

When Steve came on, he quickly proved himself to be one of the most capable and effective managers on Capitol Hill. I think that is certainly in the proof today with the many friends he has, of staffers and consultants and others in this town who have tremendous respect both for his opinion and his judgment.

You would be hard pressed to find a man with a greater drive, a greater competitiveness, or a greater work ethic anywhere. He truly loved working, as he always puts it, to change America and to make it better. One of Steve's greatest assets that continually blessed me is his ability to identify talented young people and give them the confidence and the ability to become outstanding professionals.

He never approached the young staff on Capitol Hill with a condescending attitude. It was always an attitude of empowerment: What is it you can do today with the talent you have, and how is it you can develop the new talents you need to take those next steps you need to take to reach that ultimate goal.

How incredibly important to have people in our lives who empower us to reach our potential and to reach our goals, to reach for the stars, not just for ourselves but for our great country, and for those whom we love. There is no greater blessing than to see someone who gives of himself to make sure others can reach their potential.

Steve has mentored young men and women on my staff who have gone on to become House and Senate Chiefs of Staff, congressional State directors, campaign managers, State party directors, and a multitude of other positions. Steve also encouraged those in my office who showed great aptitude to continually challenge themselves and take on new responsibilities, never to shut a door or an opportunity they may have thought was too big or out of their realm, but encouraged them to do as much as they possibly could and to reach for those stars.

Nearly all of my current senior staff served me in some shape, form, or fashion, whether as an intern, a staff assistant, or a legislative correspondent before being promoted to their current position, and they did so with the recommendations of Steve Patterson, who said: Learn all the jobs in this office so you can talk about and know what it takes to make this office tick and to make it great.

Steve left me in capable hands, and I truly believe Steve's ability to nurture so many of the best and brightest political minds our State has to offer will be one of his lasting legacies.

But what also makes Steve special is he was more than a great boss to my staff; he has been a tremendously great friend to me and to my family.

Steve is a self-described Green Bay Packers and Cincinnati Reds fanatic as well as an Oklahoma Sooner and Oklahoma State Cowboy supporter. Steve was known to be commissioner or at

least participated in fantasy football and baseball leagues with the staff. March was not complete without the famous Patterson annual March Madness pool. We think about it now as we move into those basketball playoffs.

Steve was an avid Senate softball player in his earlier days and took up golf in his later days. He loved getting the staff, both male and female, outside the office for these kinds of great activities of coming together in fellowship and fun and making sure our office was tight, not just in the responsibilities we had to accomplish but in the friendships we could build and things we should share with one another in helping each other to grow in our stature and in our accomplishments.

It was his passion for those things that endeared him to them and built bonds that went between the typical employer-employee relationship. It is what also made our office strong and will continue to make our office strong as we see the quality in all of those attributes we build both professionally as well as the fellowship with our fellow man.

Lastly, I couldn't talk about Steve Patterson if I did not mention what a terrific family man he is. "Punchy," as he is known in his family, was a wonderful son and is an exceptional husband and a father. In 1984 Steve married Jean, and shortly thereafter, they had a daughter together, Megan. Steve was devoted to both Paige, his first daughter, and Megan.

While in Virginia, he was active as a soccer coach for almost 10 years. Many of our staff remember this decked-out van he drove. He loved his van because he loved the time he spent in it traveling the State and the parameters of the State of Virginia with his girls on soccer tournaments. He drove to work in the van, but on the trips his daughters went on with the soccer tournaments, it was transformed. It was a home unto itself and he loved it.

He was more than a loving father, he was also a caring son. I was able to see that. His parents came to live with his family in 1985 when his mother was ill with breast cancer. Steve, Jean, and the girls cared for his mom until she passed away in 1994. I talk oftentimes about my own family, my grandmother living with us when I was growing up and what an incredible experience it brought to me and to our family. I could see Steve saw the value not only in what he could do and the love he could share and provide for his mother and father but also what it meant to his family to be a part of a larger giving in love.

