is a tremendous frustration to this particular Senator to hear everyone crying surplus.

What is the monkeyshine? The monkeyshine is, you can look right at the front page of the same Treasury report. And you ought to read that. As of the final monthly Treasury statement—highlighted—I quote: This issue includes the final budget results and details, a surplus of $237 billion for fiscal year 2000.

And then, as old John Mitchell would say, don't watch what we say, watch what we do. You turn to page 20, table 6, and there is no surplus at all. On the contrary, there is a deficit of $23 billion.

How do they do that saving face? I will tell you how they do it. They do it, No. 1, by taking from the trust funds, Social Security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this document entitled ''Trust Funds Looted to Balance Budget.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUST FUNDS LOOTED TO BALANCE BUDGET

[By fiscal year, in billions]

	1999	2000	2001
Social Security	855	1,009	1,175
Medicare:			
HI	154	176	198
SMI	27	34	35
Military Retirement	141	149	157
Civilian Retirement	492	522	553
Unemployment	77	85	94
Highway	28	31	34
Airport	12	13	14
Railroad Retirement	24	25	26
Other	59	62	64
Total	1,869	2,106	2,350

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, at the end of fiscal year 2000—last September—we owed Social Security some $1.009 trillion. We owed military retirement $149 billion, and civilian retirement $522 billion. You can go right on down.

Now, as projected by the Congressional Budget Office, we are going to borrow $244 billion more this fiscal year 2001 from these trust funds. When the day of reckoning comes, who is going to raise the taxes? Who is going to issue the bond and raise the taxes at that particular time to pay for the benefits?

All we need to do to make Social Security fiscally sound is quit spending it. I have a lockbox, a true lockbox written by Ken Apfel of the Social Security Administration. I couldn't get a vote on it all last year or the year before. I will put it up again this year.

If you want to have truth in budgeting, please see my staffer, Mr. Barry Strumpf, and join with me in a bipartisan fashion to get at least truth in budgeting. We are going to offer an amendment calling for a budget freeze because we still play this game here of surplus, surplus. We put in an amendment to the budget resolution year before last in that last session of Congress, and we got 24 votes for the Greenspan stay the course. Alan Greenspan, at that time, said: Stay the course and just take this year's budget for next year. If you did that, you could save some $50 billion.

As a Governor, I had to do that. Many a mayor this year will do just that. He will go before his council and say: We don't want to fire the firemen. We don't want to fire the policemen. We are getting along well. Let's just take this year for next year. If we did that at the Federal level, we would save $50 billion.

The other way in which they play this game of public debt and Government debt is not only to borrow from

all these trust funds—like borrowing from yourself, like taking your MasterCard and paying off your Visa card—but they are also projecting no new spending. The CBO will adjust their economic assumptions to accommodate the $1.3 trillion tax cut. You can see what is going on.

I don't think the economy can stand it. I think the best tax cut and the way to get on top of long-term interest rates is to do exactly what was done back in 1993.

I will make one more reference. Two weeks ago, in an issue of Newsweek they had an article on page 58: ''Boy Did We Know Ye,'' comments by members of the Clinton administration, by Stephanopoulos, Leon Panetta, and several others. I will read just this one little paragraph by Bob Rubin.

> The moment that most sticks in my mind was the meeting we had with Clinton on Jan. 7, 1993 in Little Rock.

I read that because this is just about January 7 in the year 2001.

Reading further:

> We met with him for six and a half hours on what the budget strategy ought to be. From the beginning what we [the economic team] recommended was that there ought to be a dramatic change in policy, with the view that deficit reduction should create lower interest rates and spur higher confidence. Before the meeting, George Stephanopoulos told me that was going to be hard, [that Clinton] would have to make that decision over time, but after about a half hour at the meeting, Clinton turned to us in the dining room of the governor's mansion in Little Rock. He said, ''Look, I understand what deficit reduction means [in terms of public criticism for program cuts], but that's the threshold issue if we're going to get the economy back on track. Let's do it.''

And we did it, and that is why we have had the good economy. We are about to go the other direction on this tax cut, returning to the increased deficits of the Reagan years. We had less than a trillion-dollar debt when President Reagan took office in 1981. For 200 years—including all the wars, the Revolution, Spanish American, World War I, II, Korea, Vietnam—we accumulated less than a trillion-dollar debt. We now have a debt without the cost of a war—the Saudis took care of Desert Storm—of 5 trillion 700-some-odd billion. We can't stand that any longer.

I thank the distinguished Chair for indulging me, but the truth has to come out. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will work with us to reduce the deficit and reduce the debt. Let us get to work on it and quit playing games with the American public.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REID). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Before the Senator from South Carolina leaves the floor, I will reflect with him a minute on some of the struggles we have had the last several years.

