The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

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

Almighty God, source of all power, we praise You that You entrust Your power to the Senators so that they may lead and govern. Keep them mindful that they hold power with Your permission and for Your purposes. May the power they hold be equally measured by the humility they express. Human power can lead to pride. Praise to You, for the privilege of power is the antidote to this pride. With power comes power struggles to determine who is in control. These power struggles can denigrate our awareness that You are in control. In this unprecedented time when power must be shared by the parties, bless the Senators with an equally unprecedented measure of trust in each other and each other's parties.

Dear Father, work in the minds and hearts of the Senators as they consider the Senate committee organization. May this Senate exemplify to the Nation that great leaders can work together. When You are our Lord, there is no need to lord it over others; when we remember our accountability to You, we can be accommodating to one another. May it be so in this Senate for Your glory and the good of our beloved Nation. You are Lord. 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.

MORNING BUSINESS
The President pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to exceed the hour of 11 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

The President pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The President. Withdout objection, it is so ordered.

The senior Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

ORGANIZING THE SENATE
Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have been in a quorum call this morning and for some part of yesterday. I know news reports are explaining to the American people that we are in the process of organizing in the Senate at this point and it has been a bit difficult because, for the first time in the history of our country, the Senate is evenly split as between Republicans and Democrats. There was an occasion in the last century, about 120 years ago or so, in which there was an equal number of Republicans and Democrats. But there were also two Independents serving in the Senate at the time. Having read a bit about that period of time, my understanding is the Independents had quite an interesting time bargaining as between the two political parties about what their respective roles might be, should they choose to assist one political party or another.

But that is not the case in this circumstance. We are evenly split. The American people caused that to happen. They sent 50 Republican Senators and 50 Democrat Senators here to the Senate. It is my hope that the negotiations currently underway between the Democratic leader, now the majority
leader, Senator DASCHLE, and the Republican leader, Senator LOTT, will bear fruit and that we will be able to organize in a manner that is consistent with the wishes of the American people. The American people have, by their desire, said that they want a split Senate, in my view.

That would say to us that after January 20, the Vice President-elect, Richard Cheney, will have the opportunity to give the Republicans an additional vote in this Chamber for the purpose of organizing. That is certainly true. But it is not the case that the Vice President, in his presiding role according to the Constitution, is going to play a role in any committee in this Congress. There is no such role for the Vice President. Therefore, in each and every committee we have a representation from 50 Democrats and 50 Republicans, a selection, then, of which is made to the committee membership. We feel very strongly that those committees ought to have a membership of 50/50.

There is no such role for the Vice President, in his presiding role according to the Constitution, is going to play a role in any committee in this Congress. There is no such role for the Vice President, in his presiding role according to the Constitution, is going to play a role in any committee in this Congress. There is no such role for the Vice President, in his presiding role according to the Constitution, is going to play a role in any committee in this Congress.

Yesterday, we had the first hearing in the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on which I serve. Senator McCain, who is the chairman of that committee—actually yesterday it was technically the Chair, and Senator McCain works very closely with Senator Hollings—who has chaired that committee all of the time I have been a Senator, Senator Hollings, in the form of a question, and ask if he would agree: The fact is, the Senate is divided 50/50. As I said before, it doesn't necessarily work with you; 50 Democrats and 50 Republicans come out equally. It would seem to me that the committee structure should be equal.

Again, reading in the Washington Times, which seemed to be a press release from the dissidents—I should not say “the dissidents”—it seemed to be a press release from those people opposing equality in the Senate. It appeared to be a press release they issued. They are saying: I don’t understand. We are saying: There is a member who deserves to have one more on the committee.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, and I ask if he would agree with me: The Republicans are not in the majority in the Senate of the United States. They are saying: I don’t understand. We are saying: There is a member who deserves to have one more on the committee.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, and I ask if he would agree with me: The Republicans are not in the majority in the Senate of the United States. On the organizational matters, there will never be any tie the Vice President can vote upon, as Alan Simpson said, formerly the assistant Republican leader and Republican whip. As he said: The Republicans will be killed by the tie that the minority wants. The majority of the Senate will be killed by the tie that the minority wants. The majority of the Senate will be killed by the tie that the minority wants. The majority of the Senate will be killed by the tie that the minority wants. The majority of the Senate will be killed by the tie that the minority wants.

He went on further to say that he thought the committee chairmanships should rotate on a yearly basis.

So again in the form of a question: I would hope, as I am sure my friend from North Dakota hopes, that the work of our leader, Senator Daschle, and their leader, Senator Lott, comes to fruition. These men have worked extremely hard. They deserve the support of the American people. What they are trying to do, as I understand it, is come up with something that is fair. That is all the majority of this Senate wants. The majority of the Senate wants a 50/50 division. If we had a vote on that today, that is how it would take place. So we should get that done as quickly as possible and get on with the business of the Senate. Then we would not be in quorum calls here.

Does the Senator from North Dakota agree?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the senior Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent, in that I took so much time of my friend from North Dakota, that his time be extended for another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. REID. My good friend, Senator McCain is quoted in the paper today, almost verbatim what the Senator from North Dakota said. He said, as quoted in the paper: I don’t report things out of my committee on a partisan basis. If I did, they wouldn’t go anywhere anyway. And, in reality, the Senate is divided 50/50.

He went on further to say, as he understood the framework of the agreement, the Democrats would allow him to be chairman. He thought that was a pretty good deal.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, in the form of a question, and ask if he would agree: The fact is, the Senate is divided 50/50. As I said before, it doesn’t necessarily work with you; 50 Democrats and 50 Republicans come out equally. It would seem to me that the committee structure should be equal.

Again, reading in the Washington Times, which seemed to be a press release from the dissidents—I should not say “the dissidents”—it seemed to be a press release from those people opposing equality in the Senate. It appeared to be a press release they issued. They are saying: I don’t understand. We are saying: There is a member who deserves to have one more on the committee.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, and I ask if he would agree with me: The Republicans are not in the majority in the Senate of the United States. On the organizational matters, there will never be any tie the Vice President can vote upon, as Alan Simpson said, formerly the assistant Republican leader and Republican whip. As he said: The Republicans will be killed by the tie that the minority wants. The majority of the Senate will be killed by the tie that the minority wants. The majority of the Senate will be killed by the tie that the minority wants. The majority of the Senate will be killed by the tie that the minority wants.

He went on further to say that he thought the committee chairmanships should rotate on a yearly basis.

So again in the form of a question: I would hope, as I am sure my friend from North Dakota hopes, that the work of our leader, Senator Daschle, and their leader, Senator Lott, comes to fruition. These men have worked extremely hard. They deserve the support of the American people. What they are trying to do, as I understand it, is come up with something that is fair. That is all the majority of this Senate wants. The majority of the Senate wants a 50/50 division. If we had a vote on that today, that is how it would take place. So we should get that done as quickly as possible and get on with the business of the Senate. Then we would not be in quorum calls here.

Does the Senator from North Dakota agree?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the senior Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent, in that I took so much time of my friend from North Dakota, that his time be extended for another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. REID. My good friend, Senator McCain is quoted in the paper today, almost verbatim what the Senator from North Dakota said. He said, as quoted in the paper: I don’t report things out of my committee on a partisan basis. If I did, they wouldn’t go anywhere anyway. And, in reality, the Senate is divided 50/50.
case, of course those many of us who feel very strongly about the need to have the opportunity to have a $50 split on the committees would not want to allow that to happen. There will then ensue, of course, a battle about the organizational structure.

Let’s avoid that. Let’s not do that. Let us, today, in the next couple of hours, resolve this in the right way and in a fair way. If we do that, we will have best served the American people’s interests.

Mr. REID. If the Senator can be interrupted, and I will be very quick, he raises an important issue. People in the State of Nevada in 1985 had a tie in the Nevada State Assembly, equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans. It was one of the most productive sessions in the history of the Nevada Legislature.

Evan Bayh, when he was Governor of Indiana, had a tie in the State Legislature. That was one of the most productive in the history of the State Legislature.

I say to my friend, he is absolutely right on target. I also say, in addition to Senator McCain, there are other people who will become chairmen after January 20, Republicans, who stated 50/50 is a fair way to do things.

I hope we can work this out. I know people have strong feelings, but I hope the two leaders will be able to bring something to us so we can get down to the work at hand. I appreciate the Senator yielding.

Mr. DORGAN. The point is, we wish Senator Daschle and Senator Lott well and hope they succeed in reaching an agreement, and we pledge our cooperation to help them do that.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to briefly talk about the Federal Reserve Board and the economy because it is important we have some discussion on what is happening in our economy.