When Steve moved to Little Rock in 2003 to run my Senate reelection bid, his father moved with them and they lived in Little Rock until he passed away in 2004. Steve's father had suffered from diabetes, and his affliction led to Steve's involvement as chairman of the Central Arkansas American Diabetes Association.

Giving back to the community was always a tremendous priority for him.

As can you see, Steve Patterson is one of a kind. We will certainly miss him in the office. But I take comfort in the fact he will not be too far away—always an arm's reach or a phone call away—he has guaranteed me that.

He has now chosen a new career path and has opened a political consulting firm with two of my former staffers in Little Rock. They are doing great things, working hard and enjoying life. In his new tenure he will specialize in fundraising, strategic planning, and grassroots coalition building, which is something he is unbelievably talented at.

Life's journey is a great journey and the road we travel is one, as we look back, that provides us so many opportunities, so many blessings. I cannot think of a greater blessing than to be able to travel that road with a great friend such as Steve Patterson, not only in the past but in the future, in the many years ahead.

I am enormously grateful, Steve. I wish you the best of luck in your new endeavor. I know you will be successful as you embark on your new path. I cannot thank you enough for all you have done for me and so many others throughout your career in service to Government. From the bottom of my heart, thank you for your faithful friendship, your service to me, the great State of Arkansas, and without a doubt your country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Texas.

IRAQ

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise to talk again to the resolution pending on the floor. I look forward to having the debate continue on the other options for the resolution.

I am against the resolution on the floor because I do not see a purpose. I do not see a purpose for a nonbinding resolution that makes America look irresolute. What could we be thinking to try to take something across the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives that would give any signal to our allies or to our enemies that we cannot finish a job, that the war on terrorism is important but not important enough to see it through?

I think of the young men and women who have died in this war. They are giving their lives, the ultimate sacrifice, as part of their legacy to our country. They are leaving something for our children and grandchildren and their children and grandchildren.

If we pass nonbinding resolutions that undercut the mission and the purpose for which they have given their lives, which is the war on terror, to keep freedom in America, we would be doing a great disservice that is undeserved for those great patriots. Our young men and women throughout the years have been willing to go into the volunteer service. The people who are fighting in this war are volunteers.

We have had volunteers and even people who didn't volunteer in past wars to make sure that America stood strong for freedom. I cannot imagine that the Congress during World War II would have passed a nonbinding resolution to say: We don't think our troops should be in Europe.

We are sinking to new lows. I hope we can resist the political winds that have caused us to get to this point. The only reason we would pass a non-binding resolution is to send a political message. I don't think the Senators who have stood on this floor for decades before us would have passed resolutions that meant nothing except to send a message that would undercut our troops in the field.

Do the people who want to pass a resolution such as this believe this isn't an important war? We are fighting for our children's futures every bit as much as we have in any conflict in which we have been engaged. We are fighting to keep terrorists from coming back to America and threatening our way of life and the opportunity that America offers for our children. If we look irresolute, if we look weak, if we look as if we can't be strong, we will put a blemish on the sacrifice that has been made already by so many of our young men and women, and we will undercut those who are serving right now in the theater in Iraq. I can't imagine, when we think this through, that that would be the course that a deliberative Senate would take.

The President of the United States knows we have not achieved the success we hoped to. For that reason, he is taking a different course. Any one of us in Congress might have done it a different way. There is no question that many in Congress are concerned about the mission. That does not mean we take the step of a nonbinding resolution that says we don't support the Commander in Chief. The Constitution didn't provide for Congress to command our military. The Constitution provides one Commander in Chief, not 535. It would be so wrong for 535 people to second-guess the Commander in Chief, who has announced that the plan he has put forward is one that was made in the military.

Many of us talked to General Petraeus. We asked questions, because there are questions about embedding our troops in the field outside the protected zone. General Petraeus totally defends the plan. He takes the responsibility for the plan. He believes it will work. In fact, there are signs things are getting better. There are signs the Iraqi Government is strengthening its measures to crack down on insurgents, militias, any of the groups that have been killing innocent people. There are signs that there are ways this could succeed.