Remember, there was an effort by the Republican majority to pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. The Senator from South Carolina remembers that battle, where he and this Senator and a number of others started out as a very small group opposing it. We said, if you want a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, you should have one that excludes the surpluses of Social Security. Remember the battle there. We were able to stop them from getting enough votes to pass that.

What would that have done to this country if that foolish constitutional amendment had passed?

Mr. HOLLINGS. It would constitutionalize the profligacy and the waste and the reckless fiscal conduct that we engage in here, and you wouldn't have any control over it because everybody would say: There is the Constitution. And you would read the first page of the Treasury report, how we have a surplus of $237 billion, when the truth of the matter is, if you look in the report, we have a $23 billion deficit. When you constitutionalize, you dignify the blooming thing. That was the ultimate. I couldn't go along with that game.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate my friend's courage and leadership on these fiscal issues. He has the ability, because of his experience, to see what is going to happen in the future, to be a little ahead of most everyone around here on these financial issues. I appreciate the Senator recognizing the tough vote we took in 1993 on the Clinton budget deficit reduction act. Members of the House of Representatives lost their elections; they lost their political careers for having voted for that. But they should know that they did the right thing.

Mr. HOLLINGS. They did the right thing. There is no question.

Mr. REID. We have a new Member of the Senate today—she was sworn in yesterday—MARIA CANTWELL from the State of Washington. She was a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, and she, with courage, walked up and voted for that Clinton deficit reduction plan. She lost her election because of that. The people of the State of Washington now know that she did the right thing and now she is a Senator from the State of Washington. Again, I commend and applaud the Senator from South Carolina for his statement today but mostly for his leadership on these fiscal issues during the entire time I have been in the Senate.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished leader. The truth will out, is what the distinguished Senator from Nevada is saying. I am glad we have Senator CANTWELL here. It was another Representative from Pennsylvania, I remember we had to finally get her vote and she lost. She was a distinguished Member.

Mr. REID. Her name was Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky.

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is it. She had the courage to do it. But here we are in January, seeing this binge that we are on and the only argument is how are we going to spend a so-called surplus. How many tax cuts are we going to get to buy the people's vote. That is the best thing, running on TV, saying: I voted for tax cuts, I am for tax cuts. That is the only thing that holds that crowd in office.

Mr. REID. The biggest tax cut this country could get is reducing the $5 trillion debt we have. Will the Senator agree?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Very much so. That is the tax cut I favor. That is the way to give to middle America so they get a lower mortgage rate and lower financing rate on the refrigerator, the stove, et cetera. That is what Greenspan told them, and I hope Greenspan will get back and say the same thing here, some 7, 8 years later, that what we really need to do is hold the line.

I had the privilege of sitting there with Don Evans, the new Secretary of Commerce-designate, the best friend of President-elect Bush. One sentence I got, over all the things he said with respect to trade, competition, trade and technology, there is one sentence: tell the President rather than, by gosh, all these tax cuts, just come in and hold the line, stay the course as Greenspan recommended last year and take this year's budget for next year.

Don't start us pell-mell down the road to loss of revenue and increasing the deficit, increasing the debt, when we are telling the people that this is going to lower the debt and lower the deficit. It is pure folly.

Mr. REID. The people who met yesterday with the President-elect in Texas, these rich people—and I have nothing against rich people; I am happy he is meeting with them—I hope some of them realize the biggest tax cut anyone will ever get in their entire professional career is if we reduce the deficit.

We talk about across-the-board tax cuts; that will give an across-the-board tax cut because everything they do, from buying a new piece of land to paying their mortgages, will be cheaper.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I looked at that list and it looks to me like a bunch of corporate heads who are interested in sales. They are not interested in the economy and the market; they are corporate heads interested in sales. It is like asking children if they want broccoli or spinach, or do you want a dessert. They are in Austin saying whoopee, give me dessert.

I know the advice that crowd will give. Tell them to start talking to the Bob Rubins. This action yesterday by the Federal Reserve and Greenspan will influence the short-term but not the long-term rates.

I thank the distinguished leader, and I thank the Presiding Officer.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appointments the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, and the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL,

as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LANDRIEU). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have served with the distinguished Presiding Officer for a number of years. We served together a number of times in the Congress during his service in the other body, in fact, on conference committees on rural issues, agricultural issues, and other issues. The distinguished Presiding Officer would agree with me that yesterday was something unique as we watched the opening of the session.

I was glancing through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We are blessed with the finest reporters of any parliamentary body in the world; it is very accurate, but the one thing it cannot show is some of the facial expressions and some of the other features of the session.

