

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO BETTY BURGER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Betty Burger, a remarkable public servant and extraordinarily devoted congressional staffer. Betty died on Saturday at the age of 87. Betty was my chief caseworker and my oldest and longest serving staff person. She was still on the payroll as of Saturday.

Although I am deeply saddened by her departure, it brings me comfort to know this devoted mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother slipped peacefully into the hands of her Maker.

It is fitting that Betty's loved ones kept vigil at her bedside. For nearly 40 years, Betty Burger kept vigil for the people of Iowa. She started on Capitol Hill working for Iowa Representative Fred Schwengel. After Congressman Schwengel left office, she worked for an Illinois Congressman by the name of Hanrahan for 2 years. Then she wanted to work for an Iowa Congressman again, and she joined my staff on my first day on the job in Washington after I was elected to the House of Representatives in 1974. Since then, for the last 32 years, Betty has worked as a congressional staffer for the people of Iowa.

If Congress needed any rationale for eliminating mandatory retirement age in 1986, Betty Burger is that example. As my chief caseworker, Betty earned a lifetime of experience on the job mastering the ins and outs of the Federal bureaucracy. Her countless contacts within Federal agencies put a face on the so-called faceless bureaucracy. No one knew how to cut through redtape more swiftly and surely. Betty was a masterful detective the way she tracked down disability claims and benefit errors at the Social Security Administration. She decoded the maze of paperwork at the Veterans Affairs Department, and navigated Byzantine immigration rules for constituents struggling with citizenship, employment status, and deportation issues. Betty Burger knew how to cut to the chase at the State Department for Iowans who were traveling, working, or studying abroad.

Most of Iowa's 2.9 million residents didn't know Betty Burger personally, but I want them to understand how this dedicated public servant made a difference for Iowans. Betty did her job for them with remarkable efficiency, tenacity, and integrity. I heard first-hand gratitude about Betty's work from individual Iowans nearly every time I went home and held town meetings. Betty also touched the lives of Iowans and their families through her work to nominate outstanding young people to our Nation's service academies. She would always talk about what a great group we had this year. Let me tell my colleagues something about Betty. We always had a great group of academy nominees as far as Betty was concerned. These young high school kids and their parents had sev-

eral conversations with Betty as they maneuvered through the nomination process. They were an inspiration to her and she knew with good young people in her academies, such as the ones she helped nominate, our country from a national security standpoint would be left in good hands.

In my office, Betty served as a role model for young staffers and seasoned colleagues alike. Her work ethic taught others to keep one's nose to the grindstone. Her professional attire taught others appearances do make a positive impression in the workplace. Her sharp-witted humor elicited laughter and taught us we could count on Betty to put a smile on everybody's face. Her uncanny grasp of cultural trends and current events taught others how to embrace aging and use one's work and life experiences for the greater good.

I can't talk about Betty without making it clear she was a fiercely loyal and proud Republican. She modeled compassionate conservatism each and every day she helped an Iowan. Day in and day out, Betty untangled a knot at a Federal agency for those who may have felt at the end of their rope trying to get an answer.

I often tell Iowans that representative government is a two-way street. Well, Betty Burger lived and breathed the spirit of representative government. She was the capable, no-nonsense person on the other end of the phone who brought thousands upon thousands of Iowans hope and peace of mind. She paved the street between Iowans and the Federal agencies from which they required service.

As her boss, I owe Betty a debt of gratitude for her tireless commitment, unwavering loyalty to this country, to the people of Iowa, and to me. As Iowa's senior Senator, I place a premium on constituent service. Betty understood this as well as anyone and exceeded my expectations.

As her friend, Barbara and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to Betty's family and the loved ones she leaves behind. As they remember their beloved mother, grandmother, sister, aunt, friend, and neighbor, please know we will dearly miss this classy and spirited Iowan who became part of our family during her honorable tenure—a lifetime—on Capitol Hill.

In the last four decades, many Iowans have felt touched by a guardian angel when Betty worked her magic on their behalf. May God's blessings continue to shine upon this guardian angel from Fairfield, IA, as she rests in peace alongside her husband John.

If I could give some advice to my colleagues, I last saw Betty in early January. If we hadn't been in session in early January of this year, probably the last time I would have seen her would have been before Christmas.

