

its decision. It added 5 more votes to the earlier total and declared me the winner by a margin of 110 votes, which I like to say in South Dakota is about 60 percent.

In recounting this story, I am not suggesting that we can afford to take that much time in getting a fair and accurate count in this Presidential election. Clearly, because of the surpassing importance of the Presidency, this election must be decided on an expedited basis. I am confident that it will be.

Instead, I tell this story to illustrate the point that our system has dealt successfully with close elections in the past.

My first race for Congress is just one example. There are many others. Even as we speak, votes are still being counted in another too-close-to-call race: the Senate race in Washington State.

Since last Tuesday, many colleagues have told me of similar experiences in their own elections. To a person, they all agree that the important thing is to take whatever time is needed to get a fair and accurate vote count. That is the only way to maintain public confidence in the outcome of the election. So yes, this is an unusual situation. But it is not a constitutional crisis.

In a Newsweek poll taken over the weekend, Americans were asked which was more important: Resolving the uncertainty over the election now so we know who the next President will be or making certain to remove all reason-

able doubt that the vote count in Florida is fair and accurate.

By a margin of 3 to 1, Americans say it is more important to get the results right than to get them right now.

Their response is proof of their faith in our system of government.

It is a system of unequaled strength and stability. And it should be allowed to work.

What we all need right now is patience.

What we do not need is "spin" from people with vested interests in the outcome.

It was particularly disturbing earlier today to see a representative of the Bush campaign on national television announce what he called a "compromise offer."

In fact, his proposal merely restated his campaign's previous position that ballots counted by hand after 5 o'clock this evening should be ignored.

He then went on to cite fluctuations in the stock market as proof that a winner must be declared in the presidential election now—even if it means sacrificing a full and fair count.

I hope that everyone involved in this critically important matter would refrain from such overheated rhetoric. It is not helpful to this process. We are all anxious to know who our next President is. We all want finality. But not at the expense of fairness.

That is what the Vice President wants.

That is what the American people want. That is what I believe Democrats and Republicans want.

That is what is needed to reassure voters in Florida and all across America that their votes in this election counted.

That is what is needed for Americans to reassure Americans that their faith in our election system is well-founded.

Regardless of who they voted for as long as Americans have this reassurance I believe they will accept the outcome of this election and give our next President their support.

It is worth exercising a little patience to get that result.

I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY,
DECEMBER 5, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:31 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, December 5, 2000, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 14, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LARRY CARP, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-FIFTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

RICHARD N. GARDNER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-FIFTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

JAY T. SNYDER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIFTY-FIFTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.