

These are legitimate questions. They are troubling questions. And they should be carefully thought through before we unleash an open-ended attack on Iraq. We had better think about these questions. We better ask these questions. The administration had better listen and so had the American people.

There are many outstanding questions that the United States should consider before marching in lockstep down the path of committing America's military forces to effect the immediate overthrow of Saddam Hussein. The peril of biological weapons is only one of those considerations, but it is an important one.

Has it been thought out? Has it been discussed? Has the administration said anything to Congress about this, whether or not the administration has explored these questions? Here are the questions. Don't say they were not asked. The more we know now, the better off our troops will be in the future.

Decisions involving war and peace—the most fundamental life and death decisions—should never be rushed through this Senate. I say that again. Decisions involving war and peace—the most fundamental of life and death decisions—they affect your sons and daughters out there, your blood. Such decisions should never be rushed through, never be rushed through or muscled through in haste.

Our Founding Fathers understood that and they wisely vested in the Congress—not in the President, not in any President, Democrat or Republican—the power to declare war.

We are going to discuss this. There is going to be a discussion of it. It is not going to be rammed through all that fast.

Congress has been presented with a Presidential request for authorization to use military force against Iraq. We now have the responsibility to consider that request, consider it carefully, consider it thoroughly, and consider it on our own timetable. I urge my colleagues to do just that and avoid the pressure—avoid the pressure to rush to judgment on such an important and vital and far-reaching and momentous matter.

I yield the floor.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at the conclusion of the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Lieberman substitute amendment, regardless of the outcome, the

Senate stand in recess until 5:15 p.m. today; further, notwithstanding rule XXII, the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Gramm-Miller amendment No. 4738 occur at 5:30 today, with the time between 5:15 and 5:30 equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; and that second-degree amendments to the Gramm-Miller amendment may be filed until 6 p.m. today.

When this vote is completed, we will be in recess until 5:15. Both parties are having conferences. Following that, there will be 15 minutes of debate and then there will be a vote on cloture on the Gramm-Miller amendment.

I would say this has been a long struggle getting to where we are today. I express my appreciation to the manager of the bill, Senator THOMPSON, and of course the person we have heard a lot from in the last several days, my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, Mr. GRAMM.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair rises before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

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 Lieberman substitute amendment No. 4471 for H.R. 5005, the Homeland Security bill:

Debbie Stabenow, Harry Reid, Charles Schumer, Evan Bayh, Mark Dayton, Jeff Sessions, John Edwards, Jim Jeffords, Joseph Lieberman, Bill Nelson of Florida, Blanche L. Lincoln, Byron L. Dorgan, Jack Reed, Patrick Leahy, Robert C. Byrd, Mary Landrieu, Max Baucus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the Lieberman amendment No. 4471 to H.R. 5005, an act to establish the Department of Homeland Security and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LINCOLN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Byrd	Conrad
Baucus	Cantwell	Corzine
Bayh	Carnahan	Daschle
Biden	Carper	Dayton
Bingaman	Chafee	Dodd
Boxer	Cleland	Dorgan
Breaux	Clinton	Durbin

Edwards	Kerry
Feingold	Kohl
Feinstein	Leahy
Graham	Levin
Harkin	Lieberman
Hollings	Lincoln
Inouye	Mikulski
Jeffords	Murray
Johnson	Nelson (FL)
Kennedy	Nelson (NE)

Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Sarbanes
Schumer
Stabenow
Torricelli
Wellstone
Wyden

NAYS—49

Allard	Frist	Nickles
Allen	Gramm	Roberts
Bennett	Grassley	Santorum
Bond	Gregg	Sessions
Brownback	Hagel	Shelby
Bunning	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Burns	Helms	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Specter
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thompson
DeWine	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	McCain	Voinovich
Ensign	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Miller	
Fitzgerald	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Landrieu

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Upon reconsideration, on this vote the yeas are 50, the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2003—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1646, just received from the House; that the report be considered and agreed to; that the correcting resolution, H. Con. Res. 483 at the desk be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; and that any statements related to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

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

(The report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 23, 2002.)

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to present to the Senate the conference report on H.R. 1646, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003.

The bill contains two divisions. Division A is the State Department Authorization Act, and contains authorization of appropriations for the Department of State, and other foreign policy programs, and also contains several policy provisions. Division B contains the Security Assistance Act, which provides authorizations and legal authorities under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act.

