and the wind. But until that comes along, we have to look very seriously not just at oil and our dependency upon foreign nations but almost nuclear.

I can remember back in the 1960s when people would protest nuclear plants. Now they realize there is a serious problem with the quality of our air. A lot of those people are saying: Let's go back and reexamine nuclear energy. No. 1, it is the cheapest; No. 2, it is the cleanest; and, No. 3, it is the most readily available.

I think we should address that in a comprehensive energy policy. That is what I hope will be on the floor.

We have something that is very significant. I am sure the American people, since the days of my going around the Nation with Don Hodel back in the 1980s, and since we went through a very large Persian Gulf war in 1990, now realize we can't be dependent upon the Middle East. That is the hotbed. That is where the problems are today. We are concerned about North Korea and Afghanistan and about many areas, but the Persian Gulf region is where there is a tremendous threat—yes, almost a terrorist threat.

I commend the majority leader for making the agreement to bring up a comprehensive bill. But I am asking him, since it is in his lap—he is totally responsible for keeping his word on this—that he bring something to the floor early enough so we can go through the process, debate it, and have amendments. Then we can go to conference with the House. They have already passed theirs way ahead of us. We can come up with an energy policy, which we have been trying to get through. The President, I am sure, will be happy and anxious to sign it. He already stated that he would this year before we adjourn.

It is something that we must do. It is something that is long overdue. But the opportunity is here today.

I feel very strongly that this is an opportunity we cannot bypass. I commend the majority leader and am anxious to see what that product looks like. I hope we are able to work on that product and get it to conference so we get an energy policy and get it signed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDWARDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:07 p.m. recessed until 2:04 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BAYH).

CHARGING OF TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. CLELAND. I yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think it is clear for the record, but we wanted to make sure that the last approximately hour and a half is charged against the postcloture proceedings on the bill before the Senate. I am quite sure that is the case, but I wanted to make it clear.

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

AVIATION SECURITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, almost exactly 1 month ago to the day this Nation was rocked by the most horrific act of terrorism ever leveled against the United States. Following the events of September 11, we resolved as a nation to work together to secure our borders and do all in our power to prevent a repeat of the kind of assault that shook this country 30 days ago. Key to the security of America is our ability to quickly put in place enhanced security measures at our airports and on our planes to ensure that our skies are safe and that Americans are no longer afraid to fly. Yet the legislation that is key to ensuring that America's aviation system is secure—the very measure that is our most direct legislative response to the hijacking of four U.S. airliners—has been stalled now for a week. This body is in agreement on many issues in this bill and we have compromised on others. It is time that we bring this critically important bill to the floor and openly debate the differences which remain.

Whether or not to ''federalize'' airport security personnel is an issue that still deeply divides this body. I also attended the briefing by El Al officials which the distinguished Chairman of the Commerce Committee and others have referred to throughout this debate. We are all aware of the extraordinary security measures the Israeli airline has put in place and the extraordinary success of those measures. Because of the constant threat of terrorism to Israel and the Israeli people, El Al has taken the following steps to ensure the safety of its passengers and the integrity of its operations: armed, plain-clothes, in-flight guards; extensive passenger questioning and Interpol background checks; extensive luggage inspections, both visual inspection by employees and high-tech explosive detection, including the placing of luggage and cargo in decompression chambers; and secure cockpit doors that remain locked from the inside. Since the implementation of these measures, no Israeli airline has ever been hijacked. This record speaks for itself.

In that briefing the El Al officials were asked if airport security personnel were government workers or contract workers. The response was telling. The El Al officials did not even know what contract workers are. They want government workers on the front line to enforce the tightest security measures possible. As others have pointed out, we want Secret Service, government employees to provide the greatest protection possible to the President of the United States. We want Federal law enforcement officers to protect the elected members of the House and Senate. Why would we want any less for the people of this Nation?