It was such a unique situation. The First Lady was elected Senator. Her husband, the President of the United States, and daughter were in the visitors gallery. I should note for the RECORD, while they sat in the visitors gallery, they were given front row seats, probably coincidental, probably alphabetically, but somehow it was arranged.

The usual thing that happens is a motion is made to notify the President of the United States that we have gone back into session and we have assembled with a quorum present. The majority leader, Senator DASCHLE, moved to notify the President of the United States, and I heard a voice in the back of the Chamber say: Well, he's sitting right up there; you don't have to do that.

These are the interesting things, seeing so many new Members come in, the largest number of women in the Senate. When I first came to the Senate, there were none. It shows, though, even with 13 women Senators, we have a long way to go. We should have a lot more, and I expect we will. It shows a change in the Senate.

The thing I want to reflect on is the 50–50 Senate. Certainly not in the last two centuries have we seen this. This can be a glass half full or a glass half empty. I like to think of it as a glass half full.

We have fallen on very contentious times in the Senate. We had partisanship in the Senate and the other body of the most contentious nature that I have seen in my 26 years here. Following the impeachment process and the lame-duck House just over 2 years ago, we have never seemed to recover fully. I think all of us were hurt in some ways, but certainly the American people were hurt.

I have said many times, I believe the Senate can be and should be the conscience of the Nation. When you think of what we have here—a nation of 280 million Americans—there are only 100 of us who get the opportunity to serve at any given time. With all of our talents, with all of our frailties, only 100 of us can represent those 280 million Americans at any given time. We have a responsibility to all of them, not just to our own State—of course, we have a major responsibility to our State—but to all of the country.

I think in this 50–50 Senate we have a unique ability to carry out that responsibility. I hope we will see Senators working to form bipartisan cooperation, finding those things that unite us rather than divide us—as some have said in campaigns—that we know we should do.

The closest friendships I have had in my life have been formed in this body, with Members on both sides of the aisle. It frustrates me to think we have to either support or reject an idea simply because of its party's origin.

That does not mean Republicans should automatically adopt whatever Democrats want or Democrats ought to automatically adopt what Republicans want. But we can do something in this body to set an example for the new President, somebody who comes in carrying some nearly unique electoral factors. He received half a million votes fewer than the man he defeated. He won by one electoral vote, after the U.S. Supreme Court stopped the recount in the State of Florida. But he will be our President on January 20, and we will all accept that.

We will feel, at least initially, some of the pain from some of the campaigns and some of the elections on both sides. But ultimately we have to look out at what is, in many ways, the most wonderful country history has ever talked about—our own—and think of what we can do to make it better.

I am not suggesting a litany of areas in which to go. But we will see what happens during the hearings on Presidential nominees during the next couple weeks and those that will continue thereafter. It is a chance for us, at least in the Senate, to try to work together. Will we always agree? No. Can we agree a lot more than we have in the past? Yes.

We have two extremely hard-working leaders in Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT. Both have different philosophies. Both have entirely different types of caucuses to lead. But they are two leaders who respect the fact that the Senate can do better, should do better, and I believe will do better.

So I think it will be a very interesting year. I wrote in my journal yesterday, I could not think of anywhere on Earth I would have rather been than in this body yesterday at noon. And I think of how fortunate everybody was who was in attendance to see history being made.

With that, Mr. President, I have gone over my time—although I have not seen any wild stampede of Senators coming on the floor seeking recognition—and I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this Saturday, January 6, there will be an extraordinary event—which occurs every 4 years—created by our Constitution. There will be the count of the vote of the electoral college, the official determination of the identity of the next President of the United States.

Probably this year more than most, we are sensitive to this matter, and we understand what led up to it—a historic election where the Democratic candidate for the President, AL GORE, outpolled the Republican candidate for President, George W. Bush, by over 400,000 votes nationwide and lost the election.

It is not the first time in American history this has occurred. If I am not mistaken, it is the fourth time we have elected a President who failed to win the popular vote.

But the rules of the game and the rules of this election were dictated by those who wrote the Constitution many years ago when they made it clear that the process would not be by a popular vote but, rather, by the vote of electors in an electoral college.

What is the electoral college?

I think we can recall from our earliest civics classes that it is a creation of the Constitution which assigns to every State an elector for each Member of Congress and for the two Senators.

In my home State of Illinois, with 20 Members of the House and 2 Senators, we have 22 electoral votes. The State of Wyoming, with one Congressman and two Senators, has three electoral votes.

So the voters who cast their votes at the polls in Arkansas, Illinois, and Wyoming on November 7 were not voting for AL GORE, George Bush, Ralph Nader, or anyone else. They were voting for electors—men and women who then came and ultimately cast their votes in State capitols a week or so ago. Those votes will be counted in the House Chamber this coming Saturday.