This bill includes several important items, including the completion of a project that Senator HELMS and I began in 1997, the legislation to authorize payment of our back dues to the United Nations in exchange for reform in that organization. The conference

report would facilitate the final installment of \$244 million in arrears to the UN and other international organizations. I salute the former Chairman of the Committee, Senator HELMS, for initiating this project six years ago and for sticking with it. It has made a material difference in improving the relationship between the United States and the United Nations.

The bill includes two other provisions important to continuing the improvement of our relationship with the United Nations. First, the bill clears the way for the payment of nearly \$80 million in new arrears which have accumulated in the last few years. Second, the bill authorizes the payment of our dues to the UN at the beginning of the calendar year, rather than the current system whereby we pay our dues at the start of the U.S. fiscal year. That late payment of our dues is detrimental, not only to UN operations, but to U.S.-UN relations. I hope the Administration will embrace this provision and request the necessary funds in the fiscal year 2004 budget.

Further, the bill authorizes funding at levels equal to or exceeding the President's budget request for the Department of State, embassy security, contributions for international organizations and international peacekeeping, and international broadcasting. The United States is a great power, and it has substantial responsibilities around the world. In order to meet those responsibilities, it must have a well-funded and well-equipped diplomatic corps. And if we are going to deploy our diplomats around the world, we must protect them. We cannot provide perfect security for our people, but we can and must take all reasonable precautions against known dangers. In 1999, Congress provided an authorization of \$4.5 billion over five years—or \$900 million per year, for embassy construction and security. This bill adds an additional \$100 million to this authorization for fiscal year 2003.

Division B of this bill is the Security Assistance Act of 2002. It includes: foreign military assistance, including Foreign Military Financing and International Military Education and Training; international arms transfers; and many of our arms control, nonproliferation and antiterrorism programs.

This division includes some significant initiatives. For example, several provisions are designed to streamline the arms export control system, so as to make it more efficient and responsive to competitive requirements in a global economy, without sacrificing controls that serve foreign policy or nonproliferation purposes. This is a vital enterprise. U.S. industry depends upon the efficient processing of arms export applications, and U.S. firms lose contracts when the U.S. Government cannot make up its mind expeditiously.

At the same time, however, an ill-advised export license could lead to sensitive equipment getting into the

hands of enemies or of unstable regimes. So there is a tension between the need for efficiency and the need not to make a mistake that ends up putting U.S. lives at risk. This bill addresses that tension providing funds for improved staffing levels, information and communications to enable the State Department to make quicker and smarter export licensing decisions. It also raises modestly the prior notice thresholds for most arms sales to our NATO allies, Australia, New Zealand or Japan. On the other hand, this bill adds a prior notice requirement for some sales of small arms and light weapons and strengthens the prior notice requirement for changes in the United States Munitions List.

Division B includes several new nonproliferation and antiterrorism measures. For example, the ban on arms sales to state supporters of terrorism, in section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, is broadened to include states engaging in the proliferation of chemical, biological or radiological weapons.

This bill requires the President to establish an interagency mechanism to coordinate nonproliferation programs directed at the independent states of the former Soviet Union. This provision is based on S. 673, a bill introduced by Senator HAGEL and me with the cosponsorship of Senators DOMENICI and LUGAR. It will ensure continuing, high-level coordination of our many nonproliferation programs, so that we can be more confident that they will mesh with each other. The need for better coordination has been cited in several reports, including last year's report of the Russia Task Force of the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board, chaired by former Senator Howard Baker and former White House counsel Lloyd Cutler.

This bill encourages the Secretary of State to seek an increase in the regular budget of the International Atomic Energy Agency, beyond that required to keep pace with inflation. Because the IAEA's budget for 2003 has already been adopted, this bill authorizes an increase in the U.S. voluntary contribution to IAEA programs. This organization is vital to our nuclear nonproliferation efforts, its workload is increasing, and now it has begun a major program to locate and secure "orphaned" radioactive sources that could otherwise show up in a terrorist's radiological weapon.

Subtitle XIII-B of this bill is the "Russian Federation Debt for Nonproliferation Act of 2002," a provision that Senator LUGAR and I introduced, with the support of Senator HELMS. This subtitle authorizes the President to offer Soviet-era debt reduction to the Russian Federation in the context of an arrangement whereby the savings to Russia would be invested in agreed nonproliferation programs or projects. Debt reduction is a potentially important means of funding the costs of securing Russia's stockpiles of sensitive

nuclear material, chemical weapons and dangerous pathogens, of destroying its chemical weapons and dismantling strategic weapons, and of helping its former weapons experts to find civilian careers and resist offers from rogue states or terrorists.