I have been watching in recent days the announcements both by the Federal Reserve Board and also the way the press in this country has portrayed the discussions about a softening or weakening economy and the Federal Reserve Board’s attempts to respond to it by cutting interest rates.

Let me first say uncharacteristically that the Fed did the right thing a few days ago by reducing the Federal funds rate by 50 basis points. The interest rates imposed by the Fed have been historically too high. Seven months ago, the Federal Reserve Board increased interest rates for the sixth time, and that was 50 basis points. Do my colleagues know why the Fed did that 7 months ago? Because the Federal Reserve Board said America had an economy that was too strong and growing too rapidly.

The reason I want to have this brief discussion today is to say this economic slowdown people talk about is not an accident. The Federal Reserve Board believed the economy was growing too rapidly. They worried, therefore, that it would ignite a new wave of inflation. In my judgment, that was not a logical conclusion of the economic growth we were seeing, but normal growth, or economic slowdown, and the Federal Reserve Board deliberately wanted to slow down the economy.

What is the result of all of that? Let me read a couple of headlines: “Slowdown May Cause Job Cuts” and “Federal Reserve Board’s Slowdown.” Associated Press, January 4, 1993.


“Sears to Close 89 Locations.” This morning’s Washington Post.

“E-Toys to Eliminate 700 Jobs.”

“Covad to Lay Off 400 Workers.”

I think one gets the point. This economy is slowing. The Federal Reserve Board increased interest rates six times since June 1989, the last time 7 months ago, by 50 basis points, believing that despite higher productivity growth by the American workers there would be a new wave of inflation, and intending that it had to respond to an economy that was too rapidly growing. In my judgment, they were mistaken. I said so at the time on the floor of the Senate.

Seven months later after saying the economy was growing too rapidly, we have all the things that, gee, this economy is slowing. I wish the reporters would ascribe that slow growth now or the slowdown of the economy to the Fed’s actions. This was medicine administered by an economic doctor 7 months ago and the months previous to that on five other occasions because the Fed believed our economy was growing too rapidly. It was the wrong medicine at the wrong time. The result is a slowdown, in many cases, perhaps, a slowdown that is more dramatic than the Fed intended. Because of that, 2 days ago the Fed decided it would decrease the Federal funds rate by 50 basis points. The problem is that does not always take effect quickly. It takes some while for it to course its way through our economy.

A 50-basis-point reduction is not enough. The Federal funds rate, and therefore all other interest rates, are still high historically relative to the current rate of inflation. It is, therefore, a very, very high interest rate. An average American household, because of the previous six interest rate increases imposed by the Fed, is now paying $1,700 a year in additional interest charges. Think of the chaos that would have caused had someone come to the floor of the Senate and said: We have a proposal. We think the economy is doing too well, and we would like to ask every American family to pay $1,700 more a year in taxes. Think of the debate that would have ensued.

Higher cost of credit is a tax on the American people artificially imposed by the Fed. Interest rates that are imposed by the Fed, is now paying $1,700 a year in additional interest costs. And so far, $1,700 more a year in taxes. Think of the chaos that would have caused had someone come to the floor of the Senate and said we have a proposal. We think the economy is doing too well, and we would like to ask every American family to pay $1,700 more a year in taxes. Think of the debate that would have ensued.

Higher cost of credit is a tax on the American people artificially imposed by the Fed. Interest rates that are higher than are justifiable. Real interest rates, above the rate of inflation, are still extraordinarily high, and in my judgment, represent a wrongheaded public policy.

We will see if we get out of this with a slowdown that is a soft landing and slow growth. But, one, I ask whether the Fed has really miscalculated and increased interest rates so much that it took this economy off track. I hope it is not the latter. I hope it is the former. I am not wishing a bad economy, but I am saying the next time someone talks about this economy—I heard some conservative commentators say this is the Clinton slowdown. This slowdown is engineered by the Federal Reserve Board. They talked about it, they insisted upon it, they voted upon it, and now 7 months later, we bear the fruit that might be a bitter fruit. I want people to understand.

I kind of yearn for the day—and I was not here then—when we debated interest rate policies all across this country, read the economic and financial history of this country and you will find that a century and a half ago, the question of interest rates and monetary policy was debated from bar rooms to barber shops all across this country. The Fed acts imperviously to public input. It is the last dinosaur in town. It operates behind locked closed doors. The American public is not allowed in, and no President will comment much about the Fed because they are worried they will upset the market. So they went on their merry way 7 months ago believing they ought to slow down the American economy.

The next time you hear about this economic slowdown, understand it was engineered by the Federal Reserve Board. We need a balanced policy—not just the aggressive additional action—not just the 50 basis points a couple days ago—but aggressive additional action to put interest rates where they ought to be relative to the rate of inflation and stop overtaxing the American families by engineering the higher cost of credit they have caused in the last year and a half that is unjustifiable.

It probably is shouting in the wind to talk about the Federal Reserve Board, but it is the last dinosaur in town. It operates behind locked closed doors. The American public is not allowed in, and no President will comment much about the Fed because it is worried they will upset the market. So they went on their merry way 7 months ago believing they ought to slow down the American economy.

The next time you hear about this economic slowdown, understand it was engineered by the Federal Reserve Board. We need a balanced policy—not just the aggressive additional action—not just the 50 basis points a couple days ago—but aggressive additional action to put interest rates where they ought to be relative to the rate of inflation and stop overtaxing the American families by engineering the higher cost of credit they have caused in the last year and a half that is unjustifiable.

I very much hope we can continue an economy that produces the rewards of new jobs and new opportunities and hope for all Americans. We need a balanced fiscal policy and a balanced monetary policy to do that. The Fed controls monetary policy absolutely. We control fiscal policy. We will have, I assume, in a matter of weeks, people bringing to the floor of the Senate very significant proposals, as some say, $1.3 trillion or $1.5 trillion over the next 10 years, to respond to this very issue of an economic slowdown. Again, I say this slowdown was...
to the floor between now and 3:30. At that time, I will ask that the Senate vote on the organizing resolution. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I could be recognized at this point, I do want to say I was certainly willing to cooperate with that. I have asked if there is a Member who feels the necessity of a recorded vote. I have not been so notified. I want to make sure Members understand we anticipate there will be a voice vote. However, there will be opportunity for debate and a colloquy which Senator DASCHLE and I will have between now and 3:30.

So Members can have some idea of what to expect, we do expect to have the vote around 3:30. In the debate or comments that will need to be put in the Record, they can still be made after that. But between now and that time, we still have an opportunity for Members to present their statements on the Record.

Mr. DASCHLE. I know, again, 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. Mr. 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. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 3:30 and that it be a unanimous-consent request for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, and I will not object.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask the request be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is so vitiated.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could be recognized at this point, I do want to say I was certainly willing to cooperate with that. I have asked if there is a Member who feels the necessity of a recorded vote. I have not been so notified. I want to make sure Members understand we anticipate there will be a voice vote. However, there will be opportunity for debate and a colloquy which Senator DASCHLE and I will have between now and 3:30.

So Members can have some idea of what to expect, we do expect to have the vote around 3:30. In the debate or comments that will need to be put in the Record, they can still be made after that. But between now and that time, we still have an opportunity for Members to present their statements on the Record.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

CONDUCT OF A 50/50 SENATE

Mr. DASCHLE. The other day, I quoted the writer Thomas Wolfe who said: America is not only the place where miracles happen, they happen all the time.

If the resolution I will soon introduce is not miraculous, it is, at the very least, historic. It is also fair and reasonable. The details and the spirit of this agreement—of which I expect the Senate to pass later today, should enable us to conduct our Nation's first 50/50 Senate in a most productive and bipartisan manner.

I especially thank the Republican leader, Senator LOTT. We will enter into a colloquy in a period of time to be later determined, but I must say, without his leadership and his sense of basic fairness, this agreement would not have come about. He and I have spent many hours over the last several months, and now weeks, and certainly in the last several days, negotiating the details of this agreement. He spent many more hours consulting with the members of his caucus about it. He and I deserve credit for taking this unprecedented step.

I also thank and commend my colleagues on this side of the aisle for their good counsel and patience as this agreement was negotiated, and for their support of the finished product. I particularly thank our distinguished President pro tempore, ROBERT C. BYRD, for his advice. When you are making history, you can't have a better guide than the man who has literally written the book on the history of the Senate.