Betty got sick about that time and was going to the doctor. We were keeping in touch with her by phone but always waiting for her to get better and come back to work. Then, all of a sud-

den, she got very weak. We actually thought she would come back to work, but she got weak and then suddenly died.

My advice to colleagues would be this: I didn't get to see her since that last time she was in my office in January. Don't make the mistake I did. I should have been there by her bedside sometime during the period of her last week in hospice. I am sorry I wasn't. To my colleagues, take a lesson from me: When people are sick, see them. They may not come back to the office as you expect.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time for morning business be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Morning business is closed.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 372, which the clerk will report.

A bill (S. 372) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, first, let me express my disappointment that we are here under these circumstances. This is not the way we should be handling this important national security legislation.

The fiscal year 2007 Intelligence authorization bill should have been considered by the Senate, in fact, 7 months ago when it was reported unanimously by the Intelligence Committee. That is usually the way things are meant to work. For reasons that are still not clear to me, it was never brought before the Senate.

Because of the importance of this legislation, Vice Chairman BOND and I made the Intelligence bill the first order of business this January when the new Congress convened. We hoped the Senate could act swiftly on the bill so we could move to the conference with the House, but an anonymous hold on the other side prevented us from bringing up the bill and passing it by unanimous consent. Again, I am not

clear what the reason for that might have been, but it was discouraging to us and, in any event, it precluded our taking any action whatsoever.

Fortunately, Senator REID understands how important this legislation is. So last week he attempted to call up the bill. But even that simple motion to proceed to the bill was blocked, forcing the Senate to invoke cloture by a vote of 94 in favor and 3 against.

The Senate, after 7 months of delay, is finally considering the legislation that sets the policy framework for the Nation's intelligence efforts, but because of the inordinate number of obstacles put in the path of the bill to date, the majority leader has been forced to file a motion to invoke cloture on this legislation. I agree with him that this is the only way to force the Senate to finally do its job and pass this very important bill. It is unfortunate, but it has to happen. This is national security legislation.

I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support cloture so that we can move this bill forward to a conference with the House. I know I am joined by my colleague, the vice chairman. I understand that some, both in the Senate and in the administration, have expressed concern with a number of the provisions of the bill. The Office of Management and Budget issued a Statement of Administration Policy last Thursday including a veto threat, and unfortunately that statement ignored several important developments and several changes Vice Chairman BOND and I have proposed in a managers' amendment, which I am going to talk about briefly.

The administration complains about the magnitude of the fences and other restrictions contained in the classified annex to the bill. They ignore the fact that the classified annex was drafted last September with a view to having it in full effect for the full fiscal year. Vice Chairman BOND and I decided in January that the best approach to achieve swift passage was to simply bring up and pass the bill as it had been reported unanimously last year.

We have always known that many of these provisions have become outdated or have been overtaken by events. Of course, they will be adjusted, or perhaps dropped, when we go to conference. We have no intention of fencing 50 percent of a program with only 4 or 5 months left in this year. Please give us some credit.

Perhaps the more important omission in the OMB statement is the effort that Vice Chairman BOND and I have made to address, through a managers' amendment, many of the administration's specific concerns with those legislative provisions. I will run through these provisions quickly.

As reported by the committee, the bill requires two actions related to the public disclosure of intelligence budgets. First, it requires the public release of an overall budget request authorization and appropriation, the so-called

top line, one number for all intelligence spending.

The second action is a study and report by the Director of National Intelligence on whether the top line for each intelligence community element; that is, the CIA, NSA, et cetera, can always be declassified without harming national security. This was a recommendation, in fact, of the 9/11 Commission.

The managers' amendment; that is, the amendment by Senator BOND and myself, struck that requirement for a study and a report on the agency-level declassification. The study and report alarmed some who believed that declassification itself would cause no harm but worry that it could lead to a "slippery slope" of revealing too much information.

The managers' amendment returns the bill language to the specific stated objective; that is, the declassification of the overall national intelligence budget. This is something the Senate has voted for twice in the last 2½ years, including last month when it passed S. 4.

This concurrent version of the authorization bill includes another provision that has passed the Senate twice but which concerns the administration and some of our colleagues. That provision in section 108 provides additional authority for congressional committees, including the Intelligence Committees of both the House and Senate, to obtain intelligence documents and information.

The managers' amendment modifies section 108 in three ways. First, it doubles the amount of time the administration will have to respond to these priority requests from 15 to 30 days.