There was a recent article in the Atlanta Constitution about an Atlanta-based security company which provides baggage screening for 17 of the 20 largest airports in the country, including baggage screening for Dulles and Newark airports—where two of the four hijacked planes originated on September 11. According to the Atlanta Constitution:

The company has 19,000 employees and provides security for office buildings, colleges and Federal facilities. In the past year, it pled guilty to allowing untrained employees—including some with criminal backgrounds—to operate checkpoints in Philadelphia International Airport. Its parent company was fined $1.2 million. In addition, the company is also said to have falsified test scores for at least 2 dozen applicants and hired at least 14 security screeners with criminal backgrounds ranging from aggravated assault and burglary to drug and firearm possession. The highest advertised job at this company pays $7 to $8.50 an hour.

Mr. President, to repeat, these workers are paid $7 to $8 an hour. With minimum wage pay like this, no wonder many of these screeners look at going to work at a fast-food restaurant as a promotion. Clearly we cannot have this attitude as our first line of defense.

In the El Al briefing, there was a slide describing the onion-like layers of security in their aviation system. At the outer layer was the layer of intelligence—key to any effective protection of our skies and borders. In Israel, when there is knowledge of a possible security threat, there is immediately a line of intelligence communication from the highest levels of government down, and in that intelligence loop are the security officers at Ben Gurion Airport. This is a compelling reason why we should have Federal workers at the airport checkpoints in this country. There are over 700 of these checkpoints at over 420 airports. We need a domestic version of the Customs Service as our first line of defense against hijackers.

The General Accounting Office in assessing our aviation vulnerabilities stated that ''the human element is the weakest link in the chain.'' We saw that on September 11. The airline industry is in favor of federalizing airport security personnel. More importantly, the American people support it.

In a recent national poll, 82 percent of the people surveyed said they would support having the Federal Government take over security screening at U.S. airports even if it cost $2 billion a year.

All of us appreciate the value of rapid response in combating terrorism. It is time to bring the aviation security bill to the floor and fulfill the number one responsibility of Congress: to work to ensure the safety and protection of the Nation and its citizens. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I note the Senator from Oklahoma is not in the Chamber, so I will withhold until he reaches the floor. What I intend to do when he does reach the floor is ask unanimous consent that we vitiate the remaining hours on postcloture and proceed to immediate consideration of S. 1447.

Today there was an ABC news poll that showed 42 percent of the American people are still concerned about flying on an airliner.

The day before yesterday there was a meeting in New York City between the Speaker of the House, the Democrat leaders, Representative GEPHARDT, and 20 business and labor leaders, as well as Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve. According to published media reports, there were strong recommendations by all these individuals to move on airport security so the confidence of the American people could be restored and the economy would have a chance to recover.

For 2 weeks we have been trying to get this bill considered. Meanwhile, we have American men and women who are in combat, putting their lives on the line for the safety of American citizens and we cannot even act on an airport security bill. I don't feel like running through the litany of all the things that have happened, all the meetings the Senator from Texas and I have had, and not had, the scheduled meetings and the unscheduled meetings, the canceled meetings, and the negotiations. This legislation is being held up for reasons that have nothing to do with airport security. There are legitimate differences of opinion on this issue. I respect those differences.

The Senator from Oklahoma was going to state when he objects that he is afraid a nongermane amendment or nonrelevant amendment may be added to the bill. I oppose, as does the distinguished chairman, Senator HOLLINGS, nonrelevant and nongermane amendments, but, at the same time, that is not reason to block the legislation from being considered.

Because there are objections that are related or nonrelated to this legislation, we are blocking the legislation because of certain select interests or concerns. That is not the way we should do business. The way we should do business is to take up bills, vote on them, have debate, have amendments, and vote on them. That is the way the process is supposed to work.