Our negotiations involve many difficult issues and many strongly held opinions. Neither party got everything it wanted. Both sides made concessions. Both caucuses made principled compromises. That is the essence of democracy.

This agreement accurately reflects the historic composition of the Senate. More important, I believe it reflects the political thinking of the American people. It calls for equal representation on Senate committees. Every committee would have the same number of Republicans and Democrats. And it specifies that Republicans will chair the committees after January 20. It allows for equal budgets and office space for both caucuses, at 50/50.

One of the most vexing questions we struggled with during our negotiations was how to break ties when committee votes are divided equally. We have agreed that in the event of a tie vote, either leader can move to discharge a bill or nomination. The other leader will then debate the motion to discharge for four hours, and that time will be equally divided. There will then be a vote on the motion. If the motion passes, the bill or nomination will be placed on the calendar.

Similarly, the resolution allows committee Chairs to discharge a subcommittee in the case of a tie vote and place the legislative item or nomination on the full committee agenda.

We arrived at this process after much thinking and exchange of ideas. Senator LOTT has been concerned that equal representation on the committees could lead to gridlock. While I do not share that concern, I believe this was a fair concession to get this agreement.

As to cloture, the resolution provides that no cloture resolution shall be filed by either party except to end a debate, and in no case would cloture be filed before at least 12 hours of debate.
This provision reflects concerns on our side of the aisle. We wanted to ensure that there would be an opportunity for debate before cloture was filed. Here, too, I believe Senator LOTT and the Republicans have provided a fair deal. The resolution provides that the majority leader shall retain his prerogative to obtain first right of recognition but that both leaders may be recognized, as is currently the case, to make motions to proceed; and in scheduling legislation on the floor, both leaders shall attempt to attain an equal balance of the interests of either of the two parties; and if either party achieves a true majority during the 107th Congress, we would need to adopt a new organizing resolution.

Senator LOTT and I have discussed other ways to ensure bipartisanship in the Senate, from the right to offer amendments to the makeup of conference committees. We have pledged to work hard to make the Senate operate in a fair and bipartisan manner, which I hope will enable us to demonstrate to the American people that their system of government is strong and sound.

I have been asked what bipartisanship will mean in the 107th Congress. We cannot quantify bipartisanship. Bipartisanship is not a mathematical formula; it is a spirit. It is a way of working together that tolerates open debate. It recognizes principled compromise—such as today's historic agreement. Bipartisanship means respecting the right of each Senator to speak his or her mind and vote his or her conscience. It means recognizing that we must do business differently after an election that gave us a 50/50 split between the parties.

Today's agreement makes a big downpayment on the bipartisanship we owe our country. Democrats and Republicans made significant concessions, putting the national interest first and putting party aside. It is my hope that my expectation will be witnessed only the beginning of a cooperative and productive 107th Congress. This certainly sets a mark.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wouldn't say this is my preferred result, but I think it is a reasonable one with a serious downside. We have work to do and we need to begin it now, not in a week or two or three or four. We need to conclude the assignment of our Members to the all important committees that will be having hearings on the nominees. We need to go forward with the confirmation hearings on the President's nominations to the Cabinet, not in 2 weeks or 3 weeks but right away, as soon as possible, as soon as the necessary paperwork has been completed and the hearings have agreed to by the senior members of the committees.

As soon as the Inauguration, we need to have in place a Secretary of the Treasury, a Secretary of State, a Secretary of Commerce—as many as we can get—so that this new administration will be ready to begin work the morning of Monday, January 22.

More important than these rules agreements or the organization resolution and the hearings of the nominees is, what are we going to do with it? What are we going to do about the concerns of the American people? Will we be able to come together and do what is necessary to preserve the quality, availability, accountability, and safety of our schools in America? I think we can.

But if we in this Chamber wrestle over first the rules—rules while they do make a difference, rules do affect substance—I think the American people will say: What is this talk of bipartisanship? Why aren't you coming together, agreeing on this, and moving to the agenda of education and dealing with the problems of our defense and the problems of our defense needs in America, dealing with the problem of readiness of the defense of our country, confronting the needs of our people on Medicare and what we are going to do about prescription drugs and Social Security reform?

That was a big item in this campaign. To the credit of our President-elect, George W. Bush, he had the courage to step up and say we need to take a look at this.

The last discussion I had with the Senator from New York, Mr. Pat Moynihan, in this aisle was what we should do about reforming Social Security, how it could be done, and just with two or three actions, we could secure Social Security for 70 years. By the way, he also talked about how he believes there should be some opportunity for individuals to invest some of that money. Social Security, Medicare, prescription drugs, defense, education, tax relief for work that keeps the economy growing—that is the agenda. We are going to have tough debates. We will have different approaches, but we will find a way to come together and get a result because the American people are expecting that of us—the Republicans, the Democrats, President George W. Bush, all of us.

I would prefer to have a clear advantage on every committee and a clear advantage number-wise on everything. While that would be preferable, it is not the reality. There are those in this Chamber who will not agree with me that we are going to support this resolution. There are those in this Chamber who probably will not agree with Senator Daschle that this is enough. Some will say it is too much; others will say it is not enough. Who is to say?

The day may come when we will say: Well, yes, we didn't do that right; we didn't secure some of the things that might happen or the way the rules might be used or abused. If that happens, then we will have to deal with it. Senator Daschle and I will have to go to the other side of this aisle or my side of the aisle and say: That is not in good faith. That is not what we intended. Or, when we make a mistake, change it. We have done that. One of the last actions we did this past session was to put back in place a rule dealing with scope coming out of conference that we changed a few years earlier. We finally realized it was not right, and we changed it.

What we have here, as difficult as it may make life for us, as difficult as it may be for our committee members and our chairmen and ranking members to make this situation work, it is going to require additional work, but it can be done. It is going to require us to work together more than we have in the past. No doubt. I do not think that is bad. I think this is a framework for bipartisanship. There has been a lot of talk about that word, and I am sure there are some people in this city, in this Chamber, who smirk at that, laugh at that. People across America are saying: I have heard enough of that; let's get some results here.

It is a framework to see if we really mean it. It can force us to live up to the truth and best meaning of that word—nonpartisanship, Americanship, that is what we ought to call it—to find a way to get to these issues.

The President has repeatedly talked about how he is going to be a uniter, not a divider; he is going to reach out. Be conservative, yes; he was elected because he is, but he also is compassionate about the Government.

The Government can be involved and helpful in certain areas. It can be a big problem in a lot of others. I guess I am of the school that follows the latter part of that more than the former, but there are clearly some roles for the Federal Government. I do not have to list them—defense, national transportation, health care concerns in America. This is America. We cannot leave any child behind. We cannot leave any mother or grandmother unattended. We have to work together on this to do something about those serious problems.

We should follow the President-elect. Shouldn't we follow him? He has laid down a marker. He has talked about coming together and getting results. Shouldn't we do less than that?
If it does not work, then the American people will see. If these 50/50 committees do not function, then we can talk about obstructionism, and one way or the other, the American people will know who is trying to make it work and who is stalling it. If we come to this floor and have a debate on a tax bill and it passes this Senate by whatever number and does not get to conference or is tied up in conference or is killed in conference, do you think the American people are going to stand for that? I do not think so. We cannot let that happen.

I have been here 28 years, in the House and Senate. I was here during the eighties. I watched Speaker Tip O'Neill; I had quite a relationship with him. On the floor, we fought like tigers. I even had his words taken down one time. He never uttered a word to me about that. He never held it against me. Privately, he could not have been any friendlier.

In instance after instance, even though he controlled the Rules Committee, he had the power to stop the Reagan agenda. He did not do it. He would not do it. He said: No, this is the President. He was elected. He has a right to do what he wishes, for or against, and voted on. And the Speaker fought him like a tiger.

I remember going to former Congressman—the Senator from Texas was there—Ralph Hall from Texas. I stood on the Democratic side of the aisle, and the Speaker came up and said: Ralph, you can't vote for this Reagan budget. I said to my friend, Ralph—actually, it was Sam Hall, not Ralph. Ralph Hall is a good man also.

Mr. GRAMM. That was the deciding vote.

Mr. LOTT. Sam, this is a chance where you can make a difference for history. We can control spending some, we can give the people a little tax relief in a way that will help the economy grow.

He stood there with the two of us looking at him, took out his voting card, stuck it in the box, and voted for it. That required an act of courage. Did the Speaker get mad at him? Did the Speaker rough him up or punish him? No. He said: I am going to fight you, President Reagan, but as two good Irishmen, we will get together at the end of the day, we will have a good discussion, we will have a little fun, and we will talk about America.