Second, section 108 currently applies to requests from any committee—any committee—that has jurisdiction over any part of intelligence, not just the Intelligence Committees of full jurisdiction in the House and Senate. This amendment will limit the provision to requests from the Intelligence Committees.

Third, it would make clear the Intelligence Committee could specify a greater number of days than 30 for intelligence community responses. We are not unreasonable people, and if more time is needed, we would, obviously, want to be helpful.

Let me be clear to my colleagues on other committees with jurisdiction that touches on intelligence matters, because some of them are sensitive about this issue. These changes will in no way limit their ability to ask for and receive intelligence-related information. In fact, any Senator can ask for such information.

The amendment sets up an expedited procedure available to the Intelligence Committees, but it does not change existing relations or procedures for obtaining such information for other committees. That should be of comfort. If another committee were to encounter difficulty in obtaining intelligence

information, they could easily ask the intelligence community to request the information under this expedited procedure. It sounds wordy; in fact, it is very easy. I think this is a sensible modification to alleviate the concern that the Intelligence Committee would be overwhelmed with requests requiring short turnaround times. Vice Chairman BOND and I are sensitive to that concern and modified the matter.

A second provision of the bill dealing with the provision of information to Congress is section 304. That section tightens up the requirement for the President to fully inform the Intelligence Committees about intelligence activities, including covert actions. Section 304, as reported, requires if the President does not inform all members of the committee about intelligence activity, the DNI must provide all members with a summary with sufficient information to permit members to assess the legality, benefits, cost, and advisability of these activities. This is on a case-by-case basis.

There was a discussion of this provision during our markup, and the administration has objected that this requirement is too detailed. The managers' amendment seeks to resolve that objection by providing instead that the DNI submit a classified notice with "a description that provides the main features of the intelligence activities." This standard is sufficiently broad to allow the notification of members, but at the same time protects sensitive sources and methods or ongoing operations.

Section 310 of this bill, as reported, would establish a pilot program on access by the intelligence community to information protected by the Privacy Act. This provision was controversial and several members expressed reservations. We subsequently learned the administration is no longer seeking this authority, so the managers' amendment strikes section 310 from the bill.

Finally, the managers' amendment modifies one of the reporting requirements included in the bill. Section 314 requires a classified report from the Director of National Intelligence about clandestine prisons. One part of that provision called for reporting on the location of any clandestine detention facility. Vice Chairman BOND and I agreed this particular information was of such sensitivity it should not be included in this report. The managers' amendment strikes that one requirement.

Mr. President, might I ask before calling up the managers' amendment, does the distinguished vice chairman wish to speak?

Mr. President, will the vice chairman have adequate time to speak?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, if the chairman wishes to offer the amendment, I will be happy for him to do that. I will talk as long or short as I have the opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit on the bill at this point.

AMENDMENT NO. 843

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I offer the managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], for himself and Mr. BOND, proposes an amendment numbered 843.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER, in not only bringing before this body the Intelligence authorization bill, S. 372, but also offering the managers' amendment. This is an important first step for the Senate to return to and enhance its responsibilities of coordinating oversight and conducting aggressive oversight of intelligence activities and programs.

The committee has not been able to pass an authorization bill in the last 2 years, which means the work that has gone on in the committee cannot be reflected in guidance to the committee or in carrying out our oversight responsibilities.

Some Members may recall, others have been informed, that 30 years ago the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence was formed to address a serious problem. There had been a complete lack of congressional oversight of U.S. intelligence operations. Then when we reviewed the attacks of September 11, the findings of our committee and the findings of the 9/11 Commission confirmed that congressional oversight of intelligence was not what it should be.

We firmly believe that enacting S. 372 will move us a long way in restoring the Senate's legitimate role in oversight of U.S. intelligence. I believe we must be in a position where we can assure our colleagues and the people of the United States that the intelligence activities necessarily conducted in secret do comply with the Constitution, the treaties and the laws of the United States and other mandates and limitations placed on the exercise of that secret power.

Make no mistake about it, intelligence in this global war on terror, which has been declared on us by al-Qaida and other Islamic groups, is one that can only be countered with effective intelligence. Intelligence is the most important weapon we have in keeping our homeland safe and protecting U.S. interests and citizens abroad. We need to make sure it is done properly. We need to make sure it is done effectively.

