purpose of developing that leadership and for the purpose of shaping his policies for us and the Nation, to evaluate and form those policies ultimately for us to be governed.

We have a responsibility in the Senate. We are going to start hearings on those nominees to that new Cabinet in the very near future. I hope, in the atmosphere of bipartisanship, and the kind of cooperation we see here today, the hearings will be fair, the hearings will be probative, but, most importantly, that in the end it is not the choice of an obstructionist to deny a new President his opportunity to lead and, therefore, his opportunity to form a new Cabinet. That is part of what our leaders struggled over: How do we sift that out and create that kind of fairness in the process?

Time will tell. And that is exactly what Leader LOTT has just said. Some of us on our side are very hesitant at this moment. We have worked with the other side, but we have also seen an element of what we would call obstructionism over the course of the last year. But that was last year. Since that time, an election has passed. We are now in the business of shaping a new Congress, with a new administration, to accomplish new goals for the American people. I hope we can work cooperatively to accomplish that.

Shall we live in interesting times? a Chinese proverb might say. I would say to whomever crafted that Chinese proverb, I have lived in enough interesting times. Two years ago at this time we were talking about the procedures of the Senate for trying the impeachment of a President—interesting times. Following the November election, our Constitution hung in the balance for 36 long days—interesting times, historic times. And now, in a very historic way, the Senate attempts to govern itself in a 50/50 representation.

For this Senator, enough history. Now let's get on with leading and governing for the sake of the American people and for this great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LINCOLN). The majority leader.

SENATE PROCEDURE IN THE 107TH CONGRESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the resolution we have at the desk, that no amendments or motions be in order to the resolution, and that the Senate vote without any intervening action or debate at 3:30 on adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object, and I will not, if I can be assured between now and 3:30 the Senator from New Mexico has an opportunity to speak, but I am not sure that will occur. I would object to the time certain. The rest of it I will not object to.

Mr. DASCHLE. How much time would the Senator from New Mexico be interested in?

Mr. DOMENICI. I would like to reserve 10, 15 minutes, let's say.

Mr. DASCHLE. How much time——

Mr. GRAMM. Ten.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the Senator from Alaska seek recognition?

Mr. STEVENS. I will, but I seek to follow Senator BYRD. He is my chairman. I will follow Senator BYRD.

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I modify the unanimous consent request that I made in the following manner. I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be recognized in this order, and to the times allocated as I will suggest: Senator BYRD be recognized for 10 minutes, Senator STEVENS be recognized for 5 minutes, Senator GRAMM of Texas be recognized for 10 minutes, Senator DOMENICI be recognized for 10 minutes, Senator ROBERTS be recognized for 4 minutes, Senator BENNETT be recognized for 5 minutes, and that Senator REID of Nevada be recognized for 2 minutes; that at the end of the debate the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 8) relative to Senate procedure in the 107th Congress.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. To say that these are historic times would be hackneyed and trite. To say that the leaders of the Senate have risen to new heights and are acting and speaking as statesmen would be something other than trite.

I first want to congratulate my leader on this side of the aisle and my leader on that side of the aisle. I know they have gone through some excruciating moments. I know, without asking, that they have lost some sleep. I know, without inquiring, that they have rolled and tossed on their pillows, having been in their shoes myself.

When I came to the Senate, Lyndon Johnson was the majority leader. Politics did not prevail over statesmanship. He worked with a Republican President, President Eisenhower, in the best interests of the Nation.

When the great civil rights debate of 1964 occurred, Everett Dirksen did not play politics.

Had Everett Dirksen not worked with Lyndon Johnson and with Mike Mansfield, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would never have been written. Had Everett Dirksen played politics instead of acting the part of statesman, cloture would never have been invoked on the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

When the Panama Canal treaties were before the Senate in 1977, had Howard Baker chose to play the part of a politician and not worked with ROBERT BYRD in the interests of the Nation as we saw those interests, the Panama Canal treaties would not have been approved. More lives would have been lost. Howard Baker acted the part of statesman. We both were swimming uphill. The Nation's polls showed that the people generally were much opposed to the Panama Canal treaties. We came together. Even in this past election, I still lost the votes of some West Virginians because of my support of the Panama Canal treaties in 1977.

We saw on those occasions the separation aisle here become a passageway to the best interests of the Nation; Senators from both sides joining hands and marching together.

On the Appropriations Committee, we do not need a resolution of this kind. We have always worked together, Republicans and Democrats, on that committee. The longer I work on that committee, the better our members of both parties seem to work together. We have worked well throughout all the years I have been on that committee, when Senator Russell was chairman, when Senator McClellan was chairman, when Senator Ellender was chairman, and when Senator Hatfield was chairman, when Senator Stennis was the chairman.

I say here today and now that the paradigm of cooperation, of statesmanship, of bipartisanship has occurred during the chairmanship of TED STEVENS. I am one Democrat who has absolutely no compunction when it comes to stating the truth about a colleague. If I have to say that the chairman is a better chairman than I have been, I have no compunctions about that. I said that several times about Slade Gorton, the former chairman of the appropriations subcommittee on the Department of the Interior. He was a superb chairman. He was a better chairman of that subcommittee than I ever was. That is a westerner's subcommittee in the main.

TED STEVENS has been a chairman par excellence. We don't need any resolution. Whatever problem there is, he and I can settle it. There is no rivalry, none, between these two Senators. There is no party between these two Senators. There is only friendship and respect and trust. That is the way it has always been, and that is the way it is always going to be.

That is the secret to getting things done in this evenly membered Senate in these times, a 50/50 tie: trust, mutual respect and trust. I am not going to go to heaven if I hate Republicans. My old mom used to say: ''You can't go to heaven and hate anybody, ROBERT.''

Now, there are some people on both sides of the aisle who are extremely partisan. There are many others who are only moderately partisan. I think for the most part we can say that most Members on both sides are moderately partisan.