During one of the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, Senator LIEBERMAN asked General Petraeus if a resolution such as we are voting on today would give the enemy some en-

couragement, some clear expression that the American people were divided. General Petraeus answered:

That is correct, sir.

We have been talking about this for the 2 months-plus that we have been in this session of Congress. We certainly talked about it all last year. We will continue to talk about it. I hope what we say on the floor is carefully crafted so we can disagree with people who do support this resolution, and we can do it based on the Constitution, on principles of war, on the relationship that Congress should have with the President. All of these are legitimate. There can be disagreements about what is the best approach for finding success, but what we cannot disagree about is that we must win the war on terror, we must show America's commitment, and we will not undercut our troops who are in harm's way today.

I have seen all the iterations of the resolutions that have been proposed by the majority. They have changed many times. Some of those resolutions even set deadlines for us to withdraw troops. What do my colleagues think that does for the troops who are there right now? If our enemy knows we are going to start the withdrawal of troops on a certain deadline, what does that do to their treatment of the people who are on the ground right now? They would consider that we have put a bull's-eye on every one of our young men and women with boots on the ground right now. It would be akin to saying: We are going to leave here so whoever is here now is not going to have the support needed to finish this job. If we are not going to finish the job, why wouldn't they step up their efforts, which is exactly what they would do.

We have to look at the reality. No matter what kind of front we would put on a resolution that shows that we do not have the resolve, the commitment to see this through, it will embolden the terrorists. When the terrorists think we are going to leave or that we can't take it, that we have to start an exit without regard to the success of the mission, then what would keep them from beginning to take over Iraq, make it a terrorist haven, make it the training ground from which they could proliferate weapons of mass destruction and terrorists all over the world? We have already seen that in many specific instances. This would give them a bigger field in which to train, one that is not going to be necessary to hide. It will give them more revenue to produce weapons that could hurt even more.

I have cosponsored S. Res. 70, the McCain resolution, which renews our commitment to defeating the terrorists in Iraq and winning the war. That is a resolution that we should all support. Congress has the right to cut off funds, but I cannot imagine that responsible Members of this body would vote for a resolution that would cut off funds and say we are not going to give the troops who are there the equipment, training,

and protection they need to do the job. That would be unthinkable. That is one of the resolutions also pending for us to address.

Losing this war will not make America safer. This is a war that must be fought. It must be won, not just for the sake of the Iraqi people. It is for the sake of America. It is for the sake of freedom. It is wiping out terrorists where they are so they do not harm innocent people in America again.

I hope cooler heads will prevail. I hope this deliberative body that has a great history for our country and in the world will see we should not be taking the political position. We should not be testing the political winds because what we say has consequences. What we say can be used as propaganda against our troops who are in harm's way. Most certainly, it can be used to embolden those who are training right now to attack America.

I hope, in the end, we will defeat the Reid resolution, that we will take up some of the other resolutions, and we will keep in mind that what we say and the longer we talk about it, the more dangerous it can become for our troops and for the likely success of the mission that is before us. We want the Iraqi Government to take the responsibility for the safety and security of the Iraqi people. What do Senators think the Iraqi Government is going to do to make that happen, if they think America's resolve is wavering, if they think we might set a deadline in which to leave, if they think we might start a graceful exit before they have the ability achieve security?

We can't let the Iraqi Government think we are going to plan for an exit before we have won the war, secured Iraq, kept the terrorists from having a training ground and revenue to harm more innocent people in the world or we will not be standing for the traditions and the spirit and the commitment to freedom that Americans have made throughout the generations of our country.

That is not a legacy I think any Member of the Senate would want to leave. I certainly do not want to leave that legacy for my children and grandchildren, nor for the children and the next generation of the State I represent and love so much, the State of Texas, nor for the children and grandchildren of Americans, the country I am serving. I hope we will not forget exactly what our legacy will be if we do the political thing rather than the right thing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas, who is indispensable to the Senate.