Having studied the intelligence community and having gone through exhaustive reviews over the last 4 years of shortcomings pointed out in the intelligence community operations, we believe we can work with the intel-

ligence community and provide necessary legislative support to ensure that the intelligence activities not only are staying within the road lines—staying on the road in the path—but also being carried out effectively. That is why we feel it is tremendously important we pass this legislation.

The chairman has pointed out there are concerns that have been voiced by the administration about this bill. To be candid, there are some provisions in the bill I do not favor or at least question. I hope in the amendment process and in the House-Senate conference we can develop a good bill that will be signed into law. But it is important to remember—and my colleagues who have expressed concerns particularly about the administration's objections should know—that what has been outlined by the chairman in the managers' amendment begins to deal with the major questions they have. The chairman and I have agreed it makes sense, for example, to declassify the top line number of the intelligence budget.

I have talked with leaders in the intelligence community and I said: Does that cause you any problems? They said: No. It is only when you get below that. Were you to go down the slippery slope of disclosing amounts going into particular units or particular programs of the intelligence community, you give away vital secrets.

This body has twice gone on record and was stated by the chairman and the 9/11 Commission has recommended disclosing the overall number so that the people of America will know whether we are continuing to support the intelligence community adequately, whether we are supporting it with the kinds of resources needed.

In our managers' amendment, we took out a study that would purport to look at the possibility of declassifying further details, other than the top line. We both agreed that should be out. The administration also was concerned about identifying certain sites, and we agreed, and in our managers' amendment we will take out any reference or any requirement of identifying those certain sites. The administration also was concerned about the number of people, the manner of informing members of the committee about certain activities that were highly classified. We are working to remedy that. The administration also had concerns about getting reports filed, the potential for a large number of requests being dumped on the intelligence community, and we have dealt with that.

So there are other items the administration has concerns about, and we may be able to address some of those here. We may be able to address some of those when we get to conference, if they still are not properly solved. But I would say one thing. The administration, like every administration, sometimes feels that congressional oversight goes further than they would like. Well, our job is to conduct over-

sight, and we do so with an aim of improving intelligence, the products that come out, and also ensuring that procedures are properly contained within the rules of the road, and we will continue to seek those legislative oversight tools.

We are going to accommodate the reasonable concerns of the Executive in every instance that we can because we want to make sure we don't, either by overt or inadvertent action, compromise intelligence sources, intelligence methods, or other essential intelligence programs that are necessary for the safety of our homeland and the safety of our troops in the field.

In addition to the measures contained in the managers' amendment, I have filed nine amendments, some of which overlap with the managers' amendment that we can discuss on the Senate floor. Some of these may be necessary to ameliorate and alleviate the administration's concerns. We were disadvantaged in filing this managers' amendment because the time that we had to do it was the time when most Members were out of Washington, DC, in their home State, which has led to some confusion.

I hope everybody who had a first-degree amendment that they wanted filed was able to file it by 2:30. We hope we will be able to deal with those amendments, and also we look forward to a good, robust debate on the floor of the Senate.

I hope we will have ready a description, at least for our side, of the provisions in the managers' amendment. Most of the concerns I have heard about this bill are concerns that should be alleviated by the managers' amendment, so I would ask all of my colleagues to read carefully the provisions in the managers' amendment to ensure that we have resolved those concerns.

In addition, Senator ROCKEFELLER and I are always willing to discuss with colleagues, in this unclassified setting, the unclassified portions and our reasoning for it. Our invitation to Members still stands; that if Members want to be briefed on classified portions of the intelligence bill or on matters that cannot be discussed on the Senate floor, we stand ready with our staffs to have briefings set up in the intelligence facilities to fill them in on questions that they may legitimately have.

We will look forward to conducting the debate in the time ahead.

I thank the Chair, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 rescinded.

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

MOVING AMERICA FORWARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my distinguished counterpart, the Senator from

Kentucky, Senator McCONNELL, held a press conference at 2:30, talking about what the Senate has not accomplished this year. I, of course, am very disappointed in that because I thought we had done a lot. I believe we have produced.

The minority talk a lot about their desire to see this Congress pass meaningful legislation. They talk a lot about supporting our troops. We have heard a lot from them about the need to defeat terrorists and make the country more secure. Their actions do not match their rhetoric. In far too many instances, our Republican colleagues say one thing and do another.