I, for one, believe this is a system which should be abolished.

The electoral college has been in place for over 200 years. You might

wonder how men who wrote the Constitution, in their infinite wisdom, came up with this idea that the American people would not elect the President of the United States but the state legislatures would appoint electors in each State, who would then elect the President of the United States.

Today, by state laws, the people elect the electors on a winner-take-all basis in each state. There are two exceptions. Two States, Maine and Nebraska, allocate their electors by congressional districts. But, by and large, every other State has a winner-take-all situation.

The reason this was created by our Constitution is interesting. We generally think of elections in a democracy where people cast their votes and a majority will win. That applies to almost every election, whether it is for school board, or for mayor, or for county official, or for Governor, or for Senator, or for Congressman. But in the original Constitution, the men who wrote that document in the name of democracy showed a distinct fear of democracy, because they did not give the power to the people or the power to the voters in America to choose Federal offices in most cases.

In fact, in two out of three cases where the American people were given the right under this Constitution to choose a Federal officer, they were to do it indirectly, not directly—indirectly in the case of the President with the electoral college, and in the original Constitution indirectly when it came to this Chamber.

The Senators were not elected by the people of the United States under this Constitution. No. They were chosen by State legislatures. It wasn't until the 17th amendment to the Constitution in 1913, after a great deal of corruption and scandal, that we decided to change that and create a direct vote where the people of the United States each choose their two Senators to represent their States. It was a breakthrough, really, democratizing the electoral process.

When they, of course, empowered the people in each congressional district to choose a Member of the House of Representatives, that was a direct vote—the only direct vote in the Constitution given by our Founding Fathers in this democracy.

Out of the three opportunities—for President, for Senators, and for the House of Representatives—our Founding Fathers said in two out of three in this document: We don't trust the people to make this choice directly.

Why not? Why wouldn't they trust the voters in a democracy?

Their reasoning in creating the electoral college was very clear. They said first: How in the world can a voter in the State of Virginia ever come to know a candidate for President from a State as far away as Massachusetts? He—because they were all men—may never hear of this candidate and may never meet this candidate. So we had better create a system where it isn't a direct vote by a voter for a President but, rather, an indirect vote.

Secondly, of course, there was a concern not only that there wouldn't be this knowledge of the candidate, but a concern that they had to get the Constitution ratified, and the smaller States in this new national consolidation were concerned about their power. So the people who wrote the Constitution said in the electoral college, the States will decide. We will give more power to smaller States. That is why we have an electoral college today.

Some people like the electoral college. A lot of people from smaller States like the old electoral college. Let me illustrate for a moment why. If there are 281 million people in America, which is a rough estimate of our population, and we have 538 electoral votes, which is the subtotal of the membership of the House of Representatives and the Senate plus 3 for the District of Columbia, then we roughly have about 522,000 Americans for every electoral vote cast for President. That is kind of the standard by which to judge.

On a clear equality of this system, each electoral vote should be represented by 522,000 Americans. Take a State such as Wyoming. Wyoming has a population of about 480,000 people. Wyoming has three electoral votes. So if one lives in Wyoming, you are a bonus voter for President. Every 160,000 population in Wyoming gives one electoral vote for President. I live in the State of Illinois with 12 million people and 22 electoral votes, about 550,000 people per electoral vote for President.

We can see the distinction, the difference. Why should some get a bonus in voting for President because they live in the State of Wyoming as opposed to living in any other State? That was created by the Constitution.

I am not raising this issue in this question because of this specific election. Some might think, standing on the Democratic side of the aisle, that is what it is about. I first raised the issue in 1993, and I raised it again a week before the election in November of this last year. I understood, and I hope others do, what is at issue here goes way beyond any single election and the election of any single person. I happen to believe that in a democracy, one that I respect and thank God I had a chance to be born into, that the people should speak through their votes, and a majority vote should rule, as it does in virtually every democratic institution.

That is not the case when it comes to the electoral college. In fact, we have an indirect system, a winner take all system, where States are voting in disproportionate strength based on their population. Smaller States like it because they have more power. They believe it attracts more attention to them during the course of a national campaign. From that perspective, it is hard to argue. From the perspective of a nation that is trying to say to every American, we want to be able to say you elected the President, how can you do that under an electoral college system which gives bonus votes, triple the voting power, in some States, over other States? That is exactly what happened in this election and every single election since our Constitution was enacted so many years ago.

So on a bipartisan basis Congressman RAY LAHOOD, a Republican from Peoria, IL, and I have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and to say that to be elected President of the United States you will be elected by popular vote of the people nationwide, and you must win at least 40 percent of the vote. If any candidate fails to win 40 percent of the vote, then the top two candidates have a runoff election a short time after the original election.