This agreement is a real accomplishment. I don't think I would have accomplished this, if I had been majority leader. That leader on the Republican side had an extremely tough way to go. Today he has risen to a new stature. I thought he did himself well during the impeachment trial. I thought my own leader set a fine example. Today these two leaders have set a wonderful example. But the example of statesmanship goes beyond these two leaders.

I know it has been difficult for Members, particularly on the Republican side, to come to an agreement such as has been reached here. But they have been willing to give up their partisanship for the moment in the better interests of the Nation.

Also, it is exceedingly important—I have already mentioned it here—to George Bush, who will become the President of the United States on January 20. It is vitally important to him, if he is to expect to see his programs considered and adopted. And hopefully, from his standpoint, certainly, and from the standpoint of many others, if he is to see those programs succeed, he is going to have to have help. He can't depend on all of its coming just from his side of the aisle. He is going to have some help over here. Who knows, I may be one who will vote with him from time to time. There will be others on this side.

This agreement is exceedingly important to him. It sets the right example. It should give heart and encouragement to the people of the Nation. I view it as a pact which will make it possible for us to rise above the interests of party, rise above even ourselves from time to time, and enable us to accomplish something worthy of remembrance in the pages of history.

This can be the most difficult situation that could ever confront the U.S. Senate. We could just tie ourselves in knots. But there is a spirit of goodwill that I see emanating here that has brought about this agreement, which I hope will be agreed upon soon, and it is a unique agreement.

I personally express my deep gratitude to Mr. LOTT and to Mr. DASCHLE. I would never have thought it could be done. I viewed the future with a great deal of dread, but I am encouraged to believe that we can, indeed, accomplish something that will be in the best interests of both parties, be in the best interests of the Nation, and be in the best interests of this Senate and make this Senate, once again, the beacon that it has so many times shown itself to be in times of peril, in times of stress in the history of this great Nation.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I am humbled by the statement of the President pro tempore and the current chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He and I have served together now for many years. I know he did not know earlier today in our conference I told the conference that I thought that this resolution that has been crafted by our two leaders was, in fact, extending a hand of friendship across this aisle based upon trust.

He, in his normal way, has stated it more clearly and precisely than I. Senator BYRD honors us all. But we are here as senior Members. As our leader on this side of the aisle has said, this is a 50/50 split in the Senate. But it is still the Senate of the United States. Coming from Alaska, I know the value of the vote that comes from the Vice-Presidency. It was the only vote that Vice President Agnew cast that broke the tie on the Alaska pipeline and brought our Nation billions of barrels of oil.

We face issues all the time when we are split and have a tie. This time we start with a tie, but we start also with the friendships and the knowledge of one another that have been built up over the years. I think it will be an interesting experience for newcomers to witness. The Senate starts on the basis of trust.

When I was a very new and appointed Senator, I asked a Senator here who was managing the bill on the other side of the aisle to call me when it came time to offer an amendment. I was tied up in a committee. I was surprised that the bell rang in the committee and the vote was going on. I came to the floor. I am not one to be shy in expressing my opinions, and I went to the then manager of the bill and started to berate him. Senator Mike Mansfield came to me and said: Senator, you should not use language like that on the floor of the Senate. I told Senator Mansfield what had happened. He, as the majority leader, looked at that Senator and said: Is that true? The manager of the bill said: That's true, but that amendment would not have passed. Senator Mansfield said: Have you got your amendment, Senator?

He took the amendment from me, he stopped the vote that was going on, he returned the bill to second reading, and he offered my amendment. That amendment passed, and it has benefited my State for a long time.

I merely state it here today to say every Senator on this floor has equal rights. The 50/50 that we have is the result of the voters of the country, but there need not be a division between this body in terms of the 50. We work on the basis of a majority. We can have a tie at almost any time, or a majority with a quorum.

We are looking at a process where every Senator has the right now to understand the responsibility that comes from this agreement that has been reached. I congratulate the Democratic majority leader; I congratulate our future Republican majority leader for reaching this conclusion. I share the feelings of my friend from West Virginia that this is an act, really, of true statesmanship. I believe those who have not agreed should help us make it work because it will take the relationships that exist between myself and my great friend from West Virginia to make this work. I not only trust the Senator from West Virginia, I trust him with my life, and he knows that. We have never had an argument. I have served with him as chairman; he has served with me as chairman. We have resolved every difference we ever had before we came to the floor. That is what is going to happen now.

Most of the work we do will be in committee. This resolution gives us the ability to work in committee on the basis of trust. I honor the two leaders for what they have done. I am proud of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I begin by congratulating our two leaders. I personally have deep concerns about this agreement and its workability, but I begin my statement today by saying I intend to support it. I intend to do everything in my power to make it work. I want to make a pledge to myself and my colleagues that I hope others will make, at least to themselves. If it fails, it won't be because of me.

I will try to explain my concerns in the few minutes that I have. First of all, when it became clear that we had the extraordinary result of an equal number of Members in both parties, I sought direction from the ultimate source of direction in the American democracy by turning to the Constitution. As Senator LOTT has already pointed out, the founders so long ago, in a world so different than our own, not only thought about this potential but they wrote it into article I, section 3 of the Constitution. In fact, they didn't wait very long in writing the Constitution to put it in.

In section 1 of article I they give exclusive legislative powers to Congress. In section 2, they establish the House of Representatives. In section 3, they establish the Senate. Then they turn to exactly this question: ''The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate''—the only responsibility given to the Vice President in the Constitution of the United States. Then they give him his only delegated power other than the power of succession in the event of death. That power is, ''but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.''

My basic response in following the Constitution as a guide is that we have reached exactly the situation that the founders recognized in writing the Constitution. We do not have 50 Members of the Senate who are Democrats and 50 who are Republicans. We have reached section 3 of article I of the Constitution in terms of American history, and the Vice President of the United States, with the Senate equally

divided, casts the deciding vote. My reaction, in looking at this provision of the Constitution, was that we have a Republican majority, that we have 51 Republicans and 50 Democrats.