Is this an issue that is a minor policy disagreement? Is this an issue that has to do with only a small number of Americans, maybe the State of Arizona or just the State of Texas? No. This is an issue of compelling requirements. Very few Americans, if any, will ever forget the sight of those airliners flying into the World Trade Center. All of us will remember it as long as we live. Every time they see it, they will want to know that their Government, working with the elected representatives, not by Executive order but by working with their elected officials, has taken every measure possible to ensure the safety of the flying public, which is a large number of Americans.

Supposedly at 4:57, as a result of my parliamentary inquiry before lunch, we will be going to the bill, but the reason I propose a unanimous consent request now is by the time there are opening statements tonight, we will have killed another day. Perhaps we may even use all of tomorrow. Usually we don't do a lot of work around here on Friday. And we would then have expended another week before we could get on this legislation.

I thank the Senator from Texas for all of her hard work on this issue. I know the Senator from Oklahoma will object and give his well-thought-out reasons for doing so. I know the Senator from Texas will make her comments. The time for backroom negotiations and conversations and proposals and counterproposals is over. We have a bill. We had hearings in the Commerce Committee on airport and airline security. This legislation is a direct result of those hearings. This is not something made up in the backroom. This legislation was produced through thoughtful consultation with the best minds in America that we could find. We think it is vital we move forward with this legislation.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent we vitiate the remaining hours in postcloture and move directly to the consideration of S. 1447, the Aviation Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. NICKLES. Reserving the right to object, I wonder if my colleague and friend from Arizona would be willing to modify his unanimous consent request, that he amend it to say that all amendments be relevant to the underlying airport security bill?

Mr. MCCAIN. In response to the Senator from Oklahoma, that would be a highly unusual request, as he knows, because the normal procedure in the Senate is to take up legislation. If there is a concern about nongermane or nonrelevant amendments, then a cloture motion is filed, as has already been filed in one case.

So, no, I do not agree to modify my request for that because I think it would be depriving Members, at least temporarily, of their voice and their concerns and their amendments that they might want to propose. I promise the Senator from Oklahoma I will object and vote against and argue against, as the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee stated, any nonrelevant and nongermane amendment. I hope that satisfies his concerns.

Mr. NICKLES. Further reserving the right to object, I appreciate the remarks of my friend and colleague. If we can keep the bill itself pretty much to relevant amendments, I think and believe we can get this bill passed this week.

For the information of our colleagues, we are very close to concluding the antiterrorism package. I appreciate the patience of my friend and colleague from Arizona. We have been trying to pass two bills this week: one, an antiterrorism package, and the other an airport security package. I hope and believe we can pass both this week. The antiterrorism package is much closer to being there. In fact, it is our hope we can pass it today. We are in the process of trying to conclude a unanimous consent request to pass the antiterrorism package today that will be in agreement and hopefully have the vote by 6 o'clock tonight.

With that in mind, the fact we are so close to doing the antiterrorism package and getting it to conclusion at this point, I object to the unanimous consent request proposed by the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am getting as frustrated as the senior Senator from Arizona. We have been working on aviation security since September 12, 2001. I introduced the bill that would increase the number of sky marshals that very week. I could see the traveling public was going to be stunned. Of course what has happened is even worse than that. The impact on the economy of having people stay out of airplanes and airports is staggering. It was a domino effect. The airlines are flying at half capacity. They are not flying as many flights. Hotels are not full. Rental cars are not being rented. The cancellation of conventions all over the country is being reported.

We can do something about this. We have been working on it in a very bipartisan way. There are very few disagreements on the bill—things we can work out or have amendments, vote them up or down, and we can send a decent package to the President.

What is holding the legislation up is extraneous amendments. These amendments may have merit, but they are not worked out yet and they are not relevant to aviation security. We are dealing with some very complicated matters. Antiterrorism is complicated. We have tried to keep that clean so that the disagreements are on the bill and disagreements on other issues don't encroach on that bill.

We need to do the same thing for aviation security so we are not talking about differences on an unemployment bill in the middle of other differences on the relevant bill and not be able to come to the conclusion on the aviation security bill because of something that does not relate to aviation security.