Today we are confronted with a struggle that could very well define the world in which our children and their children will live. Many will say this statement is hyperbole or politically

expedient and designed to disguise a troubled policy. I only wish that were so.

Today we are fighting to prevent Iraq and Afghanistan from disintegrating into failed states, where that chaos will be exploited by those who wish to undermine—and even destroy—mainstream Muslim and Western civilization.

In the past, these terrorists used Afghanistan and other developing nations as safe havens from which attacks against Americans were planned and executed throughout the world. One hardly needs to be reminded of the bombings of our Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania or the attack on the USS *Cole* to see this is true, not to mention the events of September 11, 2001.

What would happen if we were to permit these terrorists, and others who wish us ill, to have another such safe haven? Of what would they be capable? Just today we have read in the papers of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed's confession to many of the world's worst acts of terrorism. Remember that from Afghanistan, a country without significant infrastructure or resources, these terrorists were able to orchestrate the greatest attack on American soil since Pearl Harbor. Just imagine what their capabilities would be if they were able to control only a fraction of the oil wealth of Iraq. Is that the world in which we want our children and our grandchildren to live—a world in which uncertainty and fear become a part of everyday life?

As one prominent Democrat stated before he reversed his position and announced his intention to run for President:

... we cannot and will not retreat. We will defend ourselves and defeat the enemies of freedom and progress.

Were mistakes made in the conflict in Iraq?

In a word, yes. I am sad to say important errors were made. Perhaps one of the greatest occurred over the past 30 years right here in our Nation's Capital. Past and present administrations, Congresses, and Department of Defense leaders primarily concentrated on training and equipping our forces to fight what is called in military circles "The Big War."

In such a conflict, large formations of mechanized divisions, corps, and armies seek to fight decisive battles on a conventional battlefield. This is not to say maintaining such a capability is no longer vital to our national security. It remains an absolute necessity.

However, in large part, due to the resolve of many of our military leaders not to fight "another Vietnam," for the bulk of our Armed Forces, the skills necessary to fight a counterinsurgency had withered and atrophied. This is exemplified by the fact that the Army-Marine Corps Doctrine for Counterinsurgency had not been updated for 20 years, until December of 2006.

As General Petraeus, our new commander in Iraq, wrote 1 year ago:

[T]he insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan were not in truth the wars for which we were best prepared in 2001; however, they are the wars we are fighting and they clearly are the kind of wars we must master.

Other dire mistakes were made.

Many of those errors can be directly attributed to the decisions made by the Coalition Provisional Authority which originated from or were ratified by the senior civilian leadership at the Pentagon at the time. This includes the decision to disband the Iraqi Army without providing alternative means for the employing and sustaining of its former members. These former Iraqi soldiers went on to become the foundation of the initial insurgency. We might have been able to prevent that had we chosen another route.

Another mistake was the decision to eliminate the first three levels of leadership, not only in Government ministries but hospitals, universities, and Government-run corporations. Managers, no matter how junior, who were members of Saddam Hussein's Baathist Party were removed. The result was those who had the managerial experience best suited to rebuild Iraq's institutions were arbitrarily dismissed, even if they had not played any role in Saddam's atrocities.

In sum, many of the problems we confront today are as a result of our own shortsightedness and the administration's failure to fully and comprehensively develop and execute a plan for stabilization of Iraq after the fall of the Saddam regime.

So how do we go forward? We do have options.

Some, such as the authors and supporters of S.J. Res. 9, argue that we should unilaterally bring the bulk of our forces home from Iraq. Yet we all know what would happen if that were to occur. Iraq would be a failed state offering a safe haven for terrorists, not to mention the thousands and thousands of Iraqis who would be killed. Those who make this argument forget—or perhaps they do not know—that unlike our war in Vietnam, we face an enemy who is religiously committed to bringing the fight here to our shores. If the terrorists know we will withdraw the bulk of our forces in 120 days, as this legislation calls for, all the enemy has to do is husband its resources or "lie low" until that date. Perhaps the terrorists will launch fewer attacks to lull us into a false sense of security that this defeatist strategy is working. Then, with the cold calculation for which these terrorists have become notorious, they will spring on the Iraqi people before their Government's institutions—which were completely destroyed in 2003—can mature and fully take over the reins of fighting and defeating this insurgency.