It is awfully easy to say it when the new Vice President is a Republican, but let me make it clear: If the new Vice President were a Democrat, I would expect the Democrats to be the majority in the Senate. I personally would have never contemplated that they would not have a majority on each of the committees because they would have the responsibility under the Constitution for governing.

We have made a decision to go in the other direction. I have said that I will support it and I will do my part in making it work. But let me tell you what my concern is about it. If there is anything that we learn as we live and have experience, it is that the old adage about never giving someone responsibility without giving them authority is a valid adage. That is my concern about this agreement, even though I hope it does represent a reaching across the aisle, I hope it does bring in an era of bipartisanship. I am sure people back home do not understand why it is not so easy for us to get together.

I have disagreements with Senator BYRD, not because I don't love Senator BYRD, not because I don't admire Senator BYRD, and not because Senator BYRD is a Democrat and I am a Republican. I have differences with Senator BYRD from time to time because we have a different vision of what we want America to be. We have a different conception of the problems we face. Jefferson said: Good men with the same facts are prone to disagree.

My concern is that we may very well, in this process, be guaranteeing gridlock by giving just the responsibility to one party which clearly, under the Constitution, Republicans now have. Come the 20th, our leader will be called ''majority leader.'' I will be the chairman of the Banking Committee. Senator DOMENICI will be the chairman of the Budget Committee. My concern is that we should not separate responsibility from authority.

I am reminded, in concluding my remarks, of the Biblical story, as Senator BYRD and I am sure everyone will remember, about the two ladies who brought a baby before Solomon and contested about whose baby it was. Now, Solomon could have decided: The solution here is an equal division. He could have cut the baby in half. But Solomon decided that was not right to divide the baby and fortunately, with his great wisdom, he figured out how to determine who was the real mother by feigning to cut the real baby in half in which case the real mother said: No, let her have it. Solomon, with his great wisdom, having determined the real mother, gave her the child.

I hope that by separating responsibility and authority we have not cut the baby in half here today. I hope we can make this work. I think it is in the interests of the Nation that it work. Bipartisanship is a wonderful thing, and we have had it on many issues. Senator BYRD and I worked together on the highway bill, and every time I ride on one of our new highways in Texas, I rejoice that we got together and made the Federal Government stop stealing money out of the highway trust fund, and we spent the money building new highways in America so when people pay gasoline taxes, sure enough, the money goes for the purpose they are told it goes.

There have been many great bipartisan actions taken by Congress. But there are times when there are differences, not because one party is good and the other party is bad or one party is right and one party is wrong—but because there are fundamental differences. When those occasions arise, we are going to have to work very hard to make this system work.

I intend to try to make it work. I think we can make it work. I believe we are going to pass the President's tax bill, for example. I think it is going to get an overwhelming vote in the end. But I would say that under this system it is going to be a lot harder to make the Senate work.

So in this joy from bipartisanship, I hope we are all committed to rolling up our sleeves and engaging in the extra effort that this is going to take. I commit today that I am, and I yield the floor.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the majority leader seek recognition?

Mr. DASCHLE. If I could just make a unanimous consent request? The Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, asked for 3 minutes. I ask unanimous consent he be recognized preceding the recognition of Senator REID for 3 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but if he is going to be able to get that, I would like to have 1 minute before his time.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent Senator INHOFE then be recognized, and Senator CARPER be recognized after Senator REID for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, fellow Senators, after we had a Republican conference, I went to my office and, with one of my most helpful friends and workers in my office, I prepared some remarks. Let me assure you, after being part of the Senate here this afternoon, I don't need my remarks. But I would like to share with Senator BYRD and those who speak of history—I would like to share my history as a Senator. It will be very brief.

I was unexpectedly elected to the Senate and I never had been a legislator anywhere. I was on a city council. I sit here—but I sat in that second-to-last seat and waited my turn. And what a long time it took.

I was never blessed with the luxury, Senator BYRD, that you have been in your life of being on the Democratic side all of your life and having such huge majorities from your side of the aisle. When I arrived, there were only 38 of us. We didn't have to worry about this kind of agreement, as you know. The Democratic majority was a huge majority and they ran every committee. They were in charge and they got a lot done.

But what I learned, so there be no mistake about it, was to work with Democrats. I learned to work with them when we got up to 44, and I learned to work with them when we got up to 46, and what a thrill when we finally got a majority. I still have more legislation passed here, there, and yon that is bipartisan. I wish to say from the very beginning, I pledge to try to make this work. I will do that with every ounce of ingenuity, wisdom, or the opposite thereof if required, to try to make something work.

It is one thing to say to this Senate: Senator HARRY REID and I have grown to be very good friends because we serve on an appropriations subcommittee and we always agree on everything after we have spent some time disagreeing. But I would also tell you that he and I do not agree on policy. I note, with a big smile on my face, his policy positions have become more known and more pronounced since he has occupied the second chair on that side—which I expected of him.

Did I have any real friends in the Democratic Party who went to exceptional ends to be helpful to me? Let me tell you a brief story. I was a pipsqueak in the Senate, and Senator Long was a very big Senator. I was just starting my first term. I passed only one bill. It was a big bill. It imposed a 10-cent gasoline tax—Senator BYRD, you remember that—on the users of the inland waterways. Do you remember that fight? It went on forever, but I won fair and square, and I went home to campaign. And, believe it or not, a Senator from that side of the aisle, in my absence—I was in New Mexico—was going to undo my victory because they had the votes and he had the floor. A staffer called me and said: You better come back, get off the campaign trail and come over here and defend the only legislative victory you have, of any significance, in the first 6 years. I was prepared to do it.

Guess what the next call was, in about a half hour—Russell Long. I had defeated him on the floor in that debate. And he said: PETE, they won't do that.

I said: What?

They will not upset your victory. You won. You stay home and campaign.

Think of that, telling a Republican to stay home.

You stay home and campaign and I will take the floor in your place and object to what is contemplated. And the victory that you got will not be undone here on the floor by a Democrat.