The President wants to deal with unemployment. We want to deal with unemployment. We can do that in the economic stimulus package or in a freestanding bill. That would be the responsible thing to do, particularly when we know if there are going to be other jobs available. Right now we have a huge loss of jobs in the aviation industry. But we are trying to add jobs in aviation security. We are trying to add jobs in the defense industry because we are going to be ratcheting up our defense needs. So let's give our employees a chance to seek other jobs before we pass something when we are not even sure how much we are going to need or if that is relevant by the time we see if these other jobs can be filled.

But it is a whole different issue. So why not talk about aviation security? I see the distinguished Commerce Committee chairman, Senator HOLLINGS. He has worked with Senator ROCKEFELLER, the chairman of the Aviation subcommittee. I am the ranking member of the Aviation subcommittee, and Senator MCCAIN is the ranking member of the full committee. We have worked on this bill.

We have worked with the White House trying to come to the agreements on this bill, and we are very close. We are going to strengthen the cockpit doors. You would think that after what happened just yesterday on the airplane where the deranged man fought his way into a cockpit—just yesterday—there would be an impetus to take up this bill.

We are going to add air marshals in the bill that I introduced the week of September 11, because we know people will feel safer if there are air marshals on airplanes. We know the more we can get in, the more likely people are to fly and the less likely we are to have incidents, because we will have on those airplanes trained law enforcement personnel.

We are trying to upgrade the screening. Everybody who has been through an airport knows there have been holes in security, in the screening process. Today in many airports there are long lines at the screening stations. We want to regularize that process so people know what to expect and so we can get through on a more expedited basis using trained people with good equipment.

Those are the things we are trying to do with this bill. So I support Senator MCCAIN's motion. I think we need to proceed to the bill, and I think we need to keep extraneous amendments off, and that should be a bipartisan agreement. Then we can argue legitimately about the bill itself and how much federalization we have and where it goes and what the dollars are. All of that is legitimate disagreement. Let's get to the bill. Let's do what we must do to get people back into airplanes feeling safe and secure. Let's give them that security, and let's help the economy strengthen.

We must do that. We are wasting valuable time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas, and our ranking member, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN.

We did not come to our particular bill for the federalization of airport and airline security in America in a casual fashion. The truth of the matter is that having been on this committee for over 30-some years, I can say we have been trying to beef up security for quite some time.

I could go back to the 1970s in speaking on this topic, but I will bring you right up to 1988. When Pan Am Flight 103 exploded over Lockerbie, Scotland, we heard of security breaches there—which have now been proved in court. As a result, we had hearings, we had conferences with the White House and the leadership and the airlines and everyone concerned, and what did we come up with?

We wanted to keep it just the way it is with privatization, but what we were going to do is have higher standards, more training, more supervision, more money: The same old same old after 1988.

Then, of course, they had the TWA Flight 800 disaster in 1996, 5 years ago. Following the disaster, we had the Gore commission, and what did we come up with? We came up with more training, higher standards, more supervision, more money—the same old same old.

So I determined, along with Senator MCCAIN, that bygones were bygones with all this fetish about privatization. In a time of war we can't relegate security and safety to any kind of low-cost bidder.

You can put in the words, is my point, of higher standards and more supervision and more training and more money, but you have to fix the lack of accountability and standards, as they have in Israel.

Right to the point, while the distinguished Senator from Texas was talking about just the screeners, I believe we must focus on the whole security picture, including the outer perimeter or rim in the Israeli onion ring plan—the outer ring is intelligence.

Incidentally, I have just been in a discussion where they were talking about too many leaks of classified information to the public. Let me say this, the war on terrorism is not a military war, it is an intelligence war, and intelligence operates on a need-to-know basis.

You do not have to tell the Senator from South Carolina anything. Just tell me what we have done. Don't tell me you are backing up aircraft carriers and you are going to do this and you are going to jump from the helicopters like they have in the headlines, or that you are working with this group and that group—they don't know how to run a war, particularly against terrorism.