It is different, but I think it reflects more what a democracy should represent, the voice of the people and the vote of the people, instead of an electoral college which has become a constitutional dinosaur.

I hope families across America will take some time on Saturday to turn on C-SPAN and have their children sit down and watch the vote of the electoral college. It will be like watching a dinosaur roam through the jungle because that is what we have as a system to elect the President of the United States.

Now, having stated my views on this issue and why I feel this way, let me give a candid political analysis. I don't have a chance in passing this constitutional amendment. I have to bring this amendment to the floor of the Senate where the small States have the same number of votes. The smaller States will stop us in our tracks. If there was some miracle of miracles and we passed it through the Senate and the House, where do we send it? To the States, where we need three-fourths of the States to approve it, and the smaller States will stop us there.

That is why there have been more proposed amendments to this section of the Constitution than any other, and none of them have passed. It is an interesting academic discussion. I hope it doesn't end there, because if it ends there it is academic and does not help us understand a frustration that voters feel as to what happened on November 7 of this year.

Let me suggest that what Maine and Nebraska have done, other States can do: Allocate electoral votes by congressional district that gets closer to the people's will. In those States, if a candidate for President wins the votes in a congressional district, he received that vote, and the one who won a majority of the votes in the State wins the two votes that are allocated for the Senators. At least there would be some allocation of votes within a State that would be closer to the will of the people.

Let me also add that I think we would be derelict in our duty if we overlooked the reality of the failure of

our election process on November 7, the failure of a process which generated some $3 billion in spending by candidates and barely brought out a scant majority of voters in the United States who participated. Think of all the attention paid to that Presidential campaign and election after November 7 with the recounts, the court cases, the Supreme Court, on and on and on. Half the people in this country really didn't have much of a reason to watch it because they hadn't voted in the first place. They were observing something that was as foreign as watching an Australian rules football game, trying to understand what this is all about.

We ought to be reflecting on the fact that so few people participate in our elections. I think it is important to think anew in this new millennium, in this new century, as to how we will make America not only more democratic in name but more democratic in practice; what we can do to make our elections more effective, to bring more people to the polls. I think we ought to approach it with an open mind.

Why do we vote on Tuesday? I don't know. Somebody thought Tuesday was a good day at one point in time. But is it a good day now for most Americans, or is there a better day? Could we find a way to vote on a weekend without, perhaps, raising some religious objections from some groups? I hope so. Can we find ways to vote that are more convenient for voters? In States such as Oregon and Washington, more and more people vote by mail. In fact, in Oregon virtually all the ballots were cast by mail. My brother-in-law lives in the State of Washington. He is a permanent absentee voter. He always receives his ballot by mail and returns it. You can do that in Illinois, but it is pretty difficult. We should be trying to establish a national means by which people can vote without these obstacles.

And let's talk about the voting machinery. In my home State of Illinois, and in 40 percent of the polling places across America, they have these infamous Votomatic punch systems. I have been through enough election contests as a staffer, as an attorney, and as an elected official, that by the time I finish punching my ballot out, I stop for a minute, turn it to the light, I knock off the chads. I know what to look for. I know what can disqualify my vote. How many Americans know how to do that? Probably more today than last year. Still, an awful lot have gone to the polls and made a personal sacrifice to do their civic duty to cast their vote and have their vote be heard, when it comes to the election of the President, only to learn afterwards that tens, if not hundreds of thousands, of ballots have been voided, possibly their own. That is not fair. It is not American. It is not something we ought to tolerate. I think it is more than a coincidence that the biggest breakdown in disqualification of these ballots turns out to be in inner-city precincts. I don't think that is any accident. In many instances, that is where we have the oldest voting equipment, we have less attention paid to the education of voters, and, as a consequence, folks who are making a genuine effort to do their best and do their civic duty are denied that opportunity.

By and large, this decision on how to run a campaign and how to manage an election is a State and local responsibility, as it should be. But my colleague from the State of New York, Senator SCHUMER, who sits next to me, has proposed that we bring forward a fund for electoral reform across America and create incentives and opportunities for States and localities to upgrade their voting equipment.

Let me tell you about a piece of voting machinery that is used in South America. It is a piece of machinery where you have indicated the name of the candidate and the office and a symbol for the candidate's party. When you vote and push on the screen for your choice, up pops the picture of the candidate to verify that you picked the person for whom you want to vote. Doesn't that sound modernistic and futuristic? You may be surprised to know the equipment is produced in the United States. It is sold in South America, but it has not become popular here in this country. But think of the unlimited possibilities for us to create a system that is honest and fair and helpful to voters, instead of one creating obstacles and problems that can be strewn in their paths so they would leave the polling place uncertain and maybe frustrated.