That is friendship, right? But, listen, I didn't agree with Russell Long on a

lot of things—and he knew that—here on the floor of the Senate.

I say to my Democrat friends on the other side of the aisle, all kinds of expressions have been used talking about what is going on: ''We extend a hand to you'' and all those other wonderful words.

All I can say is, I am going to do my best to work with you, and I hope you will do the best you can to work with me on the Budget Committee and get something done.

I, too, thought we were starting this session—and it is the reason I was concerned about what was happening—I thought we started with the idea that on January 21, Vice President CHENEY would be in that chair and he would make it no longer 50–50 but 51–50. I still believe that is the case.

My thinking is he is going to be denied the right to vote on this issue. Maybe we ought to have a lengthy debate so he can have a vote on this issue.

Our leadership has gotten together—I cannot use words of high enough praise to exceed the great words on the floor complimenting you, Senator DASCHLE, and my Republican leader for what you are doing.

Those who have listened to me in our own conference and maybe some media person has caught a glimpse of what I was saying heretofore the last few days, I hope everybody understands that was my version of what we were stepping into, and I thought clearly from the precedents I had read that that event would occur in due order, and we would not be split 50/50.

It is imperative we try to work together. The fact that I am going to try to work with my counterpart, KENT CONRAD, with whom I have already met two times and talked with today at length about the Budget Committee—but I am not sure it will work—while I am going to try my best, I do not know whether we are going to be able to get the work of the American people done under a 50/50 arrangement as to the committee structure. I hope and pray that it will work.

I assure my leaders that, with all our vigor and all our commitments, it will be tough to get our work done as to serious and contentious matters that are between the two parties or favor the President. It will be very difficult to get it done. Nonetheless, I support it. It is a very high-minded purpose that both of you had in mind and you achieved it. Our Republican leader achieved it. He will be praised for trying to bring not just friendliness but bipartisan effort to the Senate.

My words expressing how much I hope that works are inadequate. I hope our praise will not be short lived and what we are praising them for today will not be for 2 weeks or 2 months, but maybe at the end of 1 year, when we look back on it, we can say, in spite of the most difficult committee structure we have worked with in this Senate, we were able to work.

I know Senator BYRD as chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and Senator STEVENS, my great friend as well as his, have been able to do that, but I submit to them that the appropriations work is a little bit different than some of the other committee work. Some of it will end up in our committees that have very philosophical, very partisan overtones. We will try to mellow those and get our work done as Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS have in such an exemplary manner.

I close by saying I graduated along in this Senate, never serving in any other institutional body of legislative significance. Senator BYRD has frequently said that we must learn to understand and know the Senate, and once we have, we will love it. I have heard him say those words or others. I am one to whom you have said: Senator DOMENICI, you have really learned what the Senate is all about. I hope I have. I wanted to achieve; I wanted to bring bills to the floor that were contentious. I see no other way to run the Senate other than that.

Nonetheless, again I repeat, I pledge all my energy to making this bipartisan arrangement work. I say to Senator DASCHLE, I will try. I say to Senator BYRD, I will try. To my distinguished majority leader, rest assured this Senator will try to make your excellent agreement, difficult agreement work. If I have reservations, I think they are legitimate. They are concerns about whether this institution can work with equal committees and without more assurance on the conference situation which others will discuss.

All of the discord is gone. Senator LOTT was my leader in the negotiations. I compliment him for the results, and I compliment the majority leader for his success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

Madam President, the motto from my home State of Kansas is ''Ad astra per aspera.'' Translated it means ''to the stars through difficulty.'' If you take a look at our pioneer past and the history of the problems we experienced in the West, our heritage and progress we have made as a free State, the motto is very appropriate. Perhaps ''to the stars through difficulty'' should be the appropriate motto to describe the challenge we face in the Senate as we begin what Senator BYRD has described as a very historic and a very unprecedented session. With a 50/50 membership split, we have to proceed in a bipartisan fashion or we are not going to proceed.

I thank and pay credit to the distinguished majority leader, Senator DASCHLE, and our distinguished Republican leader, Senator LOTT, for persevering. Senator BYRD said it was excruciating, and it probably has been. There has been a lot of second-guessing, a lot of concern, a lot of frustration, a lot of worries. I have had some of those, but they have basically worked out what we hope will be a blueprint of Senate rules and procedures that will allow us to work together and avoid gridlock and get something done.

Our respective leaders have said, and will speak for themselves, that this will not be easy. Senator DOMENICI and Senator GRAMM have expressed those concerns.

I suppose some are wondering why a worker bee or a rank-and-file person in the Senate should be here as opposed to the leadership and the distinguished chairmen of the committees, but I have a little history in regard to this body and the other body.

I served 14 years as a staffer, 16 years in the House of Representatives, and now 4 in the Senate. That is a long time. I am the only member of the Kansas delegation who has ever served in the minority. That is rather astounding to me.

I can remember when how legislation was considered and when it was considered in the House was a foregone conclusion. There were an awful lot of Charlie Stenholm-Pat Roberts amendments. All of a sudden, they became Roberts-Stenholm amendments. I can remember how that worked. In the Agriculture Committee, we were not that partisan.

I have a great deal of reverence for this body. I serve on the Agriculture Committee. We have to get a farm bill done, tax policy changes, sanctions reform; we have to have an export policy that works. Our farmers and ranchers are still hurting. Senator HARKIN and Senator LUGAR will devise ways to get that done. We cannot hold that up.

The distinguished chairman-to-be after January 20 and the distinguished Senator from Michigan have quality of life issues with our armed services people; we have our vital national interests to prioritize; we have some recruiting problems, some retention problems. Quite frankly, our military is stressed, strained, and hollow. We must address this. It is our national security. We cannot hold this up. We have to move ahead.

I also serve on the Intelligence Committee. In that respect, the chairman-to-be, Senator SHELBY, and the current chairman have to detect and deter and get ready for consequence management with all sorts of problems in regard to terrorism and homeland defense. We are talking about the individual freedoms and the security of the American people. We cannot hold that up by a filibuster or any kind of gridlock.