Mr. President, this war is not the hundred-yard dash. This is going to be an endurance contest, and it is going to be off the front pages if there are going to be any successes.

Back to the screeners, they have to have the highest security clearance. When we get terrorist watch lists from international security, we might get it from the Brits, we might get it from the French, we might get it from one of the Muslim countries themselves. But these watch lists are not going to be effective prevention tools to that screener who is being paid $5 or $6 an hour and has only been on the job for 3 weeks.

We must have the highest type of personnel, not only as screeners, but as trustworthy security professionals. That is what we are talking about. That not only relates to the screener but to the person who vacuum-cleans the rug in the airplane. Don't worry about somebody going through with a pistol in an airport to get on a plane. What they are going to do is have someone working the tarmac, with a loaded gun available, and I call up ahead of time, and I say I have seat 9–A, and you tape the weapon underneath the seat. We must address these types of security weaknesses.

You have to understand, you are in a war with a clever bunch of rascals, absolute fanatics. In this kind of war you can't have 20 percent of security personnel privately contracted, for instance. Someone came to me late last evening and said: How about 20 percent of the screeners? Go out there and tell that to the Pentagon—let's have the privates and the corporals and the sergeants privately contracted.

They have 669,000 civilian civil service security personnel in defense. But they are wrangling about 18 plus 10, or 28,000 new government airport security personnel. It is not money. We have paid for it.

I have mentioned ad nauseam the $917 round-trip coach class ticket to Charleston, SC. I will willingly pay a fee to know my life is safe and there is no chance ever again of using a flight in the United States of America as a weapon of mass destruction. The pilots ought to be able to seal that cockpit door, which should have been done—they ought not have to be waiting for legislation. The airlines should not have to delay safety because of bureaucracy. They have pilots to fly airplanes—not to fight—once they go on and secure that cockpit door. As the chief pilot of El Al told this Senator: If my wife is being assaulted back in the

cabin, I do not open that door. So everybody will know that, hereafter, no matter if they are hijacking a plane to run it into the Golden Gate bridge, or into a building, or into the Sears Tower, or anyplace else—they are picking out all kinds of targets in people's minds—airplane hijackings are not going to happen; that is done with.

We have to move along to protect other terrorist targets, because that is how the terrorist's mind moves. They can maybe get 100 trying to wrestle the plane down. I don't believe they can get the plane down. Once the pilot hears a disturbance, yes, people can be hurt, someone can be killed, but he immediately knows his orders. Rather than open the door and say, ''Do you want to go to Cuba? Let's go''—no; now the doors stay closed, and he immediately lands the plane. He wires ahead, and the FBI and security is there to take charge. They are not going to get very far trying to hijack the plane.

Having taken these preventive steps, the Israelis knew, almost proof positive, when the plane that came out of Israel and went down with an explosion over the Black Sea, that a bomb had not been put on that plane. You have to go through those parameters of defense, of security and safety, in Israel. There is no way to get a bomb on the plane unless you have the pilots and everybody conspiring together.

That is not going to happen. The security system that we have set up and planned to pay for was approved by whom? By the pilots. We have their official approval of our approach in this particular bill. The flight attendants approved of it, and begged for it. The executives of the airlines are for it. The municipal associations, the tourism associations—I am getting boiled up.

We have held this bill up on the floor for 1 week on the motion to proceed. Why? On account of procedural Mickey Mouse nonsense, or—there is no better word—constipation. Everybody wants to add this or that measure onto it. We have to get Amtrak. No. We have to get benefits. No. We have to have a stimulus bill. No. We have to get this. Sure, let's take care of all those issues, but in order.

It is unforgivable to stand around here now for a week just on a motion to proceed. Objection just occurred when the distinguished ranking member of the committee and chief cosponsor said let's move to it, debate it, and listen and learn about these amendments, and vote them up or down; that is all. But we apparently have a minority. I am ready to vote, because I think I have some votes. Being in the minority does not surprise me, with all the undercurrents and the lobbying going on by the contractors. We read in Roll Call yesterday that when I am talking on the floor to an empty Senate, the lobbyists are back talking on individual treatment to the Senators.