During this great debate over the election of November 7, 2000, with this electoral vote next Saturday and the swearing in of President George W. Bush on January 20, in just a few weeks, if we do not stop to think about the long-term impact of the integrity of voting in America, I think we are derelict in our duty as elected officials. I hope, if we are not going to amend our great Constitution to eliminate the electoral college, we will at least dedicate ourselves, on a bipartisan basis, to modernizing the machinery of elections across America so the next election in 2 years or beyond will be a fair election, a more honest election, and one that creates more opportunities.

I do not believe there is a partisan spin to this. I believe Republican candidates, Democratic candidates, and independent candidates alike can all be disadvantaged by the uncertainties of the current election system. We need to encourage more people to be involved, and we need to say to them: We are doing everything within our power to use the technology and resources of America to make elections in this country an even better experience for all Americans.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OKLAHOMA SOONERS—2000 NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the Oklahoma Sooners, the football team which defeated the Florida State Seminoles last night by a score of 13–2, the seventh national championship for the Sooners.

This was also the Sooners' 17th appearance in the Orange Bowl. In 1980 and 1981, our friend and colleague from the House, J.C. WATTS, was quarterback and did a great job. I remember those Orange Bowls in 1980 and 1981. J.C. WATTS was not only an outstanding quarterback but also is an outstanding Congressman. I was with him last night to watch the Sooners win their seventh, well-deserved national championship.

The Sooners went to the Orange Bowl with a perfect 12–0 record. They defeated several outstanding teams including the once number one ranked Nebraska, the University of Texas, and Kansas State. Although we did not play them before last night, Bobby Bowden, head coach for Florida State has an outstanding football team and an outstanding program.

I congratulate the Sooners.

I congratulate Coach Bob Stoops, who only in his second year at the University of Oklahoma was named the ''AP Coach of the Year''—a well-deserved honor, and it is certainly a well-deserved honor for the entire Oklahoma Sooner football team.

In addition, I wish to congratulate my friend and our former colleague in the Senate, David Boren, who is the President of the University of Oklahoma. All people in Oklahoma can say he is doing a fantastic job not only scholastically but athletically as well.

My congratulations to the team and to their leader.

From the entire State, we are all very proud of the University of Oklahoma for once again becoming the national champions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL RESOLUTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I want to give a report on the progress

Senator LOTT and I have been making throughout the day. We have been discussing matters relating to the organizational resolution throughout the day and have just, again, had the last of our meetings for the day.

While we are closer than we were at the beginning of the day, there are still some matters to be resolved. However, it is my hope that we could resolve the outstanding issues some time tomorrow, and then it would be my hope that the Senate will proceed to a vote on the organizing resolution.

Senators should be aware that it may require a rollcall vote. It is my hope we can avoid that, but that is yet a possibility. So for purposes of the schedule, I think Senators should be prepared to be here to vote. It is my intention to call the Senate back into session at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow. We will have further reports about our progress and about the schedule for the day after we convene.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CALIFORNIA SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, this past weekend, our nation lost one of its finest public servants with the passing of former California Senator Alan Cranston.

Senator Cranston served California well, and our hearts and thoughts go to his son Kim and the rest of his family at this difficult time.

Senator Cranston holds the distinction of being the only Democrat in our State's history to win four terms to the United States Senate, serving 24 years.

Born in Palo Alto, California in 1914, Alan Cranston was a tireless champion for peace, justice, and human rights. He was also a steadfast advocate for the poor and oppressed.

Senator Cranston was educated at Stanford University where he excelled as both a student and athlete. After graduating, Senator Cranston worked as a correspondent for the International News Service and then served his nation well in the U.S. Army in World War II.

In 1939, Alan Cranston edited the first unexpurgated English translation of Adolf Hitler's ''Mein Kampf'' published in the U.S. in an effort to alert Americans to the dangers of the Third Reich.

In fact, Senator Cranston had the very unique experience of being sued by Hitler for copyright violation for his work on this editing project—and in true Alan Cranston form—he wore this as a badge of honor and demonstrated that he would stand up to anyone in pursuit of Democratic principles and ideals.

His first service in elected office was when he won his race for California State Controller in 1962. He then ran successfully for the Senate in 1968 and was elected seven times as party whip.

He was called by many as one of the best ''nose counters'' in the Senate. My esteemed colleague and former Senate Majority Leader ROBERT BYRD said of Senator Cranston, ''He is absolutely superb when it comes to knowing how the votes will fall in place on a given issue.''

Senator Cranston also was a strong leader in an effort to protect our environment. I am proud to say that he was the original author of the Desert Protection Act and he called me shortly after I won election to the Senate in 1992 to ask me if I would take over the effort to get the bill approved. In 1994, we amended the bill a number of times but were able to get it passed and make the legislation a reality.