In regard to what we have to do, let us follow the example of President-elect Bush. He has said: Let us unite. I am a uniter; I am not a divider. We can do that. We can follow his example. We have reached out with a hand of friendship and trust, as described by Senator STEVENS. We ought to seize that opportunity.

I know there are some who say we are going to get a slap in the face in return. It will not be a slap in the face in return to anybody in this body or from a partisan standpoint; it will be a slap in the face to the American people, and they will understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. I talked to a respected and veteran newspaper editorialist of the Washington Post, Bob Kaiser, just a couple days ago. He said: PAT, you have been around here quite a while. Is this possible? 50/50, will it work in the Senate? Can you avoid the partisan bickering and all that that encompasses?

I said: I don't know, Bob, but we've got a shot. We have an opportunity. Borne out of necessity, we must do this.

Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE, and our leadership team, thank you for arranging this possibility. It is now up to us. We have the responsibility, and, yes, both of us now have the authority. Let's see if we can get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I had not realized when I came down to the floor that this was going to turn into a history class. But I have a little history to add to it myself, and I hope that it is appropriate.

During our conference today, we talked about a previous situation where the Senate was close to this circumstance. The Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. NICKLES, and I had an exchange about the facts in that situation. He had it different than I had it. So naturally, under those circumstances, you go check it out. I found out we were both right. So I would like to recite that to perhaps give us a historical setting of where we are.

I have only served in this body for 8 years. But as I have indicated on the floor on other occasions, as a teenager I sat in the family gallery while my father served here. And this will perhaps shock everybody, but that was before STROM THURMOND was sworn in. I was in the Senate Chamber before STROM THURMOND was, if you can believe that. And it is true.

The Republicans had just won the historic election of 1952. Dwight Eisenhower was the President. The Republicans won the Senate by the narrowest of margins, 49/47. Then, very quickly, Robert Taft was the majority leader. I still have memories, sitting in the family gallery, of watching Robert Taft—a man whose face is now in the lobby as one of the five greatest Senators in American history—prowling around in the back of this Chamber.

One of the interesting things about it is that the Chamber looked exactly the same then as it does now, except that TRENT LOTT has now changed the color of the walls, I think wisely, in the television age.

But very quickly in the Eisenhower administration, Wayne Morse found that his differences with President Eisenhower were irreconcilable, and he announced himself an independent. So you had 48 Republicans, 47 Democrats, and 1 Independent.

Senator Morse insisted that he would not take his committee assignments from either party, he would take them from the Senate as a whole, and very quickly discovered that that kind of a stance meant he got no committee assignments, period. So he began caucusing with the Democrats with whom he was more ideologically aligned.

Then Robert Taft died. He contracted cancer. He yielded the majority leader's position to Senator Knowland of California. Senator Taft fought the cancer gallantly for months, and then he died. There was a Democratic Governor in the State of Ohio, and Robert Taft was replaced by a Democrat. It suddenly became 48 Democrats, and 47 Republicans, with 1 Independent.

That was the position Senator NICKLES was trying to explain to me during the conference, and he was right. My memory was the first circumstance, and that was right. The difference was, we had had a death in there that I had forgotten.

Now this was the situation: Because the Republicans had organized the Senate with 49 Senators to begin with, they had organized it with a Republican majority on every committee. They held that Republican majority on every committee until Senator Taft died, and it switched. At that point, Senator Morse—this I do remember—said, A, he had been elected as a Republican and, B, the Republicans controlled the administration and, therefore, in order to prevent the new President from being frustrated in his opportunities to get things through, he would, even though he had denounced his Republican party membership, vote with the Republicans on organizational issues, giving the Republicans 48, the Democrats 48, and with Richard Nixon in the chair giving the Republicans 49.

Here is the key point. Under those circumstances, the Democrats said: We will not ask for a realignment of the committees. We will allow the majority that was there on the committees to be maintained through the balance of this Congress.

So it was 48 Democrats, 47 Republicans, and 1 Independent, with the Independent vowing to vote against any organizational resolution the Democrats might bring forward, and of course Vice President Nixon would vote also that way, so the Republicans, even though they had only 47 seats, in a 96-seat Senate, maintained the chairmanships and a 1-vote margin on every committee.

Now we are in a different situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Now we are in a different situation in that we come into it even, 50/50. This time, the Democrats have not been so shy about saying, we will automatically give up control on each committee. And they have been very firm about saying that the committee ratios must be exactly the same. If I were in their shoes, frankly, I would probably be arguing exactly the same way.

On the other hand, the Constitution has been cited here by the Senator from West Virginia, by the majority leader, and others, saying that the Republicans have the ultimate right to break the tie through Vice President CHENEY after January 20.

This creates what is sometimes called an immovable object facing an irresistible force, with both sides digging in and saying: This is what we absolutely have to have. And with the power of the filibuster, both sides have a nuclear weapon.

To have come up with a resolution that is producing the kind of rhetoric we are now hearing on the floor this afternoon demonstrates the wisdom, the intelligence, and the skill of our respective leaders. I, for one, want to go on record congratulating them both and all of the Members of the Senate who are lining up behind it, even though there are those on both sides of the aisle who are terribly unhappy with the ultimate result. The fact that we have one that is now going to pass by unanimous consent is a tribute to our leadership. I wanted to express that here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, while I do not disagree with anything that has been said here, I do feel compelled to make a statement. While I was not on the floor, there was a unanimous consent request propounded successfully, so that this is automatically going to become a reality without a vote. That is fine. That is going to happen. But I have to say, I was not here on the floor, as 75 percent of the Senators were not here.

I am not criticizing the majority leader or any Member of this Senate. But I have to say, I agree with Senator BYRD that—I think he probably recited it, even though I was not here—section 3 of Article I of the Constitution says:

> The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no Vote, unless they be equally divided.