Should I have to go around and call on the 99 other Senators and explain this bill to them and get past the lobbyists? What has the Government come to in a time of crisis? Let's move on. Don't wait until 5 o'clock and maybe then file some amendments and maybe have some more cloture and some more delay.

This bill, from its origin, should not have been called airline safety but airline stimulus. Ironically, this crowd will go forward with any kind of stimulus.

We are under limited time. We are on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is informed that his 1 hour of cloture has expired.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that I continue with an additional hour from any other Senator, that I proceed for another few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I will conclude with a thought I just expressed about stimulus.

This measure would stimulate the airline industry—exactly what we are trying to do all over America. When you get people traveling, when you get them on the airlines, when you get them in the hotels, when you get New York going again, and when you get all of these other places back to normalcy, the best way to stimulate the airlines is to get safety for them.

What the bureaucracy has done up here with the procedural hangups is to give $15 billion to keep the airlines alive and then guarantee that they go broke by not giving them the safety and, therefore, ensure that the traveling public is not on the planes.

This is the best way I know of to not just stimulate the airlines and air travel but to stimulate the economy. Please come forward. Let's move on this particular bill.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Alaska for indulging me the extra moments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

DEVELOPING A BALANCED ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I will try to be brief to accommodate my colleagues who are seeking recognition.

I would like to call attention to a release that came out of the majority and the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, indicating that at the request of the majority leader, Senator DASCHLE, the chairman of the Energy Committee, Senator BINGAMAN, suspend any further markup of energy legislation for this session of Congress. I emphasize ''this session of Congress.'' That sounds pretty definitive to me. Instead, I quote the release:

The chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation that can be added—

I emphasize ''can be added.'' It doesn't say ''will be added;'' it says ''can be added''—

by the majority leader to the Senate Calendar for potential action—

It doesn't say ''action;'' it says ''potential action.''

I certainly have the highest respect for the majority leader. I notice that this is very carefully worded. It says that it ''can be added;'' it doesn't say ''will.'' Not that there is a proposed action but ''potential action.''

Very frankly, that is not good enough for me. I will ask the majority leader to specifically respond as to whether or not he intends to develop a balanced energy bill. I question the word ''balanced'' because that means no input from the minority, no input from the Republicans, an effort to circumvent the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, of which I am the ranking member. I question how it could be balanced.

So I urge the leader to address specifically whether he will take up and introduce an energy bill, and whether or not it will be placed on the calendar, and whether or not we will have sufficient time to offer amendments on the issue of fairness and equity in the contribution of the minority.

I would also add, the reason for this action, apparently, is twofold. One is the question of jurisdiction. In other words, there are other committees involved. There is the Committee on Finance, on which I serve, relative to tax implications associated with an energy bill. And as you tax forgiveness, accelerated depreciation, here is obviously the role of the Committee on Environment and Public Works in certain areas—perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary. But clearly, the majority of the jurisdiction is within the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

We have been working a long time on this. We began and introduced a bill early in the session, early in February, as a matter of fact. We have been working with Senator BINGAMAN on his comprehensive bill. We were committed to try to report out, tomorrow, Senator BINGAMAN's expedited bill on energy infrastructure, which I support.

I do not know the rationale. I can only assume that perhaps the leadership thought there was not the votes in the committee to block certain amendments that might come up or perhaps the majority thought there is not the support in the Chamber to stop an energy bill.

I think it is interesting to note that the public polling indicates about two-thirds of the individuals polled nationwide support an energy bill; polling on the contentious issue of ANWR is about 64 to 36 in favor.

So as we address what is behind this shroud of sudden reluctance to pursue an energy bill, one can only deduce that perhaps they did not want to give the President a victory. The President,