That is what is going to happen here. There will not be obstructionism. If there is, it will be clear who is doing it, if it is on our side, one way or the other, or on the other side. This is not a prescription for inaction. It could be a prescription for action beyond our wildest imaginations.

We are going to talk a little bit more about what is in it. I will not go into all the details here. The resolution will be relatively simple. In instance after instance, Senator DASCHLE and I discussed points, argued about points. When we could not come to agreement, we said we would deal with the rules as they are. So we got it down to what really matters.

Yes, we are going to have 50/50 on the committees, but remember the Senate is 51/49. I wish it were 50/50. The Constitution very clearly provides for this. Our forefathers were brilliant. They were brilliant. They could not have seen this exact situation, and while it is not unprecedented, it is rare that we have had these ties of 50/50, or if it was one time 49/50, maybe one time 38/38. It has been relatively rare in 200 years, but they provided for this. It is in the Constitution. Senator BYRD carries his around. Mine is not quite as tattered as his, but I have referred to it quite a few times in my life.

Article 1, section 3:

The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote. When the Senate is equally divided, the Vice President shall have a vote to break the tie. That is the solution. If it is 50/50, the Vice President breaks the tie. It is equally divided. We will have a way to deal with it.

My concern about doing 50/50 was: It just cannot work. Senator DASCHLE did say that. He was very clear and candid. If we have a tie voting on a bill in the subcommittee or in the full committee, there has to be a way to have that matter considered by the full Senate. Do my colleagues think if we had a Supreme Court nominee killed on a tie vote in the Judiciary Committee that the American people would stand for that or that the full Senate would be satisfied with that? No.

So we labored and we labored, and we tried a lot of different innovative ideas—some I suggested, some Senator DASCHLE suggested—and most or all of them were not liked by both caucuses. Neither side liked them.

We finally came up with what I think is a further extrapolation of what the Constitution provides, and that is, if there is a tie by a unique procedure, a discharge petition, a superdischarge petition, if you want to call it that, a discharge action, the matter could be brought to the floor, debated, yes, but not blocked on a unanimous consent request, not filibustered, but to get it on the calendar, whether it is the Legislative or Executive Calendar. At that point, all the rules of the Senate apply. When we go forward from there, all rights and prerogatives are preserved. It could be vetoed.

A lot of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, when I talked about what the rules already were, were shocked. Most people do not realize you can filibuster a Federal judge. Sure, you can filibuster. We have over the last year the Democratic side filibustered, and then they said: Oops, we don't think that is a good idea; that is not something we want to start doing around here, and backed away from it. We did; they did. We are going to fix that. The rider is there.

On bills, sure, you can filibuster the motion to proceed, you can object to this, that, or the other filibuster the bill. Nothing has changed on that. It will still be protected. I think we should try to find a way to do less of that, less filling up of the tree, no filling up of the tree, if at all possible. I do not think that is making that practice, and I want to make it clear, and I will clarify it even later.

We should not have situations where we filibuster every bill and have to file cloture in every instance. We ought to have a full and fair debate on both sides and move on and have a vote. We can do that.

Different times call for different actions. Last year is history. It was an election year. It was an unusual election year. It rendered an unusual result. What are we going to do with it? Are we going to make this Republic work and produce for the people or are we going to argue over part B of rule XII of the Senate? It is important; I do not think it is that important. What the American people expect more of us than that. This resolution may haunt me, but it is fair, and it will allow us to go on with the people's business. I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho sought recognition first, and I will allow him to be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will be brief. Others of our colleagues have come to the floor. The hour is late and snow is falling.

We gather here today in the full recognition that elections have consequences. There is no question that the November election changed the character, the makeup of the Senate. We have heard now both of our leaders talk about the agonizing effort they have gone through in several weeks to understand the consequence in light of the rules of the Senate and the way we must govern in the coming months.

I am not quite sure if we can yet determine whether the glass is half full or whether the glass is half empty, but we know that somewhere right about at the middle, it is divided, and that it is in that division we must work out our differences to govern. That is what our leaders have to do.

The resolution before us this afternoon speaks to that line that we are attempting to draw and that we as Senators are attempting to understand. I would tell you what I believe the election meant, but I am not quite sure that my opinion is any more accurate than anyone else's.

But I do know one thing that the American people will expect of us in the coming months. They will expect us to give a new President an opportunity to lead. They will expect us to allow a new President to form his Cabinet in the way he has chosen, for the
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. When we go 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. 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 to know that Senator DORGAN and I 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. DOMENICI. I would like to reserve 10, 15 minutes, let’s say.

Mr. DASCHLE. How much time—

Mr. GRAMM. Ten.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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 BAYH 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 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 given some exasperating 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 B. 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 and 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.

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 of the Senate 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 have worked as a 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, Senator Byrd, Senator Russell, Senator McClellan, Senator Ellender, Senator Hatfield, Senator Stennis.

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 speaking 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 Siade 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.

Senator Russell has excelled as a chairman by 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 truly from the start 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. S050 tie; trust; mutual 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. S050 tie; trust; mutual respect and trust. That is the way it has always been, and that is the way it is always going to be.
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 interest 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 see his programs succeed, he is going to have to have help. He can’t depend on all of it 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 encourage 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 knots. But there is a spirit of goodwill from time to time. There will be others on this side.
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I was told it goes. That is friendship, right? But, listen, if you remember, 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—Mr. DASCHLE—was trying 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 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 51-49. 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 he has done.

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, how 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 twice and talked with today at length about the Budget Committee—but I am not sure it will work—I am going to try to work with everybody, understand what 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 twice and talked with today at length about the Budget Committee—but I am not sure it will work—I am going to try to work with everybody, understand what 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.

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 the other committee work. Some of it will end up in our committees that have very philosophical, very partisan overtones. We will try to meld 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 want to be able 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 think they are legitimate. They are concerned 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 in this 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 an uncalled-for precedent process. With a 50-50 membership split, we have to proceed in a bipartisan fashion or we are not going to proceed.

I thank and pat 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. We have finished chairman 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 2 years and more as 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 then 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 Robert Dole 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 have the amendments 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 this 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 consequences of government 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 for any kind of holdover.

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 have the right to it.

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 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, as 75 percent of the Senate are not here, there was a unanimous consent request propounded successfully. 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. The Republicans have the 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 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. The Republicans have the 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 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. BENNETT. 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 came into it even, 50/50. This time, the Democrats have the advantage. So I, for one, would probably be arguing exactly the same way.

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 right to a nuclear weapon.

I would probably be arguing 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 right to a nuclear weapon.
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 goes 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. My good friend from West Virginia, or my good friend, Mr. OTT, for assuming the chair. I as a member of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI and I have already said, it is a special day for me. 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 and my friend 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, I would like 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 permitted to be absent for a few minutes.

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

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

We have had a challenge to make it work. We have said that 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 arrangement, 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. I 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 clear, under our Constitution, that under the Constitution and 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 has always been one of 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 teaching and working with 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 clear, under our Constitution, that under the Constitution and 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 has always been one of 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 teaching and working with them in this Chamber, and it is their decision that has determined the result.

What I mean by that is what I have just had the opportunity to share with 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 OTT, 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. 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 almost daily.

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, and we would have spent our time in 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 is 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 the 50/50 Senate 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 illusion. 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. I 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 Constitution 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 will be set forth 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 special committees chaired—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 are 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 are able to work 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 independence of the President who is on the floor, we 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 in this case, which is the mother of 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 think it 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 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 distributed with an equal number 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 lev-
els; and that the Chairman of a full com-
mittee may discharge a subcommittee of any
Legislative 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 ra-
tions shall remain in effect for the remainder of the 107th Congress, except that if at any time during the 107th Congress either party attains the majority 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 resolu-
tion 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 com-
mittee 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 ex-
ceptions listed above, the following ad-
ditional Standing Orders shall be in effect for the 107th Congress:

(1) If a committee has not reported a legislative item 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 and Minority Leaders, may, only after consultation with the Chair-
man 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 stated. Provided, That fol-
lowing the use or yielding back of time, a vote occur on the motion to discharge, with-
out any intervening action, motion, or de-ate. If it be placed immediately on the Calendar of Business (in the case of legislation) or the Executive Cal-
dendar (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 an cloture motion to be made on an amendable item during its first 12 hours of Senate debate: Provided, That all other pro-
visions of Executive Calendar items remain in stat-
te.