I often say that one of the few qualifications I have for this office is that I am not an attorney. So when I read the Constitution, I know what it says. So

after the 20th, we will be a majority party.

While I chair two subcommittees, the rule that we are adopting here, the resolution, says that even though I chair that subcommittee, if it is an equal vote—it is a tie vote—it goes on to the full committee. I do not think that is right. For that reason, I just want to make sure the RECORD does reflect I do oppose the resolution. I would like to have the RECORD reflect that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair. May I say, I congratulate the Presiding Officer for assuming the chair. I assume this is her first opportunity.

Madam President, I was among the class of chairmen to hold out for the one-vote majority, not for any reason personal against my distinguished friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle but because of the enormity of the annual bill of the Armed Services Committee on which our distinguished colleague from West Virginia serves and my distinguished chairman from Michigan serves.

That bill last time was brought to the floor with about 450 pages. It grew to 900 pages. It took us 5 weeks. Therefore, with that type of responsibility, whether I am the chairman or others are chairman or, indeed, on this side of the aisle, should it occur on a split, you need the authority to do the job. Then you have to accept the responsibility.

I fought the battle along with others. My distinguished leader, Mr. LOTT, gave me every opportunity to express my views. The decision was made within our conference. I accept that decision, and I today publicly commit to make it work. We have to make it work. We have an obligation to 281 million people to make it work.

Our great Republic, three branches, coequal in authority, has gone through one of the great chapters of American history, a hard-fought election by the contenders in the executive branch, that decision then thrust upon the judicial branch, finally decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. Now to the legislative branch is posed a challenge to make it work. That we will do.

I say to my friends in the Senate, we will draw from that treasure that we have in this institution called personal friendships and relationships. They are not well known publicly, but I am blessed, I say with humility, to have so many close, personal relationships throughout this Senate, ones in which I pose great trust and confidence.

If I may be personal to my good friend from West Virginia, or my good friend, Senator REID, and Senator LEVIN, we shall make this work in the interest of our country. Because the other two branches are going to make it work, we will. The legislative agenda of President Bush will rotate around the axle of the Senate—no disrespect to the other body. This split will be the axle around which it rotates, and we will make it work and move forward in the interest of this country.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator CONRAD, be recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for this time.

We have an agreement. I believe it reflects well on both sides of the aisle and the leadership on both sides of the aisle. I think neither side of the aisle is fully satisfied. There are problems in this agreement, as there are problems in any agreement, but it is a very good first start.

The hard reality is that the elected membership of this body is split 50/50. The elected membership, Senators, are split 50/50. So one would anticipate that the membership of the committees would be split 50/50. This is a result of an election. The people of our country have spoken. They have chosen who serves here, who represents them in this Chamber, and it is their decision that has determined the result.

There has been much discussion of the Constitution and the Vice President's role. It is absolutely the case that under our Constitution the Vice President breaks ties. Those are ties on the floor of the Senate. The Vice President doesn't break ties in committees. So I think the arrangement that has been worked out between the two leaders is the only logical conclusion to which one could come.

As a member of the Budget Committee and the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee, let me say that the Budget Committee will be among the first places to test this new arrangement. Senator DOMENICI, who will chair the Budget Committee after January 20, which I have the privilege of chairing for the next 2 weeks, has said he will give it his best effort to make this work. I come to the floor to say I make the same pledge, that I will give my best effort to make this arrangement work.

What I mean by that is what I have just had the opportunity to say to the Secretary-designate of the Treasury, Mr. O'Neill, in my office just moments ago, that bipartisanship is more than a word. It means that both sides give up part of their fixed positions. That is what bipartisanship means. If there is going to be compromise, it means that neither side gets precisely what it is seeking. But only through that kind of compromise and bipartisan spirit can we advance the agenda in this Chamber.

Senator DOMENICI and I have already spoken several times. We had an extended discussion today. It is a good beginning.

Again, I pledge my best effort to making this arrangement work. I think it can work. I believe if people of good faith join together, we can achieve much for our country.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have stated publicly on previous occasions my admiration for the two leaders, the Democratic leader and the Republican leader, and certainly that is accentuated as a result of the work they have done today.

The work they have done has been difficult and hard, but in the process of doing the work, there have been some unsung heroes I want to recognize. I call them heroes. I underline and underscore that. When an idea is given by Senator DASCHLE or by Senator LOTT, somebody has to put this on paper and work out the details. Those details have been worked out. Therefore, I want to make sure the Senate record is spread with the fact that we have had people who could be out in the private sector making lots and lots of money. They are here because they are dedicated public servants.

I mention specifically Mark Patterson, Mark Childress, Caroline Fredrickson, Marty Paone, and Lula Davis on this side, who have spent tremendous amounts of time trying to carry forth the wishes of the two leaders.

On the Republican side, there are others who could mention probably more people than I, but I have been able to witness personally this last week the tremendous work of Dave Hoppe, Elizabeth Letchworth, and Dave Schiappa, who have done tremendous work and have really made it possible to arrive at the point we are today. The work, the leadership, the policy direction by our two leaders has been significant, but it has only been able to be implemented because of the work of these staff people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, this is my first opportunity to address this body, so this is a special day for me.

For the past 8 years, I have been in and out of this Chamber any number of times as Governor of Delaware and chairman of the National Governors' Association. I have never had the opportunity to sit down in one of these seats or to speak at one of these podiums.

One of the great things about being Governor is you get to be part of the National Governors' Association. There is a strong history there of Democrats and Republicans, and one or two Independents as well, to actually work together, to reach across the aisle and to find consensus, not just occasionally but routinely.

One of the aspects I liked most about being Governor was that every day you came home you felt good because you had gotten something done. Some of us

previously served together in the House for awhile. I can remember any number of times going home on the train to Delaware feeling frustrated, not just 1 night or 1 week but maybe months, because we hadn't gotten enough done. We hadn't really met what was expected of us by the people who sent us here.