Three months ago, the Bush Administration persuaded the G-8 countries to take a significant step: they agreed to what is known as "10 plus 10 over 10," a commitment to provide the Russian Federation \$10 billion in U.S. nonproliferation assistance and \$10 billion in assistance from the other G-8 members over the next 10 years. This joint willingness to provide \$20 billion opens new possibilities in Russian nonproliferation. It also sends a message to Moscow that working with the West or nonproliferation will be more profitable than selling dangerous technology to Iran.

The G-8 agreement included the important possibility of the leading economic powers using debt reduction to finance this assistance, and the Administration worked with us to ensure that this subtitle gives the President the flexibility he would need if he chose to use debt reduction. Pursuant to the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, he must still obtain appropriations for the cost of reducing any debt pursuant to this section. I have every hope, however, that we will see the day when both the United States and several of our allies use debt reduction to increase our nonproliferation assistance to Russia.

In closing, I thank my colleagues on the conference committee, particularly Chairman HYDE and Representative LANTOS in the other body, and Senator HELMS, for their cooperation in putting together this bill.

I would also like to recognize the hard work of all the staff on both the House and Senate committees, who did much of the preliminary work to prepare the bill for consideration by the conference committee. Equally important, I want to recognize the invaluable contributions and tireless efforts of the Deputy Legislative Counsel in the Senate, Art Ryneearson. Mr. Ryneearson labored many hours, including all of this past weekend, to assist the Committee staff in preparing and refining the legislative language in the conference report. This report would not have been ready for consideration at this time without his hard work.

This conference report is important to the operation of our U.S. foreign policy agencies. It has received strong approval in the other body. I urge its approval by the Senate.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this legislation is the culmination of a bipartisan effort begun early in the 107th Congress. Senator BIDEN chaired our conference committee and was a tremendous leader in finalizing the bill and ensuring its bipartisan support. I thank him for his leadership of the committee and his friendship over the past 30 years.

Given the strange events of the 107th Congress, this bill in fact had bipartisan authorship. We provided a first draft of this legislation to Senator BIDEN in May 2001, when the Senate leadership changed hands. The bill approved by the conference committee is similar to that draft in many respects. It contains important details that advance our national interest and reflect shifts in priorities that followed the terrorist attacks on our country of September 2001.

The bill allows for the payment of our U.N. assessments in a manner that encourages that organization to embrace improved financial practices and to complete the reforms that were initiated at our insistence, including the critical issue of appropriate representation of American personnel in U.N. positions.

This bill accomplishes a number of other important objectives. It reaffirms Congress's strong support for Israel as an important ally in a turbulent region by recognizing the right of Israel to name Jerusalem as its own capitol and by financial backing to ensure its national security. It promotes stability in the Taiwan Straits by reaffirming our insistence that any resolution of that long-standing conflict must be peaceful and based on the freely expressed assent of the people of Taiwan.

We have, I hope conclusively, clarified the status of the American Institute in Taiwan by requiring that the American flag be flown just as proudly over that Institute as it is over all American diplomatic facilities.

The legislation recognizes the importance of maintaining pressure on the repressive Castro regime in Cuba and moves us toward the goal of liberating the Cuban people. It does this by specifically authorizing continued radio broadcasting to Cuba.

The bill provides Secretary Powell with additional authorities to meet the increasing need for effective American diplomacy in the present crisis and to enhance the capacity of Diplomatic Security agents. It also makes equitable pay, personnel and travel adjustments for the benefit of State Department personnel.

We also extended indefinitely the reporting requirement on international child abductions, reflecting our dissatisfaction with the lack of success in reuniting American parents with their children when they are kidnapped overseas by the other parent. We established new reporting obligations that ensure that Congress is notified when individuals who have previously engaged in terrorist activities are granted visas for entry into the United States.

The progress that Russia has made toward becoming a real democracy has been painful but necessary. This bill emphasizes the establishment in Russia of a free press and the rule of law as indispensable institutions in a functioning democracy. These institutions

would focus public attention on dangerous activities that are ignored or condoned by government officials. I expect that these institutions, once firmly established, would have a restraining effect on highly questionable activities, such as Russian support for the Iranian nuclear program, and help curtail the proliferation of weapons technology and expertise, nuclear know-how is just as dangerous as nuclear material. This bill also encourages the Russian Government to make serious contributions to nonproliferation efforts in order to give them a stake in these efforts and complement our efforts in Russia.