These are not compelling options. At their core these "solutions" do not have the goal of victory but consist of resignation to an inevitable defeat.

So how do we win? How do we defeat the terrorists and give the Iraqi people

a fighting chance to claim a destiny of their own, a destiny that is based upon peace and the rule of law? The answer is not simple, but what great endeavor ever was?

First, we must learn from our mistakes. Then we must implement a strategy that harnesses the tactics and strategies that have defeated other insurgents in the past and apply those lessons to the conflict in Iraq. That is what our new strategy, called Operation Fard al-Qanun—which is Arabic for "enforcing the law"—sets out to achieve.

So what is this operation's strategic objective? Once again, I believe General Petraeus said it best at his confirmation hearing. He said:

[T]he mission . . . will be modified, making security of the population, particularly in Baghdad and in partnership with the Iraqi force, the focus of the military effort.

I could not agree more. Creating a secure environment is the essential task. This is accomplished not just by conducting operations to clear an area of insurgents but by maintaining an American/Iraqi security force in cleared areas which assists in providing essential services such as clean water and power to the local population and enforcing the rule of law. This, in turn, creates conditions where the Iraqi people can begin to develop a growing economy and where families feel safe to send their children to school. As these goals are achieved, more and more of the population will desire even greater stability and will support and work toward creating Iraqi Government institutions and security services that maintain and enhance this new security environment.

How is this strategy different from past endeavors? Unfortunately, in the past there were far too few American and capable Iraqi forces available to provide adequate security once an area had been cleared and, frankly, there are cases where political impediments prevented us from providing adequate security. That is why the additional forces we are sending to Iraq are so important. It is not more for more's sake but to maintain a secure environment for the Iraqi people.

This does not mean that our forces will be going it alone. Far from it. A key principle of the new strategy is to enhance and strengthen our efforts to advise and train the Iraqi military and police forces so they may eventually take over primary responsibility for the defense of their own nation. We must also remember that training was one of the major recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. Indeed, one of the members of my own party, who has authored legislation disagreeing with this new strategy—despite voting for the nomination of its implementer, General Petraeus—stated that Iraqi forces:

... while they're not fully independently capable of operating, they're excellent and trustworthy and fighting hard with our troops today . . . I would be willing to serve alongside those Iraqi forces.

I believe it is also important to add that, as of last week, three of the four Iraqi battalions that recently entered Baghdad were at above 100 percent troop strength. Another vital element is our new commander in Iraq, General David Petraeus. I can think of no better choice for implementing our new strategy.

General Petraeus has long been a student of counterinsurgency warfare. In the 1980s, when he received his Ph.D. from Princeton, he closely studied counterinsurgency operations.

During the initial race to Baghdad, the General commanded the 101st Airborne Division, and he is largely credited with devising and implementing a strategy that secured the city of Mosul immediately after the initial combat phase.

Later, when he commanded our effort to train the Iraqi Army, General Petraeus implemented the Transition Team concept. A Transition Team is composed of a group of advisers, primarily officers and seasoned non-commissioned officers, who serve with Iraqi units from those units' inception, including basic and advanced training and eventually combat operations. This is an important strategy, since experienced U.S. soldiers learn firsthand the operational characteristics and requirements of Iraqi units and tailor a training program to fit the units' needs. It also provides a detailed analysis of the individual Iraqi units' combat capabilities. General Petraeus was also one of the authors of the updated Army/Marine Corps Field Manual on Counterinsurgency which was published in December of last year.

I do not know of any other officer with the intellect and experience necessary to carry out successfully this new strategy and win the war in Iraq. He has my confidence and apparently the confidence of most everyone in the Senate since 100 percent voted for him and he clearly articulated this new strategy. But what he needs is our support and time to carry out his new strategy.