This landmark measure created two new national parks—Death Valley and Joshua Tree—and one national preserve—the Mojave. In total, the measure has permanently saved and protected over 7 million acres of pristine California desert wilderness for all time.

As Thomas Jefferson said in 1809 that ''the care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government,'' it appears to me that Senator Cranston demonstrated this view with strong and forceful advocacy of arms control.

In the Senate, Alan Cranston played a leading role in moving the SALT and START arms control treaties through this body, and he drafted the first bill to eliminate funding for the Vietnam War.

In 1983, Alan Cranston said that ending the arms race would be the paramount goal of his run for the Presidency. That effort was not successful, but his effort to promote an honest dialogue on this issue grew and he continued to work toward a more peaceful planet right up until the time of his death.

In 1996, he became chairman of the Gorbachev Foundation USA based in San Francisco, founded by former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and devoted to nuclear disarmament.

More recently, he served as President of the Global Security Institute, a think tank devoted to same end. The Institute recently persuaded more than 100 international civilian leaders, including 44 former presidents and prime ministers, to sign on to its nuclear weapon elimination initiative.

Signators included former President Jimmy Carter, former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, Nobel Laureates Kenneth Arrow and Elie Weisel, Coretta Scott King, astronaut Sally Ride and retired Supreme Allied Commander General Andrew Goodpaster.

Former Representative Lionel Van Deerlin describes Senator Cranston's devotion to nuclear disarmament well when he said, ''He's got to be remembered for pioneering, when the Cold War was still on, limiting the worst weapons ever conceived.''

In summing up the career of Senator Alan Cranston, I believe a recent editorial in the Los Angeles Times aptly sums up his life and his service to our Nation:

> [Senator Cranston] toiled in the trenches during a long political career in behalf of California and world peace. The value of his efforts and dedication was not fully appreciated at the time and was overshadowed by his departure from the Senate. It's that body of work that should be remembered and celebrated now.

Mr. President, our Nation is no doubt a better place because of Senator Alan Cranston's service, and we will miss him deeply.

CONCEALED WEAPONS LAW

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I am very disappointed that the Governor of Michigan chose to sign a bill that will increase the number of concealed weapons on our streets by tens of thousands.

On New Year's Day, Governor Engler signed into law House Bill 4530, which takes discretion away from local gun boards and requires that authorities must issue concealed weapons licenses to those who meet certain requirements.

On December 13, 2000, I wrote a letter to the Governor asking him to veto the legislation. I asked the Governor to support our law enforcement personnel who believe the concealed weapons bill will make them and the public less safe. These groups include the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police and the Michigan Police Legislative Coalition, which includes the Michigan State Police Troopers Association, the Michigan State Police Command Officers Association, the Michigan Association of Police, the Police Officers Labor Council, Detroit Police Lieutenants and Sergeants Association, Detroit Police Officers Association, Warren Police Officers Association and Flint Police Officers Association.

I support the position of law enforcement groups in this matter and I believe the people of Michigan do also. Local gun boards should retain control of these often life and death decisions.

KENNEDY CENTER HONORS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, each year since 1978 our capital city has inaugurated its season of celebration with the Kennedy Center Honors, a joyful celebration of the lifetime achievements of our greatest performing artists. The whole nation shares in that celebration during the CBS broadcast of the Honors Gala, which this past year was on December 27.

All Americans should be grateful to CBS for its commitment to what has become an American institution, our highest honor for the performing artists who do so much to define our national spirit and our identity around the world.

Our deepest gratitude goes to those talented individuals who conceived the Honors and have produced it for more than two decades. George Stevens, Jr., Washington's own showman who came here in the Kennedy Administration to

work with Edward R. Murrow and who has since given us a remarkable series of Emmy Award-winning films, created the Honors with the great Hollywood showman Nick Vanoff, one of the shaping influences of popular television. They produced the show for years—and since Nick's death, George has produced the show each year with Don Mischer, who has given the world other extraordinary broadcasts from the Emmy Awards to the Opening Ceremonies of the Olympic Games. Their artistic genius constantly renews the Honors, fills it with fresh delights and gives us an evening that is both entertaining and equal to the Pantheon of artists it celebrates.

This year's show honored Mikhail Baryshnikov, Chuck Berry, Placido Domingo, Clint Eastwood, and Angela Lansbury—again illuminating the span and sparkle of America's talent. I think how proud President Kennedy would have been of this ceremony which, like the Kennedy Center itself, fulfills his hope for ''an America that will not be afraid of grace and beauty and which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft.''

