Senator BYRD's statement in the Chamber in December at the organizational meetings and the orientation of our new Members so that this tape will be available for historical and educational purposes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 384) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 384

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXXIII, the Senate authorize the videotaping of the address by the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) to the incoming Senators scheduled to be given in the Senate Chamber in December 2000.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—S. RES. 379

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 379, as adopted by the Senate, be star printed with the changes that are at the desk.

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

DETERMINING A PRESIDENTIAL WINNER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will make one comment at this point, and that is, this morning I had occasion to see Senator REID as he was passing by my office. We talked a little bit about history and the fact that the very office in the Capitol where I sit was where the House of Representatives met in 1801 to determine who would be President because there had been a tie in the election. The House of Representatives voted 36 ballots before they determined the winner by 1 vote to be Thomas Jefferson. He won over Aaron Burr. He went on to be one of the greatest Presidents in the history of our country. I leave that for a little thought for all concerned, and now worried, about what the future holds.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the leader leaves the floor, it is my understanding Senator SPECTER wants to speak for about 10 minutes and then we can use up the rest of the time until 12:30. Is the leader expecting to recess at 12:30 and come back at 2:15 p.m.?

Mr. LOTT. That is my intent. While we may not have normal policy luncheons, it is my intent to recess at 12:30 so we can have luncheons as a group or individually, and we will come back after the luncheons, I presume at 2:15. Hopefully, we will close the session by 2:30. I will want to make sure that Senator DASCHLE has been consulted on that and agrees with that.

Mr. REID. I say to the leader that when we do reconvene at 2:15, or maybe even by 12:30, I will be in a position to tell the majority leader how many on our side wish to speak. I know Senator DASCHLE does. I know Senator DORGAN perhaps wants to speak. But I will, as soon as I learn, advise the staff and the Senator of how much time we will need.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

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

MODERNIZING VOTING PROCEDURES IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to introduce legislation which would seek to modernize voting procedures throughout the United States in Federal elections. I do not intend to become involved in the current controversies but instead have been considering where we go from here in order to try to prevent the kind of concerns and problems which we have at the present time.

In Pennsylvania, I have had considerable comment from my constituents about the issue as to, in the electronic age, with computers available and with electronic devices available why do we have some sections of the country voting by paper ballot and why do we have a great variety of election procedures in voting, so that there is not uniformity and there is not a prompt count.

Looking at that issue, it seems to me that we can do much better on how we vote in Federal elections. The thought on my mind is Congress should address this issue at least as to Federal elections, leaving the matters of State and local elections to State officials under our Federalist concepts.

It is not really practical for someone to lay out an entire bill with the procedures to implement these objectives, but it seems to me—and I have been talking to some of my colleagues about it, and there are a number of Senators who are thinking in the same direction—that it will be useful to establish a commission which would take up the question of how we have election procedures which take advantage of computers and electronics so that votes may be tabulated accurately and promptly, and not have the kinds of issues which arose in our election on November 7.

I do, therefore, submit, Mr. President, the structure of a bill to establish a commission for the comprehensive study of voting procedures for Federal elections, to take a look at not only Federal elections but State and local elections as well, but with the purpose of finding a way to have accurate reporting, electronic reporting, and speedy reporting.

This bill is not in concrete. I am now soliciting cosponsors. I think we will have other cosponsors shortly. Since we have an abbreviated session today, with only a limited amount of time, I am introducing the bill at this time.

Mr. President, I will make just a comment or two about the electoral college.

As we have moved ahead with the concerns under the current contest between Governor Bush and Vice President GORE, I have found many of my constituents—and have noted comments in the media across the country—who are surprised about the way the electoral college works.

Illustratively, in my State of Pennsylvania, with 23 electoral votes, and Vice President GORE having received 51 percent of the vote and Governor Bush having received 47 percent, that Vice President GORE got all 23 of Pennsylvania's electoral votes.

In discussions I have found—candidly, a surprise to me—a fair amount of concern among my constituents about changing the electoral college. There is some confusion that any change in the electoral college may have some impact on the current contest between Governor Bush and Vice President GORE, which, of course, is not the case. This current election is going to be determined under the existing rules of the electoral college as it now stands. It seems to me that consideration ought to be given to a modification.