I suspect, for people outside this body, the action we are endorsing today will have a relatively little consequence or seems to be of little consequence. But the agreement that has been struck is an agreement of real consequence, not just for those of us working here in the years to come but I think a real consequence for our Nation.

We could have spent much of this month, and maybe the next month and the month beyond that, arguing about the size of the negotiating table and how many seats were going to be at that negotiating table or how many members would be on committees and subcommittees. We are not going to be doing that. Instead, we are going to have the opportunity to take up the business of the people who sent us here to work in the first place.

This may be the triumph of man's hope over experience, but maybe if we can agree on some of the difficult issues we are agreeing on today, then there is some hope and promise that we may be able to find agreement on campaign finance reform, on ways to continue reducing our Nation's debt, and we might shore up the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, and we might cut some taxes—Democrats and Republicans will find common ground there—and how we might extend health care coverage to folks who don't have it, and prescription assistance for some of our older Americans, and even on schools.

When the American people voted for 50 Democrats and 50 Republicans, they did not vote for gridlock. When they voted for almost equal numbers in the House, they did not vote for gridlock. When they voted almost equally for George W. Bush and AL GORE, they did not vote for gridlock. I am proud to stand here on my third day as a Senator to be able to support a wonderful compromise struck by two excellent leaders that holds forth the promise that the next 2 years that we work together in the 107th Congress will be 2 years that will show a great deal more progress for our country, and that is good. This is a good day. I commend those who brought us to this agreement.

I yield back my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the Senate is in an unusual situation and we are dealing, I believe, with extreme wisdom. It is a very difficult anomaly. It has never happened before that the Senate has had a 50/50 split of this nature at the beginning of Congress. The only thing that comes close was in 1953, which was very different because the Republicans had a majority in the beginning of the Congress and the 50/50 situation that existed only occurred in the second session of that Congress. The same party was in control throughout with the Vice President's vote in the second session, which had the majority in the first session.

This is an unusual situation. It took wisdom and statesmanship on the part of our leaders to put together a resolution which would carry us through this very difficult point. Just like during the impeachment situation, the leadership was able to work out a process which allowed the Senate to function and to proceed in a manner that would allow us to have comity and civility, to avoid recrimination. So here the leaders have been able to put together a resolution which will permit us to do just that. I not only wish to thank Senators DASCHLE and LOTT, but many others have been involved in this. I see one of the clear architects of anything we do around here in the Senate based on a knowledge of the Senate as an institution and a knowledge of the Constitution. Senator BYRD is on the floor. His role on this has been essential as well; the wisdom and the implications and precedents which preceded us, and which we will be setting here today, are very much known to Senator BYRD. As always, we have relied heavily upon him in achieving this result. I simply say this: One of the national papers said a few days ago that power-sharing is the first test in the Senate.

Whether that term ''power sharing'' is particularly beloved by Members of this body, nonetheless that is really what we have had to achieve today. We have succeeded in passing that test, in my judgment. We carved out the mechanism which will allow us to respect the fact that we have a 50/50 Senate.

On the other hand, we are different from the House in at least two ways. Being in the presence of Senator BYRD, I am sure there are many more ways; but at least in two ways that I focus on.

First, we have a Vice President, somebody who can break a tie.

Second, we are a continuing body. The fact is we are a continuing body. If we didn't agree to a resolution, the previous Senate's resolution would continue to be in force until it was supplemented by a new resolution.

That is very different from the situation that exists in the House of Representatives.

In my home State in Michigan, we had a very positive experience in 1993, I believe, with a 50/50 House of Representatives. But they ended up with joint speakers, joint chairmen—joint everything, because there was no alternative. There was no way of breaking that tie.

We have a way of breaking a tie here. We have a Vice President at least on the Senate floor. We don't have a Vice President in committee, but we have a Vice President on the Senate floor. And we have a continuing body. We are a continuing body, which means that the last resolution would have continued in place, with all of the difficulties and complications that would have created, until it was replaced by the resolution we are adopting here today.

I commend our leadership and all those who have been involved in making it possible for us to proceed as a Senate in a manner which I think the public will respect as being fair and which is respectful of this body and this institution.

I know how conscious we must be of what we are doing—not just for the next period of time until a majority is reestablished by one party or the other, but we must be respectful of the implications of what we are doing for future circumstances similar to these.

History, I believe, will judge this agreement favorably. It is an agreement which is very sensitive to the history of this body. It is about as close to the 50/50 yard line as we can get consistent with the fact that there is indeed a Vice President who on the floor can break a tie consistent with the nature of this body as a continuing institution.

The old saying that ''necessity is the mother of invention'' is surely true again. It is the mother of bipartisan invention here, and I think it will serve us very well, and we will find we can work together as well as we have so often even when one of us is in the majority and one in the minority.

I know this has been the case on the Armed Services Committee. As the Presiding Officer knows and may know again, many of our committees work very well together on both sides of the aisle. It has been true between myself and Senator WARNER, who has been chairman and will again be on the 20th, and with Senator THURMOND before him. We have worked together very closely. That closeness will continue surely and even perhaps be enhanced, if that is possible, by this resolution.

I thank all those who have been involved.

I see Senator REID is also on the floor. I want to add my thanks to him because he has been at every moment involved in the carving of this document. I commend him and all others on both sides for their efforts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the agreement, the resolution is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXV, or any other provision of the Standing Rules or Standing Orders of the Senate, the committees of the Senate, including Joint and Special Committees, for the 107th Congress shall be composed equally of members of both parties, to be appointed at a later time by the two Leaders; that the budgets and office space for such committees, and all other subgroups, shall likewise be equal, with up to an additional 10% to be allocated for administrative expenses to be determined by the Rules Committee, with

the total administrative expenses allocation for all committees not to exceed historic levels; and that the Chairman of a full committee may discharge a subcommittee of any Legislative or Executive Calendar item which has not been reported because of a tie vote and place it on the full committee's agenda.