The Tibet Policy Act in this bill culminates the Senate's decades-long support for the Tibetan people. It bolsters Administration efforts by specifying investment guidelines to invigorate the Tibetan economy while preserving the distinct identity of the people. Most notably, this will end any dispute over the importance of the Special Coordinator for Tibet by legally mandating such a position.

The Security Assistance portion of this bill contains several important provisions, particularly those regarding the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. While I support the overarching framework of the Russian debt-for-nonproliferation provision in Title XIII, I harbor deep concerns about continued Russian proliferation to such state sponsors of terrorism as Iran. Thus, the Title includes a provision that places restriction on this debt reduction authority by requiring the President to certify that the Russian Federation has made and continues to make "material progress" in stemming the flow of sensitive goods, technologies, material, and know-how related to weapons of mass destruction to states that are international sponsors of terrorism. In this era of uncertainty, it is critical that we address this threat. Following in this vein, the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 has been amended to require additional information be provided in required reports on transfers of weapons or weapons-related technologies to Iran.

With nonproliferation and disarmament issues taking a front seat in this bill, a provision has been included to allow development assistance to be spent for the destruction of surplus stockpiles of small arms, light weapons and other munitions in developing countries. This is indeed an important activity for developing countries as they emerge from periods of civil war or ethnic conflict.

The Security Assistance title of this bill also recognizes that South Asia is a critical theater of operations in our war against terrorism, and encourages the U.S. Government to continue to work on issues of nuclear and missile proliferation in this region. To this end, this section states that it shall be the policy of the United States, consistent with its obligations under the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nu-

clear Weapons, to encourage and work with the Governments of India and Pakistan to achieve a specific set of nonproliferation objectives by September 30, 2003. The Administration must continue to make this a high priority in its key foreign policy objectives.

Title XI affirms strong support for the profoundly important responsibilities of the Verification and Compliance Bureau to promote compliance analysis and enforce countries' compliance with their legal and political nonproliferation commitments. The title authorizes a larger budget than requested for this Bureau, including \$1.8 million for additional personnel to adequately staff the mission of this critical Bureau and to improve verification capabilities. This Bureau is essential to ensuring that treaties and agreements are more than simple parchment, and should be adequately funded to carry out its mission.

Furthermore, I am happy to support a Title XII provision that provides the President with the authority to enter into bilateral or multilateral agreements for post-undergraduate flying and tactical leadership training at facilities in Southwest Asia. This is critical addition for our war against terrorism, as it enables the United States to maintain a positive influence in the region and enables our forces to have access to training and range facilities. Additionally, Title XIV recognizes the important work of the Office of Defense Trade Controls, and supports additional authorities so that it can achieve a greater level of efficiency in processing munitions licenses.

Finally, every Senator knows that no bill is possible without many long hours and hard work by staff. I can't tell these young men and women often enough what a great service they do for the Senate and for the country. I am particularly grateful to Patti McNerney, the Committee's Republican Staff Director, Rich Douglas, the Chief Republican Counsel, Senior Staff Members Mark Lagon and Mark Esper, Republican Counsel Jeff Gibbs, and Professional Staff Members Carolyn Leddy and Maurice Perkins. I am grateful for the work of the rest of the Committee's Republican Staff: Skip Fischer, Walter Lohman, Jed Royal, Jose Cardenas, Brian Fox, Susan Williams, David Merkel, Kelly Siekman, Sara Battaglia, Philip Griffin, Lester Munson, Kris Klaich, Hannah Williams, and Sarah Bardinelli.

The cooperative efforts and hard work of the Democratic Committee staff members, especially Brian McKeon, the Committee's Chief Counsel, Ed Levine, and Jofi Joseph, as well as the current and former staff directors, Tony Blinken and Ed Hall.

Last—but by no means least—I note that Art Rynearson, the Deputy Legislative Counsel of the Senate, has done his usual superb job of putting this conference report into proper legislative form. I say thank you to all.

The conference report was agreed to.
The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 483) was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 5:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:17 p.m., recessed until 5:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. REID).

HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 4738

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, there are 15 minutes equally divided between the two managers of the bill.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself up to 3½ minutes.

One of my favorite expressions is: Only in America, this great country of ours. I was thinking, as we approach this debate on the motion to invoke cloture, that only in the Senate, the great deliberative body we are, would we find Members about to do what I fear they are going to do, which is to vote against a proposal that they themselves have made because they want to vote on it without anyone else having a right to amend it. That is where we are.

We have had a good debate. We have the Gramm-Miller substitute amendment to the underlying Senate Governmental Affairs Committee proposal that created the Homeland Security Department. Senator GRAMM and Senator MILLER said their proposal and ours are 95 percent the same. We have a disagreement about how to protect homeland security workers in the new Department and still retain the authority of the President over national security.