(3) Both Leaders shall seek to attain an equal balance of the interests of the two par-
ties when scheduling and debating legisla-
tive 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 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 Sen-
a 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. I first made 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 Pre-
sident, the Senator from Haw-
i, Mr. Akaka, who is, in my opinion, Mr. Civility in the Senate. I have stated the past that what is vitally important for us to be success-
ful 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 be-
cause it is difficult for me to see how two people can drive a car at the same time or have their hands on the steer-
ing wheel at the same time.

Also, the way I look at the prece-
dents of the Senate, it is not con-
sistent. When the Senate was organized on January 7, 1953, there was an equal number—the Senate was equally di-
vided 48-48, with 48 Republicans and 47 Democrats; the Independent was con-
vening with the Democrats, I think. The resolution said there was an equal-
ly divided Senate, and the Senate was organized on January 7, 1953, there was an equal division of 15 committees.

I am troubled by breaking the prece-
dents of the Senate. I think it is impor-
tant that we work together. I com-
plain about the leaders because they have been working together. It is incumbent upon us to make this work.

Not everybody is happy with the res-
olution, 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 suc-
cessful. It is not a test that I will cer-
tainly commit to do everything I can to make it successful.

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

There being no objection, the mate-
rial was ordered to be printed in the Rec-
ord, 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 Administra-
tion, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 18) proposing changes in the number of certain standing committees, having consid-
ered same, report thereon favorably with an amendment, and recommend that the resolu-
tion, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

This resolution would accomplish the fol-
lowing 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 stand-
ing 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 this minority.)

This will present the following committee pic-
ture:

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

The proposal

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

2. Makes committee size more nearly reflect committee workload and thereby ad-
justs 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 min-
um 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 Sena-
ators.

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 serv-
ices.

4. It disposes no one, but has distinct ad-
dvantages for majority and minority.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I sug-
gest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question, to recess, be dispensed with.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

ORGANIZING A 50/50 SENATE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I join the number of colleagues who have spoken on the floor with respect to this agreement. I share both the respect and admiration that have been expressed for the leadership for the work they have done in order to bring us here.

Particularly, I know the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. LOTT, worked hard within his caucus and had to be particularly persuasive in order to reach this accord.

I think this agreement respects the outcome of the election this year. It is a reflection of the closeness of the division in the Presidential race. It is, in my judgment, an accurate reflection of what happened in the Senate itself with the losses that took place on one side of the aisle and a result that ended up with 50 Senators in both parties.

I have argued since day one that the only fair way, and the only sensible way, to try to bring the country together and set the stage to be able to reach the compromises we needed to reach was to reflect the representation of the Senate as a whole in the committee structures.

Some on the other side argued for some period of time that that is not the way it should work. We heard some people talking a few moments ago about, if you are responsible for driving the train, you then need the extra vote in order to be able to guarantee that you can drive the train.

The problem with that argument all along is, that is not what the representation of the Senate itself reflects.

The second problem with the argument is that it relied essentially on the notion that, by having an extra vote, you somehow have an added power beyond the power of compromise, beyond the power of logic, beyond the power of the majority. Your argument, that you have a power of the extra votes simply to drive your will through. We have seen that in operation in the last few years in the Senate, frankly. I think for many of us it has been a very negative experience.

The last few years saw us avoiding the rules of the Senate in order to drive through by virtue of the fact that there were more votes on one side. In the end, you may be unable to do that on occasion, whether it is the reconciliation rules that allow you to do that, or it is a particular conference rule, or the Rule XXVIII issues we have had over the last years. Those allowed you to do it.

But I know the distinguished Senator from West Virginia would give the most eloquent argument in the Senate for the fact that that didn't necessarily serve the interests of the Senate nor even the interests of the country.

What we have achieved today I believe stands to set the stage for the ability of the Senate to serve the interests of the country.

Is there a standing of a sense of loss for some by virtue of this agreement? I think yes. I think that is reflected in the sort of difficulty that was presented in getting here to this moment. But in the end, I think the logic was simply so powerful that 50/50 on both sides means you divide the Senators and their committees according to that number.

I admire and respect the Senator from Texas, who is one of the brightest and most articulate people in the Senate and who read from the Constitution about the powers of the Vice President to cast a vote to break a tie. Indeed, that is absolutely true. But I think most constitutional experts would tell you this is in fact the power of last resort—that it never contemplated that the Vice President of the United States is somehow going to be represented on every single committee, and then he is going to go to each committee and cast a vote. Where is the tie and ultimately there is the inability of the Senate to work its will of compromise, that in that case the Vice President has the ability to cast his vote. Now the Vice President will still have that ability. That is respected in this agreement.

What this agreement achieves, which I think is perhaps the most important missing ingredient of the Senate, was reflected in the comments of the Senator from West Virginia, our former colleague, who turned to his colleague on the Appropriations Committee and talked about trust. He talked about respect. Those chairmen of either party who sides means you divide the Senators and their committees according to that number.

I hope in the next days the American people will see the Senate set the example we all want, and I know we can.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. He is a Senator of enormous ability and great talents. One of those talents is the capability of eloquence in such an impressive and persuasive manner. I want to thank him for his words today.

The President-elect can be very grateful to the two leaders of this body today and to the Senators who have accommodated the needs and the requirements of the moment to give up a little; everyone gives up a little. We are waiving some rules; we are temporarily changing some rules in this resolution. In the interests of going forward in the Nation and in the interests of making it possible for this institution to rise to the expectations of the American people and accede to their will, this resolution is really a unique instrument.
As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has just said, this resolution makes it possible for the Senate to work its will; and achieve legislative goals; it only makes it possible. We, the Members on both sides of the aisle, have to make it work. I am constrained to hope—yes, even believe—that we are going to make it work. The things I have heard said on this floor today make me believe that.

I thank the distinguished Senator. I have known him for a long time. I thank him for his contribution today.

Mr. President, if I may speak just for a few minutes, I ask unanimous consent I may address the Senate on another matter for not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on December 31st the Nation lost a remarkable man.

At his home in Los Altos, California, lands-end of the Nation and State he served, Alan Cranston did not witness the beginning of the new millennium. It has been said that death is the great leveler. But Alan Cranston's accomplishments in life have clearly set him apart.

Nearly seven decades ago, a young American journalist from California published an unexpurgated version of Adolf Hitler's "Mein Kampf"—"My Struggle"—revealing, as few had previously done, the true depth of the danger and the evil that Hitler embodied. Hitler successfully sued for copyright violation, and Alan Cranston wore that violation, and Alan Cranston wore that landmark. In 1980, Senator Cranston was the first nation to sign the Treaty. To date, 160 nations have signed it and 69 have ratified it, including all our NATO allies, Japan, South Korea and Russia. However, to enter into force, it must be ratified by 44 specified nations that have nuclear reactors, including the United States.

The Treaty would prohibit all nuclear explosive tests. In so doing, it would make it much harder for nations to develop nuclear weapons, thus putting in place an important roadblock to nuclear weapon proliferation. The treaty provides for an expanded and improved international monitoring system that would improve our ability to detect and deter nuclear tests by other nations—but only if we ratify the treaty and it enters into force.

Secretary of Defense Cohen and the Joint Chiefs of Staff all support ratification of the CTBT, as do four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including General Shalikashvili and Gen. Colin Powell.

When the Senate took up the CTBT in October 1999, it did so in haste and without the traditional bipartisan deliberation we have accorded other arms control treaties. On the eve of the vote, 62 Senators signed a letter urging the Senate leadership to delay that vote and to postpone final consideration of the CTBT until the 107th Congress. Unfortunately, that request, which was made by nearly two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, to delay the vote, was not heeded, and the result was that the resolution of ratification was defeated by a vote of 51-48, with one Senator voting present.

Again, General Shalikashvili was asked to review the entire situation, and in conducting his review, he met with a number of Senators from both sides of the aisle to discuss their concerns and their suggestions. He also met with many other experts on this issue, and he visited the nuclear weapons labs.

General Shalikashvili's report is a valuable contribution to a vitally important topic. This report, which was just filed today, places the CTBT in the broader context of our nuclear non-proliferation goals and efforts and
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points out that the CTBT is an important component of this enduring national security priority of non-proliferation. He concludes that the CTBT remains in our national interest and that the Senate should re-consider the bipartisan position, hopefully with the result that ratification is approved by the Senate.

General Shalikashvili’s report reviews the major concerns which were expressed about the CTBT during our debates and recommendations in each of these areas, including ways to improve our monitoring and verification of foreign nuclear testing efforts and ways to improve our nuclear weapons Stockpile Stewardship Program. These recommendations address concerns raised about the CTBT and provide some commonsense and balanced steps to improve our security while bringing the CTBT into force.

