

us on all these many occasions at which we enjoy their presence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—Continued

Mr. BAUCUS. What is the business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 517 is the pending business.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 1 hour equally divided between myself and Senator GRASSLEY for debate on the Finance Committee energy tax amendment; that no amendments be in order to my amendment except a second-degree amendment by Senator GRASSLEY; that at the conclusion or yielding back of the time, the Senate vote in relation to Senator GRASSLEY's second-degree amendment and to my Finance Committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, I supported this tax section that Senator BAUCUS is trying to add to the energy bill at this time when we had it in the Finance Committee. Obviously, there are some things in there that I would prefer not be in there. But we had an overwhelming vote out of the Finance Committee in support of this package.

An energy policy that does not include a tax section is not a complete policy. We have to have some incentives for these hybrid cell vehicles and to try to get marginal wells back in production, to encourage biomass, to do everything we can, along with the policy that is included in this bill, to also encourage more energy production and more energy conservation through the Tax Code.

I support this. I will be glad to work with Senator BAUCUS to see that we get it included in the Senate package or certainly in the conference when a conference is completed. We have to do that.

But at this time, we do have an objection from our side of the aisle. And on behalf of a Senator who has a tax provision in which he is very interested, I am constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I hear the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I very much understand the reasons for his objection. I deeply appreciate his statement in support of the Finance Committee title that we hope to offer to this bill.

The provisions in the Finance Committee title total roughly \$15 to \$16 billion over 10 years. The Senate hopefully will pass the Senate-passed version of tax incentives. It will be incentives for production, conventional

production, renewables, unconventional production, for conservation. The House passed a tax title to their energy bill which totals about \$30 billion.

I fully agree with the distinguished Senator that the Finance Committee provisions, which will help wean us away from OPEC by providing incentives on matters that I suggested, are vitally important. And I hope—in fact, I expect—that the Senate, before it passes an energy bill, will also include these provisions because they are such an integral and vital part of the bill.

I thank all concerned, particularly my good friend from Mississippi.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Daschle/Bingaman substitute amendment No. 2917 for Calendar No. 65, S. 517, a bill to authorize funding for the Department of Energy and for other purposes:

Jeff Bingaman, Jean Carnahan, Edward Kennedy, Pattie Murray, Mary Landrieu, Byron L. Dorgan, Robert Torricelli, Bill Nelson, John Breaux, Tom Carper, Tim Johnson, Hillary R. Clinton, Jon Corzine, John Rockefeller, Daniel Inouye, Max Baucus, Harry Reid, and Maria Cantwell.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'S ERGONOMICS ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, since President Bush signed into law a provision to overturn the ergonomics rule, over 1.8 million workers have suffered ergonomic injuries. At that time Secretary Chao promised "to pursue a comprehensive approach to ergonomics." However, now more than a year later, the Department of Labor

has unveiled a plan that ultimately falls short of the substantive protections needed to protect America's workers.

In response, Senator JOHN BREAUX and others have introduced a bill that would require that the Department of Labor promulgate a new rule on ergonomics within 2 years.

I am deeply concerned that the administration continues to build on its record of putting special interests above working Americans. I believe that Senator BREAUX's bill is an important measure that clarifies that workers deserve real protections, not more studies and voluntary guidelines.

Unfortunately, the administration's late announcement fails to provide workers adequate protections. The administration's plan states an "intent" to develop voluntary guidelines for selected industries. Senator BREAUX's bill will ensure that the administration provides real protections and not hollow promises.

STATUS OF JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I would like to respond to some comments made yesterday on the topic of judicial confirmations. I had no intention of bringing up this topic today, but now I find myself with no choice but to again set the record straight with respect to the comments my colleague made earlier yesterday.

First, I would like to put my remarks in context. I began this Session of the 107th Congress by praising the way that Chairman LEAHY and the Senate's Democratic leader had begun to handle judicial nominations. One of the reasons I did so was that I had detected the possibility that the Judiciary Committee may be headed in a new direction as we began a new Session. I sensed a chance that, after more than eight months of Democratic control, the leaders might stop steering their course by staring at the rear-view mirror, and would begin to look forward through the windshield at the work ahead. I thought that they might begin to sense the American people's frustration at the Senate's stonewalling of President Bush's priorities—especially his selections for the judiciary. Obviously, now that we are in the eleventh month of Democratic control, my optimism has become tarnished not only by the continuing extremely slow pace of confirmations and the blatant mistreatment of Judge Pickering, but also by the kind of comments we heard this morning that actually attempt to persuade the American people that the Senate's record is acceptable.

I want to correct a couple distortions of the record and explain what is really going on in the Judiciary Committee.

My colleague began his comments with the assertion that the Democrats have only been in charge of the Judiciary Committee since the end of July rather than the beginning of June—