So for all they do to make that dream come true, I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the Chairman of the Kennedy Center, James A. Johnson, and the impresarios of the Honors, George Stevens, Jr. and Don Mischer. For so many years, they have graced the stage of the Kennedy Center with this great celebration; they have graced the life of our nation by marking out the heights of its history in the performing arts. May the show go on and on.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JACK BASSO

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant, Peter ''Jack'' Basso, Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs at the U.S. Department of Transportation. Jack is retiring after more than 35 years in government service and moving on to a second career with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.

Throughout his 36-year career with the federal government, Jack Basso has distinguished himself for his leadership, commitment and dedication to public service and to making government work better. Beginning as a financial program analyst at the Federal Highway Administration, he quickly advanced through the ranks to positions in senior management at an FHWA regional office and at the agency's headquarters. He served as Deputy Chair for Management at the National Endowment for the Arts, Assistant Director for General Management at OMB, and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs before being nominated by President Clinton to his present position as Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs and Chief Financial Officer at the U.S. DOT.

As a senior member of the Senate Banking Committee which has jurisdiction over the nation's transit programs, I came to know Jack, as many other Members of Congress did, during the crafting of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and its successor, the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century or TEA 21. Jack put in countless hours running the tables, advising the Committees and individual Members, and helping to work out the compromises that ultimately resulted in the enactment of these landmark pieces of legislation and record budgets for financing the Nation's transportation infrastructure. I have enormous respect for the professionalism, ingenuity, and integrity which he brought to the positions in which he has served and greatly value the assistance he has provided to me and my staff over the years. The replacement of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge and many other transportation projects in Maryland and throughout the Nation would not be taking place, but for his persistent efforts.

Jack Basso's contributions and accomplishments in these positions have been recognized through many prestigious awards including the Public Employee's Roundtable Chairman's Award for Distinguished Public Service, the Presidential Rank Award, the Government Technology E-Commerce Leadership Award, and the General Services Administration's Travel Manager of the Year Award for two years running. His abiding sense of responsibility and commitment have earned him the respect and admiration of everyone with whom he has worked.

It is my firm conviction that public service is one of the most honorable callings, one that demands the very best, most dedicated efforts of those who have the opportunity to serve their fellow citizens and country. Throughout his career Jack Basso has exemplified a steadfast commitment to meeting this demand. I want to extend my personal congratulations and thanks for his many years of hard work and dedication and wish him well in the years ahead.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment.

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution to provide for the counting on January 6, 2001, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to extend the life of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies and the provisions of S. Con. Res. 90 of the One Hundred Sixth Congress.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Thursday, January 4, 2001, at 10 a.m. on the nomination of Donald L. Evans to be Secretary of Commerce.

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

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND A CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 1, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 1

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Saturday, January 6, 2001, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, 2001; and that when the House adjourns on Saturday, January 20, 2001, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, January 30, 2001, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Saturday, January 6, 2001; Sunday, January 7, 2001; Monday, January 8, 2001; Tuesday, January

9, 2001; Wednesday, January 10, 2001; Thursday, January 11, 2001; Friday, January 12, 2001; Saturday, January 13, 2001; Sunday, January 14, 2001; Monday, January 15, 2001; Tuesday, January 16, 2001; Wednesday, January 17, 2001; Thursday, January 18, 2001; or Friday, January 19, 2001; on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 10 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, 2001, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 2001

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m., Friday, January 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later; and that there then be a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, would the majority leader yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I would be happy to yield to the assistant Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I say to the leader, I have had a number of inquiries today as to whether or not votes may be required tomorrow. I heard you say we may have at least one very important vote tomorrow that is possible. Is that true?

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct.

The possibility exists that a request for a rollcall vote could occur on the organizing resolution. And were that to take place, of course, we would set a time certain for that matter to be voted upon, which would include, of course, some time for debate.

Mr. REID. I ask one further question. If, in fact, that vote is required, it would be on organizing the Senate, which is a very important vote. Is that also a fair statement?

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct.

As all of our colleagues know—the distinguished Senator knows probably better than anybody on our side—this has been a matter that Senator LOTT and I have been working on now for over 2 months. We have been in constant consultation with our colleagues on both sides, and with our more senior Members even more frequently.

So this is a very important matter, and I hope people would treat it as such. It is critical we continue our work here so that we can organize the Senate, that we can appoint Members to appropriate committees, and that we can take the business of the committees as seriously as that business requires, given hearings and other issues that need to be resolved at an early date. So it is very important for us to conduct our business throughout the rest of the month.

I appreciate very much the assistant majority leader's comments and questions in that regard.

I now yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, January 5, 2001.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:07 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 5, 2001, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 2001:

THE JUDICIARY

H. ALSTON JOHNSON, III, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, VICE JOHN M. DUHE, JR., RETIRED.