One approach would be to go to the popular election of a President. That appears to be unrealistic because there are so many smaller States which have only one Member of the House, two Senators, so they get three electoral votes. On a proportionate basis, they would be entitled to a 1–435th proportion in relation to the House, there being 435 Members of the House, but they have a 3–535th proportion, taking the House's 435 Members and the Senate's 100 Members. Since it takes a two-thirds vote to pass a constitutional amendment in the Congress, and ratification by three-fourths of the States, I think it is unrealistic to look to the popular election of a President.

But there is an alternative way where it might be achieved; that is, with a proportional representation. S.J. Res. 51 was introduced in the 96th Congress by Senator Cannon, cosponsored by Senators THURMOND, Goldwater, Harry Byrd and Talmadge, which provided for a constitutional amendment for proportional representation, which might be the way to go.

Illustratively, in a State such as Pennsylvania, with 23 electoral votes, and a vote split of 51 percent and 47 percent, it might be divided as 12 votes for Vice President GORE and 11 votes for Governor Bush. I think this is going to require further study.

I do think it is plain that the purpose of having the electoral college, as reflected in the Federalist Papers, was to provide a buffer between the common voter, who was thought at that time not to be sufficiently informed to directly elect a President. That, of course, was changed when we had a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of Senators.

In the original Constitution, Senators were elected by the State legislatures, so that the common man did not

vote directly for a Senator. But that has been changed as we have come to understand that in modern times every voter has a full capacity to make the direct election of an elected official with Senators, and I think on the same analogy to the President as well. But because of the extra leverage for the smaller States, which I do not contest, the direct election is not realistic. But perhaps a proportional election through the electoral college might be appropriate, with the smaller States having the additional advantage of having two electors, accounting for their two Senators. I think that is going to require further study. Again, I have been discussing that with my colleagues.

I do think people in this country want to know what our plans are for the future. I also think there ought to be an awareness that many of us in the Congress are considering whether the electoral college should stand as it now is or whether it should be changed.

An intermediate ground may be this proportional voting of the electoral college, as reflected in S.J. Res. 51 from the 96th Congress. I believe there is no doubt that we need to modernize election procedures, and that the way to go would be a five-person commission with appointments made by the President, the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the minority leader of the House. These matters ought to be subject to consideration to try to eliminate some of the problems which the country now faces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3269

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Commission on the Comprehensive Study of Voting Procedures Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Americans are increasingly concerned about current voting procedures;

(2) Americans are increasingly concerned about the speed and timeliness of vote counts;

(3) Americans are increasingly concerned about the accuracy of vote counts;

(4) Americans are increasingly concerned about the security of voting procedures;

(5) the shift in the United States is to the increasing use of technology which calls for a reassessment of the use of standardized technology for Federal elections; and

(6) there is a need for Congress to establish a method for standardizing voting procedures in order to ensure the integrity of Federal elections.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established the Commission on the Comprehensive Study of Voting Procedures (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'').

SEC. 4. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall complete a thorough study of all issues relating to voting procedures in Federal, State, and local elections, including the following:

(1) Voting procedures in Federal, State, and local government elections.

(2) Voting procedures that represent the best practices in Federal, State, and local government elections.

(3) Legislation and regulatory efforts that affect voting procedures issues.

(4) The implementation of standardized voting procedures, including standardized technology, for Federal, State, and local government elections.

(5) The speed and timeliness of vote counts in Federal, State and local elections.

(6) The accuracy of vote counts in Federal, State and local elections.

(7) The security of voting procedures in Federal, State and local elections.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall develop recommendations on the matters studied under subsection (a).

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the expiration of the period referred to in subsection (a), the Commission shall submit a report, that has been approved by a majority of the members of the Commission, to the President and Congress which shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as it considers appropriate.

(2) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Commission may submit to the President and Congress any interim reports that are approved by a majority of the members of the Commission.

(3) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—The Commission may, together with the report submitted under paragraph (1), submit additional reports that contain any dissenting or minority opinions of the members of the Commission.

SEC. 5. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 5 members of whom—

(1) 1 shall be appointed by the President;

(2) 1 shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(3) 1 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(4) 1 shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(5) 1 shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) TERMS.—Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority if its members.

(2) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(f) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(g) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall select a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson from among its members.

SEC. 6. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may hold such hearings for the purpose of carrying out this Act, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out this Act. The Commission may administer oaths and affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) WEBSITE.—For purposes of conducting the study under section 4(a), the Commission shall establish a website to facilitate public comment and participation.