Specifically, General Shalikashvili’s report examines the larger non-proliferation context of the CTBT and concludes that the CTBT has a genuine nonproliferation value for our national security. His report studies the question of monitoring and verification and concludes that the monitoring system under the CTBT is necessary if there is to be a significant new safeguard for U.S. national monitoring capabilities and that cheating will be much harder and less useful than some fear. He evaluates our ability to maintain the safety and reliability of our nuclear deterrent and determines that it can do so without nuclear testing if we fully support the Stockpile Stewardship Program and manage it prudently.

Finally, General Shalikashvili’s report looks at the question of whether CTBT should be of indefinite duration and recommends that in addition to the safeguards accompanying the treaty, the Senate and the executive branch should conduct a joint review of the treaty 10 years after ratification and a new review thereafter.

One of the key points made by General Shalikashvili is that the CTBT is conditioned on a safeguard that will assure our ability to maintain a safe and reliable stockpile. Under safeguard F, the United States would maintain the right and the ability to withdraw from the treaty and to conduct any testing necessary if that was required to certify the safety and reliability of a nuclear weapon type critical to our nuclear deterrent. Shalikashvili’s recommendation on the joint review would strengthen this safeguard by saying that if, after that joint review, grave doubts remained about the treaty’s value for our national security, the President would be prepared to withdraw from the treaty.

I know General Shalikashvili’s report will be considered carefully and seriously by the Senate and by the new administration. I hope we and the new administration will review his report in a deliberate manner, and I will be making this point personally to President-elect Bush next Monday at a meeting in Austin for congressional defense and security leaders.

We owe General Shalikashvili a national debt of gratitude for serving our Nation and its security once again. He has taken a great deal of his time since retiring from the Joint Chiefs and to craft recommendations that I hope we will implement. I recommend his report to all Senators and to the new administration, and I hope we will reconsider the treaty in the best bipartisan spirit of the Senate as his report recommends.

I ask unanimous consent that General Shalikashvili’s letter to the President, accompanying his report, and his introduction and recommendations from the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPECIAL ADVISOR TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Hon. WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON, President of the United States, The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last year, you and the Secretary of State requested that I serve as your Special Advisor for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. In this capacity, I met with senators from both sides of the aisle to discuss their concerns and suggestions for any additional steps that could be taken to build bipartisan support for ratification. I believe that America’s leadership is的责任 to engage in serious, substantive discussions about the Test Ban Treaty.

In addition to talking with senators, I have also discussed the treaty with senior members of your administration, leading national security experts from former administrations, representatives of non-governmental organizations, and numerous scientific and diplomatic experts. I have visited the three nuclear weapon laboratories, met with their directors, and talked with a number of senior nuclear designers. My representatives have traveled to the Air Force Technical Applications Center, which operates U.S. national technical means for monitoring compliance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and to Vienna, where work is underway on the international verification system. I asked several think tanks to provide a “second opinion” about verification and the treaty’s impact on other countries’ nuclear ambitions. I have also reviewed numerous reports by external expert groups.

At the end of my review of the treaty’s potential impact on U.S. national security, I support the treaty, just as I did when I served as your personal representative across the joint Chiefs of Staff. My discussions over the last ten months have only strengthened my view that the treaty is a very important part of global non-proliferation efforts and is compatible with keeping a safe, reliable U.S. nuclear deterrent. I believe that an objective and thorough net assessment shows convincingly that U.S. interests, as well as those of friends and allies, will be served by the Treaty’s entry into force.

The nation’s nuclear arsenal is safe, reliable, and able to meet military requirements. For as far into the future as we can see, the U.S. nuclear deterrent can remain effective under the Test Ban Treaty, with vigilant monitoring and verification. The treaty is not a substitute for improvements in the survivability and reliability of our deterrent force.

For as far into the future as we can see, the nation will be able to maintain a safe, reliable, and effective deterrent if we move forward with the treaty.

I have taken a great deal of my time since retiring from the Joint Chiefs and to craft recommendations that I hope we will implement. I recommend his report to all Senators and to the new administration, and I hope we will reconsider the treaty in the best bipartisan spirit of the Senate as his report recommends.

I ask unanimous consent that General Shalikashvili’s letter to the President, accompanying his report, and his introduction and recommendations from the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

(By General John M. Shalikashvili, USA, Ret.)

I. INTRODUCTION

A decade after the end of the Cold War, nuclear weapons are still important to U.S. and allied security, a silent giant guarding against a catastrophic miscalculation by a proliferating adversary. America has the safest, most reliable, most capable arsenal of nuclear weapons in the world. It will
need a credible deterrent as long as nuclear weapons exist. Equally important to our security are global non-proliferation efforts. For the past half century, the United States has led the campaign to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries or terrorist groups, and to reduce the chances that such weapons would ever be used.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty places obstacles in the path of nuclear weapon development by states that could some day threaten the United States or its allies. The question associated with Treaty ratification is whether the security benefits from the Treaty outweigh any risks that additional nuclear explosions could pose to the U.S. deterrent.
Four types of concerns have been most prominent in the debate on advice and consent to ratification in October 1999 and in my subsequent investigations:

1. Whether the Test Ban Treaty has genuine non-proliferation value;
2. Whether cheating could threaten U.S. security;
3. Whether we can maintain the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear deterrent without nuclear explosive testing;
4. Whether it is wise to endorse a Test Ban Treaty of indefinite duration.

After examining these issues, I remain convinced that the advantages of the Test Ban Treaty outweigh any disadvantages, and thus that ratification would increase national security. For these reasons, I am recommending additional actions to address concerns and further strengthen the U.S. position under the Treaty. I believe that we can obtain a level of sustained bipartisan attention equal to their high importance for national security.

The broad objectives of my specific recommendations are to:

A. Increase bipartisan and allied support for a carefully coordinated comprehensive non-proliferation strategy;
B. Enhance U.S. capabilities to detect and deter nuclear testing and other aspects of nuclear proliferation;
C. Improve the management of potential risks associated with the long-term reliability and safety of the U.S. deterrent; and
D. Address concerns about the Test Ban Treaty's indefinite duration through a joint Executive-Legislative review of the Treaty's net value for national security to be held ten years after ratification and at regular intervals thereafter.

Test Ban Treaty supporters, skeptics, and opponents all agree that the United States needs to revitalize support for an integrated non-proliferation strategy, enhance its monitoring and verification capabilities, and develop a bipartisan consensus on stewardship of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. I urge early implementation of my recommendations to address concerns and further strengthen the U.S. position under the Treaty.

As part of its efforts to build bipartisan and allied support for an integrated non-proliferation policy, the next Administration should:
A. Review the highest level issues related to the Treaty and its implementation to ensure that senators' questions and concerns on these issues of great importance to national security.
B. The United States should continue its monitoring moratorium and take other concrete steps to prepare for inspections and develop confidence-building measures.

Additional steps should be taken unilaterally or bilaterally to increase transparency regarding the nature of the United States' purpose of activities at known nuclear test sites.

Stewardship of the United States Nuclear Stockpile

A. Working with the Department of Defense, other Executive Branch agencies, and the states, the Administration should:
B. Develop a consensus on the Stockpile Stewardship Program's priorities, assessments, and plans.
C. Information sharing and analysts should be accelerated for new verification technologies and analytical techniques.
D. The United States should continue working with other Test Ban Treaty signatories to propose, develop, and oversee implementation of U.S. non-proliferation strategy.

E. Strict discipline should be exercised over changes to existing nuclear weapon designs to ensure that neither an individual nation nor the collective effort of small states could modify existing nuclear weapon designs to make it difficult to certify weapons reliability or safety without a nuclear explosion.

F. The Administrator of the NNSA should establish an on-going high level external advisory mechanism, such as a panel of outstanding and independent scientists.