Senator BEN NELSON of Nebraska and Senator JOHN BREAUX of Louisiana, working together with Senator LINCOLN CHAFEE of Rhode Island, have found common ground. They presented and crafted an amendment that gives a little bit of reassurance against arbitrary action to the Federal workers before they have their union rights, collective bargaining rights, taken away because the President determines those rights are in conflict with national security. It gives the President some new authority to reform the civil service system but encourages him to try to negotiate those changes with the unions. If that does not work out, then it is decided by a board, where the President appoints all the members. This achieves some due process and fairness for homeland security workers but does not diminish the final word of the President of the United States at all.

In short, with all respect, I say to my colleagues who support Gramm-Miller but who are going to oppose the end of a filibuster of Gramm-Miller, they do not know how to accept a yes to the question they have asked. The Nelson-Chafee-Breaux amendment says yes to the question they have asked: How can we create a Department of Homeland Security, retain the authority of the President, and still protect some fairness and due process for homeland security workers?

What they are asking for is an up-or-down vote on the Gramm-Miller proposal, the President's proposal, denying us, apparently—the majority of us, now 51—the right to vote on an amendment which, incidentally, is pretty much the exact same amendment Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA, a Republican of the House, was allowed by the Republican leadership of the House to put on the President's proposal. We can at least offer the same courtesy and rights to three bipartisan Members of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I yield such time as the Senator from Nebraska requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has up to 4 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for this opportunity to speak on this amendment.

Quite frankly, I think my colleague from Connecticut is absolutely right, and I ask my friends on both sides to take yes for an answer because I truly think this amendment will be the kind of yes that has been sought in the past.

I am puzzled, as I think perhaps anybody watching and many of us here today are puzzled, by the characterization of this amendment as being in opposition to the President. Anytime you are trying to close the gap, anytime you are trying to bring about a resolution of compromise, it is hardly an exercise in opposition. I think, if anything, we should be looked at as friends of the process in trying to bring this together.

To also suggest cloture would be inappropriate now is also very startling because I always thought cloture was how we finally brought the end of debate to get a vote for or against legislation to move it forward. Right now it seems the vote against cloture is to stall and have more opportunity for debate.

So if people are a bit puzzled, I can only appreciate that fact because I am puzzled, too.

In this exercise, I have learned a lot about the spin as opposed to the appropriate characterization of letters or of comments on the floor. I thought we were giving Governor Ridge and Senator GRAMM exactly what they were asking for because that is the way I read Senator GRAMM's comments. I

presided the day he was presenting them, and I thought I understood him. I am surprised to find out I did not understand what he was saying. I am surprised I cannot read a letter from Governor Ridge in which he says the same management authority that is now provided in the IRS model is what we are after. We provide that in this amendment. Now we find that is not the case, either.

This is a puzzling day for me. It is perhaps puzzling others who are watching it, because when it appears yes cannot be taken for an answer, I do not know what kind of an answer will be appropriate. If there is other language, I have said I will take a look at it, but I do not think the answer is no language. In fact, what we have is an opportunity to present something that ought to close the gap, fill in the last 5 percent, so we have 100 percent legislation that does what the President needs to be able to do and also protects national security.

National security is lost in this debate over nits and little differences of opinion about this piece of the amendment or that piece of the amendment. We can close them, but we have to be able to be in a position to know when they are closed and when enough will be enough.

Right now I would not know even how to begin to try to close this if it remains open, but it seems to me we can vote for cloture and then let's have the opportunity to finish this bill, get an up-or-down vote, as has been requested, move on and make national security the important point it is and have a Homeland Defense Department.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator BURNS is under the time controlled by Senator THOMPSON. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. I congratulate my friends from Nebraska and Connecticut who were just talking. It seems like yesterday we came to this body. You didn't get my goat, either.

We have all been involved in conferences. Anytime we pass legislation in this body and then it is passed in the House, we go to conference. In conference is where we settle our differences. It usually comes down to one or two items where there starts to be an impasse.

Basically, those one or two items were not dealt with in the amendment of my friend from Nebraska. It is still there and even adds another layer or hurdle for the President to jump in the management of this Department before a final decision can be made on the movement of money or personnel and their responsibilities in this particular national security Department.

We have not dealt with the two very important ones, and nobody puts it better than the ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction. So I caution Senators this is a bold attempt to find a compromise, but even though you pass their amendment, it does not deal with the heart of this debate.