(d) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services that are necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its duties under this Act.

(f) CONTRACTS.—The Commission may contract with and compensate persons and Federal agencies for supplies and services without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 5).

(g) GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property to carry out this Act.

SEC. 7. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Chairperson of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(e) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairperson of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

SEC. 8. LIMITATION ON CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.

Any new contracting authority provided for in this Act shall be effective only to the extent, or in the amounts, provided for in advance in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under section 4.

SEC. 10. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the enactment of an Act with respect to voting procedures during the period in which the Commission is carrying out its duties under this Act.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to the Commission to carry out this Act.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums appropriated under the authorization contained in this section shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I understand we are in morning business; and we can speak for up to how long?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Up to 5 minutes, with each side controlling 10 minutes total.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I commend and congratulate my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania for introducing this legislation to set up a commission. I think it is very timely.

I would just say to my friend from Pennsylvania, it seems that one of the things I have picked up in traveling around Iowa is that people are deeply concerned and somewhat unnerved by the fact that we have all these different types of voting machines around the United States. We are a mobile society. We move a lot. We go from one jurisdiction to another. You can go from one county to another and have a completely different system of voting on machines. Plus, some of these are really outdated. We have technology today that really can ensure that your vote is as you want it and that there are no mistakes made unless you intentionally want to do something such as that. We just have not adopted that new technology.

I think the proper course would be to set up some type of commission, give them the proper funding, and make sure it is a bipartisan commission that would be evenly divided, that could go out and look at these things and perhaps report back to Congress in due time. I understand the Senator said he wanted 1 year to report back, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. SPECTER. If the distinguished Senator will yield.

Mr. HARKIN. I yield.

Mr. SPECTER. The legislation provides that the commission would have 1 year to complete a study and then 6 additional months to file a report. It is structured to be bipartisan, with the leadership of the House and Senate each having one appointee and the President having a fifth appointee, so the bipartisanship would be assured.

If I may add, it is well known the Senator from Iowa and I worked very closely together on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. We just had a brief informal discussion, so I may have picked up a cosponsor here before 12:30.

Mr. HARKIN. I think you might. In fact, in my comments I was going to talk about that. Obviously, we are thinking along the same lines. I really do believe there ought to be more uniformity, especially in national elections, on the type of equipment that is used. I must admit, being from Iowa, we don't use punch cards. That went out years ago. I was quite surprised some States were still using punch cards. Really, they are open to all kinds of problems. Some States still use the old lever, the old hand-cranked machines.

I don't know; does the Senator know how many different types of voting machines are used in the United States today?

Mr. SPECTER. If the Senator will yield, I do not. There are even different kinds of machines used in Pennsylvania, and there are still many paper ballots which are being used. It is astounding not to have rapid, accurate results on election night, with computers being what they are and the possibilities of electronics. This may be a matter on which the Federal Government will have to do some financing. The study ought to be made. Congress ought to consider it and try to solve at least a big part of this problem.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the remainder of the Democratic time be allotted to the Senator from Iowa.

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

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

I note many Americans have expressed concern about the time it is taking to determine whom the American people elected as President last Tuesday. We just came out of a meeting. A bunch of reporters stopped me just off the floor, talking to me about the crisis and shouldn't we have to get this resolved. I said: Wait a minute, there is no crisis in this country right now. Frankly, I am heartened to see that most Americans' first priority is to ensure the votes are counted with precision, accuracy, and fairness. The American people know how important is one of the bedrocks of our great democracy, the idea no matter how rich or poor, powerful or weak, no matter what race, creed, or sex, the vote of every American counts equally: One person, one vote.

We can all agree this Presidential election is one of the closest in our Nation's history. Now it appears that Vice President AL GORE has won the popular vote. He currently leads by about 223,000 votes. He also, right now, is ahead in the electoral college, but that electoral college outcome is much less clear. At this point, whichever candidate wins Florida probably wins the Presidency, and right now, according to the latest reports, only 388 votes separate the two candidates. To put it in context, that is .0067 percent of the votes in Florida.

Frankly, I think we can all agree the spirit of ''whatever it takes to win and to heck with the will of the voters'' has no place in American politics. So I was pleased to see the initial polling shows that these efforts have failed. According to a recent Newsweek poll, 72 percent of American adults believe that making certain the count is fair and accurate is more important than rushing to judgment to get matters resolved quickly.