Minimizing Uncertainty with a Treaty of Indefinite Duration

A. The Administration and the Senate should commit to conducting an intensive joint review of the Test Ban Treaty's net value for national security ten years after U.S. ratification, and at ten-year intervals thereafter.
B. The review should consider the Stockpile Stewardship Program's priorities, assessments, and plans.
C. Information sharing and analysts should be accelerated for new verification technologies and analytical techniques.
D. The United States should continue working with other Test Ban Treaty signatories to propose, develop, and oversee implementation of U.S. non-proliferation strategy.
E. The Administration should implement on an urgent basis an integrated non-proliferation policy targeted on, but not limited to, countries and groups believed to have an active interest in stockpile stewardship matters, such as the revitalization of the Nuclear Weapons Council, are essential and should be continued.
F. Appropriate steps should be taken to ensure that the performance margins of various weapon types are adequate when considered by independent scientists.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY REPORT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John M. Shalikashvili, released his report reviewing the major issues regarding ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) which was rejected by the Senate in a vote last fall. His review of the broad debate in the Senate over this critical matter of national security is thorough in its scope and balanced in its recommendations. I urge President Bush and the President Bush and Senate security advisory team to review General Shalikashvili’s report closely and undertake to address his observations and recommendations immediately.

When it comes to the proliferation or improvement of nuclear weapons, time is NOT on our side. The CTBT, when ratified and in force, will discourage non-nuclear weapons states from creating their own nuclear arsenals and prevent current nuclear states from building new capabilities that can endanger American and international security. The hearings held in the Senate last fall, although not nearly as comprehensive as they should have been,
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did serve to articulate issues of greatest concern to those who are uncertain or opposed to the treaty.

Those issues must be addressed head-on in order for the nation to proceed in a bipartisan way regarding further consideration of the Treaty. The international community of nations is watching us closely to see what direction the United States will choose to take. In his report, General Shalikashvili has identified the key controversial issues and calls for specific solutions to meet primary concerns before the President and the Senate reconsider the Treaty.

President-elect Bush has clearly stated that he seeks to unify the country and is committed to enhancing our national security. Given the divisions in the electorate and in the Congress itself, the challenge of gaining bipartisan support on key legislative matters including defense matters is a daunting one for the new administration.

Given the outstanding work of General Shalikashvili in reviewing last year's debate on the CTBT, President-elect Bush has a very important opportunity to pursue bipartisan national security policy by committing to review General Shalikashvili's thoughtful and to undertake the recommendations he has put forward. As a member of the bipartisan Senate working group that has been examining the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support General Shalikashvili's efforts on this critical national security matter.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

JOSH HEUPEL RECOGNIZED FOR LEADING TEAM TO NATIONAL COLLEGE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Josh Heupel, a native of Aberdeen, South Dakota who led the undefeated Oklahoma Sooners to the National Championship January 3, 2001.

Josh and the number one ranked Sooners beat the Florida State Seminoles 13-2 in the FedEx Orange Bowl in Miami.

Although the game was a defensive struggle, Josh was able to complete 25 passes for 214 yards and also ran for another 24 yards. In the third quarter, Josh may have made the biggest play of the game when he made a crucial, 39-yard completion that kept the drive going to set up the second field goal of the game. That field goal gave the Sooners a 6-0 advantage.

Josh showed his true character after finishing second in the Heisman Trophy race. He explained that while he was disappointed, the only trophy he truly wanted was the National Championship because that represented the accomplishments of his team, not an individual. On Wednesday night he was able to accomplish his dream. That selfless attitude is characteristic of Josh, not only on the gridiron, but in life as well. He is well known for his devotion to his family, particularly as a role model for his younger sister, Andrea. He gives his time freely to charities and to work in his church. In fact, the field goal that he kicked himself was transformed into a community-wide charity fundraising event in Josh's hometown of Aberdeen by his friends and family.

Ken and Cindy Heupel are Josh's parents and they can be very proud of their son's accomplishments, both as a football player and as a caring member of society. Ken is the head football coach at Northern State and Cindy is the principal at Aberdeen Central High School.

From all South Dakotans, I want to wish Josh a heartfelt congratulations. Although you have already proven that you are a true champion with the volunteer work and the community service, I also wish you the opportunity to take home the championship hardware.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL CAREY

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont is fortunate that it still has at least one major radio station that has not forgotten its connection to the community. This station is WDEV from the town of Waterbury.

It is only a few miles from each other and raised in Winooski and and I have known the Squire family who owns the station throughout my life. It is presently owned and run by Ken Squire, who carries on the family tradition of representing Vermont first and foremost. Part of that tradition has been the long running "Wake Up Vermont." The program was done by Michael Carey and Eric Michaels and was one of the finest radio programs in Vermont.

Eric Michaels has a great ability as an interviewer on even the most complex of subjects, and Michael Carey added a sense of continuity and comfort to the program. Between the two of them had an enjoyable way to start the day. I was saddened, as were most Vermonters, to hear that Michael Carey is retiring. I have known Mike for years and always enjoyed meeting with him, either at the studio in Waterbury or over the phone when I would be on their program from Washington, D.C.

Eric Michaels said he will be devastated by the loss of his radio partner and I can well imagine he is, but I am thankful that Eric will remain.

I was just where to take this opportunity to say how much Michael Carey has meant to Vermonters and how his sacrifice in getting up in the wee hours of the morning made it possible for rest of us to face the day.

I want to thank the people of Washington County for being such a very fine citizen of that most competent broadcasters he's ever met. Michael can technically run a show while not missing a beat as an announcer. He's an absolutely wonderful news reader," said Michaels of his co-host.

VERMONT RADIO LEGEND RETIRES

(Waterbury, Vermont) — A radio personality whose reliability co-workers say was unmatched, Michael Carey, 53, is retiring because of health reasons and, despite a last show dedicated to Carey and his many attributes, it was a sad day for him and for central Vermont radio.

"It's a retirement that's been forced upon me and not one that I'm looking forward to. I loved the profession and that's what makes it doubly hard," said Carey, who shirked at the attention surrounding him, calling his profession just a profession.

Carey's profession began at an early age, and none he said he never expected to have.

At age 13, from his parents' apartment on Elm Street in Waterbury, Carey had an illegal radio station. He played records and read the weather, until a WDEV employee, Norman James, heard Carey and though he'd put the illegal endeavor to some good use, Carey said.

Carey got a job answering phones for a WDEV Saturday night request program called "The Green Mountain Ballroom."

"Norm James got my foot in the door," said Carey, whose name was already familiar to those at the Waterbury radio station.

Carey's late parents, guitarist Morton "Smokey" Carey and singer Lois Carey, used to perform each morning on WDEV, said radio station owner Ken Squire.

Carey himself was later well known as the drummer in the popular "Carey Brothers Band" that entertained throughout the area in the 1970s.

In 1965, the radio pirate turned student worker was hired as a full-time announcer at WDEV by legendary Vermont radio personality and former "Wake Up, Vermont" host Rusty Parker, who died on the air in 1982 while reading the news.

Once his start in the '60s, Carey said, "I've done every shift here at the radio station except a Sunday night shift."

During that time, "there had been memories with very good people," Carey said, listing Parker's death and the death of "Cousin" Harold Grout as two of the worst.

Two years after Parker's death, in 1984, Carey was promoted to sign-on the station and host the morning program, including "Once Around the Clock." From 5 to 6 a.m. "The Morning News Service" from 7 to 8 a.m.

When Grout died, Carey became the voice of the long-running "Trading Post" program. Carey was teamed with radio group Vice President and General Manager Eric Michaels for a 6 to 9 a.m. morning news program that quickly became known as "Wake Up, Vermont with Michael and Michaels."

"From the first day we were in the studio together we felt like we had worked with each other for a long time," said Michaels. "He can read me like a book."

"So I'm devastated (that Carey's retiring), if you want to put it in a single word. It's like getting a divorce," Michael's said.

Michaels praised Carey as one of the most competent broadcasters he's ever met. Michael can technically run a show while not missing a beat as an announcer. He's an absolutely wonderful news reader," said Michaels of his co-host.
Carey was rarely flustered.

"Doesn't matter if it was a snowstorm and floods, he could always rise to the occasion." Squier said, "That is his strength."

Bad weather and flooding once closed the Waterbury station and after a 20-minute delay, Michael and Michaels went on-air at a nearby studio that was so cold their lips stuck to the microphones. Carey was unfazed, said Michaels.

And one stormy day, it took Michaels over two hours to drive from Barre to Waterbury: "I called the whole program in by phone," said Michaels, who all the while was guided by reliable Carey, sitting comfortably at the station and casually chatting with Michaels over the phone.

With Carey’s retirement, Michaels will continue on with "Wake Up, Vermont." The "Michael and Michaels," portion of the name will be dropped, and another WDEV radio announcer will fill in for Carey while the radio station searches for a replacement.

"It’s been the most reluctant job search that I’ve ever had to do," Michaels said.

While the job search will stretch beyond Vermont’s borders, Squier said he is committed to keeping the morning broadcast a "Vermont sound."