SEC. 2. *Provided,* That such committee ratios shall remain in effect for the remainder of the 107th Congress, except that if at any time during the 107th Congress either party attains a majority of the whole number of Senators, then each committee ratio shall be adjusted to reflect the ratio of the parties in the Senate, and the provisions of this resolution shall have no further effect, except that the members appointed by the two Leaders, pursuant to this resolution, shall no longer be members of the committees, and the committee chairmanships shall be held by the party which has attained a majority of the whole number of Senators.

SEC. 3. Pursuant to the provisions and exceptions listed above, the following additional Standing Orders shall be in effect for the 107th Congress:

(1) If a committee has not reported out a legislative item or nomination because of a tie vote, then, after notice of such tie vote has been transmitted to the Senate by that committee and printed in the Record, the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader may, only after consultation with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee, make a motion to discharge such legislative item or nomination, and time for debate on such motion shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided between the two Leaders, with no other motions, points of order, or amendments in order: *Provided,* That following the use or yielding back of time, a vote occur on the motion to discharge, without any intervening action, motion, or debate, and if agreed to it be placed immediately on the Calendar of Business (in the case of legislation) or the Executive Calendar (in the case of a nomination).

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, to insure that any cloture motion shall be offered for the purpose of bringing to a close debate, in no case shall it be in order for any cloture motion to be made on an amendable item during its first 12 hours of Senate debate: *Provided,* That all other provisions of Rule XXII remain in status quo.

(3) Both Leaders shall seek to attain an equal balance of the interests of the two parties when scheduling and debating legislative and executive business generally, and in keeping with the present Senate precedents, a motion to proceed to any Legislative or Executive Calendar item shall continue to be considered the prerogative of the Majority Leader, although the Senate Rules do not prohibit the right of the Democratic Leader, or any other Senator, to move to proceed to any item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes on the resolution.

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

RESERVATIONS ABOUT S. RES. 8

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, it is no secret that I have had serious reservations about this resolution. Let me first make a commitment to Majority Leader DASCHLE and soon-to-be Majority Leader LOTT that I will certainly work with them and all Members of the Senate to make sure it works. I have the greatest respect for them, and I have the greatest respect for the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. AKAKA, who is, in my opinion, Mr. Civility in the Senate.

I have stated in the past that what is vitally important for us to be successful in the Congress is that we need a greater return of civility and working together and trusting each other. This resolution I have had problems with because it is difficult for me to see how two people can drive a car at the same time or have their hands on the steering wheel at the same time.

Also, the way I look at the precedents of the Senate, it is not consistent. When the Senate was organized on January 7, 1953, there was an equal number—the Senate was equally divided 48–48, with 48 Republicans and 47 Democrats; the Independent was convening with the Democrats, I think. The resolution said there was an equally divided Senate, but it also gave a majority of one on 15 committees.

I am troubled by breaking the precedent of the Senate. I think it is important that we work together. I compliment the leaders because they have been working together. It is incumbent upon us to make this work.

Not everybody is happy with the resolution, but this is the Senate. I think it is vitally important for our country that President-elect Bush and we get things done. It is going to be a test. It is a test that I will certainly commit to do everything I can to make it successful. I see some challenges. Any committee you look at, if you have an equal number—most committees have an odd number, so if you have disputes, one group or the other is going to win. We are going to try to run committees on equal numbers. That will be a challenge for Democrats and Republicans, and it will be incumbent upon all of us to work together. While I am not totally satisfied with this resolution, I commit to the leaders to help make it successful.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution of organization of the Senate in 1953 be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the 83d Congress, 1st Session, Senate Report, No. 1, Jan. 7 (legislative day, Jan. 6), 1953]

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

[To accompany S. Res. 18]

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 18) proposing changes in the number of certain standing committees, having considered same, report thereon favorably with an amendment, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

This resolution would accomplish the following changes in the Senate rules affecting certain standing committees as follows:

1. To increase 10 standing committees by 2 members each (1 majority, 1 minority), and to reduce 5 similarly.

2. To permit 18 Senators of the majority and 3 of the minority to serve on four standing committees—Civil Service, District of Columbia, Public Works, or Government Operations. (Present rules do not include Civil Service or Public Works and do not recognize the minority.)

This will present the following committee picture:

15 members instead of 13 (9):
Agriculture
Armed Services
Banking and Currency
Finance
Foreign Relations
Interstate and Foreign Commerce
Judiciary
Labor and Public Welfare
Interior and Insular Affairs
11 members instead of 13 (5):
Civil Service
District of Columbia
Government Operations
Public Works
Rules and Administration
23 members instead of 21 (1):
Appropriations

The proposal

1. Creates 20 new positions in the more desired committees (10 each for majority and minority) without increasing total number of committees.

2. Makes committee size more nearly reflect committee workload and thereby adjusts burdens and responsibilities more equally to all Senators and all committees.

3. Establishes a minimum margin of 1 for the majority party in each of the Senate's 15 committees, which present rules do not, in an evenly divided Senate. This can be seen from the following:

Present committee structure

1 committee of 21	21
14 committees of 13	182
Total committee positions	203
2 assignments for each of 96 Senators requires	192
Leaving for members serving on 3 committees	11

Which does not provide the necessary minimum of 15 for control of 15 committees in an evenly divided Senate.

Proposed committee structure

1 committee of 23	23
9 committees of 15	135
5 committees of 11	55
Total committee positions	213
2 assignments for each of 96 Senators requires	192
Leaving for members serving on 3 committees	21

Which divided 18 to the majority and 3 to the minority gives the margin of 15 for the majority to have the minimum 1 on each of 15 committees.

4. Permits continuity and experience for both parties on the committees which, in the past, have tended to be loaded with new Senators.

5. Insures better use of senatorial talent, industry, and ability, for both majority and minority.

In summary

1. The plan meets the necessary mechanics of an evenly divided Senate.

2. It opens the door for new Senators on major committees.

3. It retains the values of long Senate service.

4. It dispossesses no one, has distinct advantages for majority and minority.

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