Yes, democracy is slow. Yes, democracy takes time. But it is worth it, and the American people understand that. There is no crisis. We should take our time, and we should determine accurately what the will of the voters really is.

Much has been said of the hand counting of ballots in Florida, as if that were something strange and new. We do hand counting of ballots all the time for sheriff, for local county commissioner—all the time. This is done at every election in the United States, Federal and State and local, when it is very close. Why is the office of President less important than local sheriff? It seems to me if hand counting of a ballot is important for the local sheriff's race, it is equally important, even more important, for the highest office of the land.

It has been said that machines are neither Democratic nor Republican. That is true. But let's keep in mind, the only reason we use voting machines in this country is, No. 1, it is cheaper and, No. 2, it is quicker. Still, the most accurate way to determine each person's vote is to have that person walk into a voting place, give each a paper ballot, and have each go in there and mark the boxes with an x, fold the ballot, step out, and put it in a box. Then when the polls close, a committee looks at these ballots and counts each one. That is clearly the most accurate way of counting votes.

Why don't we do that in America? Obviously, you would not know the outcome of elections for months afterwards because it would take that long

to hand count all the ballots. Second, it would be prohibitively expensive. But the idea that somehow machines are more accurate than human counts is just nonsensical. It is just not true. The human count is still the most accurate.

When the votes are really close and when the office is at stake because of the closeness of the votes—.0067 percent of the votes in Florida, as I stand here—it is incumbent upon us to do what we would do in a local sheriff's race or supervisor's race, and that is to hand count these ballots.

Again, having said that, I will have more to say about it later on this afternoon. I see the hour is 12:30 so the time has come for our recess. We will be back in at 2:15. At that time, I want to explore a little further the idea of having a standardized procedure for standardized voting machines for the entire country, one on which people can rely no matter where they live. People move all the time. They should not have to be confronted with different voting machines.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the legislation just introduced by Senator SPECTER of Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Has the hour of 12:30 arrived, Mr. President?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think the resolution we have been waiting for has arrived.

Mr. HARKIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I understand that the Senate will reconvene at 2:15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes at 2:15 I be recognized for up to 15 minutes to finish my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think we have a previous consent agreement that allows for each of the leaders to present a list of those who wish to speak.

Mr. HARKIN. I did not hear the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I guess it is not an actual unanimous consent request.

Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, I had asked for a quorum call for just a moment so that staff could complete certain paperwork. So it may be understood why I asked for the quorum call and asked that it be rescinded so promptly. On behalf of our distinguished majority leader, I have been asked to make this unanimous consent request.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of the continuing resolution, H.J. Res. 125, funding the Federal Government through December 5, 2000; that the joint resolution be read the third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action, motion, or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 125) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding that when we come back at 2:15, there will be a time for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H. CON. RES. 442

Mr. SPECTER. Again, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives the adjournment resolution from the House, the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action, motion, or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. No objection.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. On behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that following the 15 minutes allotted to Senator HARKIN, Senator LOTT or his designee be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I indicated to the majority leader I would indicate when I came back how many speakers we have. Senator DODD indicated he wants to speak for half an hour. Senator HARKIN will speak for 15 minutes. The Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, wishes to speak for 15 or 20 minutes. Those are the only speakers we have had request time on this side. If there are any others, I will be happy to inform the Chair.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in view of the request of the minority, I ask unanimous consent that following the 15 minutes allotted to Senator LOTT or his designee, there be an additional period for morning business until 4:15, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I just add to that unanimous consent request that during that period of time, Senator DODD be recognized for up to 30 minutes, and the Democratic leader for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is my understanding that will be off of their time.

Mr. REID. Yes.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The time will be equally divided between the two sides. I thank the Chair and I trust that meets the requests of all interested Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I request 5 minutes of the time the majority leader has reserved.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator from Missouri is recognized.

OSHA ERGONOMICS RULE

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues and the many people across this Nation the fact that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has rushed to judgment and published a huge, extremely burdensome ergonomics rule. They had talked about this previously with bipartisan support. We had included in the Labor-HHS bill, as well as others, legislative vehicles stating that they should not go forward with this measure because of the burdens it imposed. I have in my hand the voluminous computer printout of the rule. I chair the small business committee, and I can just see the thrill and excitement with which a small business will view this rule coming down on their backs.

I hope this body can take action to stop the implementation of this rule