"I think all of central Vermont will miss him," Squier said. "He was a steady hand for listeners." Carey said he may come back at some point and do part-time work but, for now, that’s not possible.

The Duxbury resident and father of three who for decades has awoken at 3 a.m., said he will be "trying to get back to a normal life."

"Just some R and R, rest and relaxation, getting on the computer and trying to do some things. Just keeping active and doing stuff," said Carey of his plans.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. LOTT):
S. Res. 8. A resolution relative to Senate procedure in the 107th Congress; considered and agreed to.

SENATE RESOLUTION 8—RELATIVE TO SENATE PROCEDURE IN THE 107TH CONGRESS

Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. LOTT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

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 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 investigative quotas to be determined by the Rules Committee, with the total administrative expenses allocation for all committees not to exceed historic levels; and that the majority 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 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 said committee 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 any intervening action, motion, or debate, and the committee chairmanships shall be held by the party which has attained a majority of the whole number of Senators.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, to ensure 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 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 interest 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 take up any item.

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

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, AND MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recesses today, stand in recess until 12:45 p.m. Saturday, January 6, that immediately following the prayer and pledge, the Senate proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session; that at the close of the joint session, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon Monday, January 8, 2001; that at the close of business Monday, the Senate stand in recess until 3:00 p.m. Saturday, January 20, as provided under the provisions of H. Con. Res. 1.

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

RECESS UNTIL 12:45 P.M.

TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:17 p.m., recessed until Saturday, January 6, 2001, at 12:45 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 5, 2001:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ISLAM A. SIDDIQUI, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR COMMODITY REGULATORY PROGRAMS, VICE MICHAEL V. DUNN, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

MICHAEL V. DUNN, OF IOWA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 11, 2006, VICE MARSHA P. MARTIN, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

ALLAN I. MENDELWITZ, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD FOR...
A term expiring February 27, 2007, Vice Bruce A. Morrison, term expired, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

National Credit Union Administration Board

Geoff Bacon, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Credit Union Administration Board, for a term of years ending August 2, 2006, Vice Norma E. D’Amour, term expired, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Commerce

James A. Dorskind, of California, to be general counsel of the Department of Commerce, Vice Drew J. Pincus, resigned, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Susan Ness, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 1999, to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Federal Aviation Administration Board

David Z. Plavin, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Aviation Administration Board for a term of one year (new position), to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Executive Office of the President

Gregory M. Frazier, of Kansas, to be chief agricultural utilization and trade representative, with the rank of ambassador, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

United States International Trade Commission

Denis M. Devaney, of Michigan, to be a member of the United States International Trade Commission for a term expiring December 16, 2003, Vice Thomas H. Price, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of State

Peter F. Romero, of Florida, a career member of the senior foreign service, class of minister-counselor, to be an assistant secretary of state (inter-American affairs), Vice Jeffrey Davidow, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Overseas Private Investment Corporation

Robert Mays Lyford, of Arkansas, to be a member of the board of directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, for a term expiring December 12, 2002, Vice Harvey Sigelbaum, term expired, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Nina M. Archabal, of Minnesota, to be a member of the board of directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, for a term expiring December 12, 2002, Vice Hernando M. Marroquin, term expired, to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Sarah Mccloven, of Maine, to be a member of the board of directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, for a term expiring December 12, 2002, Vice Richard F. Holley, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
President of the United States of America,

By and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate, I do hereby appoint:

SHEILA TELHAMI, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2003, TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

Shirley Telhami, of Maryland, to be a member of the board of directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 20, 2003, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

National Labor Relations Board

Dennis P. Walsh, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term expiring December 16, 2006, Vice William B. Winslow, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

National Council on Disability

Edward Corcoran, of Missouri, to be a member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 12, 2002, Vice Michael B. Ryan, term expired, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Corporation for National and Community Service

Tonii G. Fay, of New York, to be a member of the board of directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring April 30, 2004, Vice Stuart E. Weisberg, term expired, to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science

Paullette H. Holohan, of Louisiana, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2004, Vice Sally Furlong, term expired, to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities

Hsin-Ming Fung, of California, to be a member of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2002, Vice Jennifer Ziegler Jenness, term expired, to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Department of Energy

James J. Hoecker, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2005, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S29–S49

Measures Introduced: One resolution was submitted, as follows: S. Res. 8.

Measures Passed:

Senate Procedure: Senate agreed to S. Res. 8, relative to Senate procedure in the 107th Congress.

Pages S35–42

Tributes to Alan Cranston: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the tributes to Alan Cranston, late a Senator of California, be printed as a Senate Document; and that Senators have until Friday, February 9, 2001.

Nominations to the Office of Inspector General: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that nominations to the Office of Inspector General, except the Office of Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency, be referred in each case to the committee having primary jurisdiction over the department, agency or entity; and if and when reported in each case, then to the Committee on Governmental Affairs for not to exceed 20 calendar days. Further, that if the nomination is not reported after that 20 day period, the nomination be automatically discharged and placed on the Executive Calendar.

Page S48

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Islam A. Siddiqui, of California, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

Michael V. Dunn, of Iowa, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration for a term expiring October 13, 2006.

Allan I. Mendelowitz, of Connecticut, to be a Director of the Federal Housing Finance Board for a term expiring February 27, 2007.

Geoff Bacino, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for the term of six years expiring August 2, 2005.

James A. Dorskind, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce. Elwood Holstein, Jr., of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

Susan Ness, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 1999, to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

David Z. Plavin, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Aviation Management Advisory Council for a term of one year (New Position), to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Arthenia L. Joyner, of Florida, to be a Member of the Federal Aviation Management Advisory Council for a term of one year (New Position), to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Gregory M. Frazier, of Kansas, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dennis M. Devaney, of Michigan, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for a term expiring December 16, 2009.

Peter F. Romero, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Inter-American Affairs), vice Jeffrey Davidow, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

James F. Dobbins, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (European Affairs), vice Marc Grossman, resigned, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Robert Mays Lyford, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2002.

Miguel D. Lausell, of Puerto Rico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 2003.

George Darden, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for the term expiring December 17, 2003.
Anita Perez Ferguson, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring September 20, 2006.

Fred P. DuVal, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring October 6, 2002.

Beth Susan Slavet, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board.

Barbara J. Sapin, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2007.

James H. Atkins, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2004, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Sheryl R. Marshall, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2002, to which position she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Judith A. Winston, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of Education.

Shibley Telhami, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term expiring January 19, 2001, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Dennis P. Walsh, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2004.

Edward Correia, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2002.

Gerald S. Segal, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 2003.

Ross Edward Eisenbrey, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2005.

Toni G. Fay, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2001.

Paulette H. Holahan, of Louisiana, to be a Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2004.

Marilyn Gell Mason, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2003.

Donald L. Robinson, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 2002.

Hsin-Ming Fung, of California, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2006.

Nina M. Archabal, of Minnesota, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006.

Betty G. Bengtson, of Washington, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006.

Ron Chew, of Washington, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Henry Glassie, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006.

Mary D. Hubbard, of Alabama, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Vicki L. Ruiz, of Arizona, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2006.

Isabel Carter Stewart, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2004.

Allen E. Carrier, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2004.

Timothy Earl Jones, Sr., of Georgia, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of six years.


Larami Faith McNamara, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term expiring September 30, 2001.

Edwin A. Levine, of Florida, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.
James V. Aidala, of Virginia, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Kenneth Lee Smith, of Arkansas, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

James John Hoecker, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2005, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Pages S48-49

Additional Statements:

Pages S47-48

Recess: Senate met at 10:30 a.m., and adjourned at 5:17 p.m. until 12:45 on Saturday, January 6, 2001.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. It will next meet on Saturday, January 6, 2001.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY, JANUARY 6, 2001

Senate

No committee meetings are scheduled.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of January 8 through January 13, 2001

Senate Chamber

On Monday, Senate will be in a period of morning business.

On Tuesday through Friday, Senate will not be in session.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Foreign Relations: January 9, to hold hearings on a United Nations Reform Report, 10:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: January 10, to hold hearings on the nomination of Roderick Paige, to be Secretary of Education, 10 a.m., SD-430.

House Chamber

The House is not scheduled to be in session.

House Committees

No committee meetings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
12:45 p.m., Saturday, January 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Saturday: Senate will meet in joint session with the House of Representatives to count the electoral ballots of the several States cast in the election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12:45 p.m., Saturday, January 6

House Chamber

Program for Saturday: Joint Session for the Certification of Electoral Votes.