One must also remember that all of the additional forces needed to fully implement this new strategy will not be in place until early June.

As the General stated in a recent news conference:

We are, in any event, still in the early days of this endeavor, an endeavor that will take months, not days or weeks, to fully implement, and one that will have to be sustained to achieve its desired effect. . . . I have been on occasion bemused by people "Hey, how's it going? Have you won yet?" And the answer is we've just started. Just the second of five brigades [has arrived]. . . . Our soldiers are resolute. They want to see this succeed, as do their Iraqi counterparts, and that is exactly what we're endeavoring to do.

So what do we offer him and the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and coastguardsmen under his command? We offer guaranteed defeat in the form of a joint resolution.

But with great respect for General Petraeus, I believe we have already

seen some preliminary success. For example, Richard Engel, an NBC News reporter who has lived in Iraq for the past few years covering the war, responded just last month about our change in tactics. He said:

Night and day. There's a radically new war plan under way in Baghdad right now. For the past four years, U.S. troops have been on main bases, most of them outside the city center, some of them in Baghdad itself, and then have been effectively commuting to work. Now they live at work, they're living in small forward operating bases. . . . It is a very different strategy. We're seeing foot patrols again that we haven't seen in Baghdad for a long time, more hearts and minds campaign. . . . It's very much a new war. A lot of people say that this feels like '03, that the war is starting again and that this is a new battle plan. The battle plan to end the war in Iraq and finally establish some sort of stability.

I would also like to address a matter that, more than any other, has weighed on my heart over the past few years. That question is, Do we, not just as a nation but as a people, have the will to see our obligations through? This has always been an important question. But now, during an insurgent war, where the side with the greatest will, not technological advantage, will generally emerge victorious, it has become the essential question.

So now we must ask ourselves: Do we have the will to see right triumph? Do we as Americans believe in making sacrifices for the greater good? History provides an answer.

Almost 230 years ago, the Continental Army began a retreat, or more accurately a route, from Brooklyn Heights over the island of Manhattan into New Jersey and then across the Delaware River. General Washington had fewer than 1,000 troops and was confronted by the greatest Army of the day. The Continental's enlistments were up and many soldiers, lacking basic supplies and even food, were making plans to go home. For all intensive purposes, the American experiment in democracy, where all men were to be treated equal, was about to end.

Then something miraculous happened. A writer named Thomas Paine wrote a pamphlet entitled "Crisis." But panic was not his essay's subject. He wrote about commitment and faith that freedom would one day be victorious. His words still echo today:

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman.

Shortly, after the Continental Army heard these words, the morale, which had been crushed by the cold winters of New Jersey, was restored enough for General Washington to launch the raids on Trenton and Princeton, thus saving the young Republic.

Commitment and faith had been restored—the faith that freedom is worth fighting for, that it is worth sacrificing for, and that is what we as a Nation must remember now more than ever.

I see the leaders are on the floor, and I will not take any more time, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Utah being his usual courteous self.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 9 be agreed to and that the Senate now begin debate en bloc on the following: S.J. Res. 9, S. Res. 107, and S. Con. Res. 20 by Senator GREGG; that there now be 4 hours for debate on the above items equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that no amendments or motions be in order to any of the above; that at the conclusion or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on each of the above in the above order; and that the preceding all occur without intervening action or debate; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, since a filibuster is any Member's prerogative, I renew my consent with 60 votes required to pass each measure; and that if any measure fails to get 60 votes, the vote on passage be vitiated and the item be returned to its previous status.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me also say, when we complete these votes, we are going to move to three judges, one circuit court judge and two district court judges. So Senators should be alerted that we could have six votes.

Mr. President, I note 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.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 214

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 19, at 2 p.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, S. 214, a bill to preserve the independence of U.S. attorneys; that when the Senate considers the bill, it be considered under the following limitations: that there be 6 hours of general debate on the bill, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators LEAHY and SPECTER or their designees; that once the bill is reported, the Committee-reported amendment be agreed