Last week, the 110th Congress reached its 100th day. In that time, the Senate has passed a series of bills that would move our country forward. With bipartisan support, we passed the toughest lobbying ethics reform legislation in the entire history of our country. With bipartisan support, we voted to give working Americans a much deserved and long overdue raise in the minimum wage. With bipartisan support, we passed a continuing resolution that enacted tough spending limits and eliminated earmarks for this year. With bipartisan support, we passed every single recommendation of the 9/11 Commission, after it languished in the Republican-controlled Congress for 2½ years. With bipartisan support, we passed a responsible, balanced, pay-as-you-go budget that reduces taxes for working Americans and invests more in education, veterans, and health care. With bipartisan support, we passed legislation that would fully fund our troops while forcing the President to change course in Iraq. And, last week, with bipartisan support, once again, we passed legislation to open the promise of stem cell research in a responsible and ethical way.

The American people want Congress to put petty bickering aside. This is exactly what I believe this Congress has done. It has not been easy. My Republican colleagues have, time and time again, allowed a small minority in their caucus to block progress that the American people, and a bipartisan majority of the Senate, demand. On every piece of legislation I mentioned, we have had to file cloture.

Sadly, on the most important issue facing our country, national security, this has been especially apparent. The minority forced us to come up with 60 votes to pass the 9/11 Commission recommendations. They required the same for the Iraq supplemental bill.

Now it appears this same group of Republicans will attempt to block passage of the Intelligence Authorization bill, the bill they wrote when they were in the majority but failed to pass for 2 years. As everyone knows, the Intelligence Authorization bill funds the operation of 16 agencies of the U.S. intelligence community, including the CIA, the FBI, the National Security Agency, the Defense Department, and all the

critical work they do in fighting the war on terror. We are so fortunate that we have bipartisan cooperation of the management of the Intelligence Committee. Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator BOND have worked closely together. They want this legislation to move forward.

This should not be a partisan issue. We had to vote to get 60 votes to proceed to the legislation. I said at that time, if you want to offer amendments while we are in the 30 hours postclosure time, do it. Now I am told the ability for us to get on the bill is going to be thwarted by not allowing us to have 60 votes.

I was upstairs this afternoon in room 407, getting a briefing on issues that are important to our country. It is so important that we move forward on this legislation and support our people who are making America safe and secure and protecting our interests all around the world. Sixteen agencies, I repeat, of the U.S. intelligence community want this legislation passed.

We are in a battle around the world on terrorism. Shouldn't our intelligence community be able to move forward with this legislation? I repeat: It was written by the Republicans. Why would they not let us go forward on this legislation? Is it because—I don't know. Is it because Vice President CHENEY thinks he is going to lose a little of his power directing everything covert that goes on in the intelligence community? Is he the one stopping this? Why? Why can't we pass legislation that was written by the Republicans to improve our intelligence operations?

This legislation includes essential initiatives that would improve our efforts to fight terrorism and control weapons of mass destruction, enhance our intelligence collection capabilities, and strengthen intelligence oversight. Does anybody dispute that? For 27 years, since we first started doing an Intelligence bill, we passed it every year. But not the last 2 years. Blocking passage of the bill leaves Congress silent on these important matters, dealing with terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, intelligence collection capabilities, and intelligence oversight. It is so important to pass this bill. This is not a partisan issue. I don't think there are political points to be scored on either side.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will let this legislation go forward. We have a managers' amendment that Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator BOND worked on that would be accepted. I cannot imagine why we would be stopped on an Intelligence authorization. I have been told that the word is out, the Republicans are not going to support cloture on this most important bill.

My friend, the distinguished Republican leader, pointed out this afternoon that we filed cloture a number of times this year. We surely have. We surely have, because there has been a minority of people on the other side who

forced us to do this. The bills we passed have been bipartisan: Ethics/lobbying reform got a big bipartisan vote; minimum wage, big bipartisan vote; the continuing resolution, a big bipartisan vote—we had to do that to fund the Government—the 9/11 Commission recommendations, big bipartisan vote; stem cell, big bipartisan vote; the supplemental, a bipartisan vote. Sure, we have had to file cloture because there has been a minority of Senators on the other side who forced us to do that on these bipartisan bills.

My friend, the minority leader, is right, we have filed cloture a number of times. The fact is, his side forced us to do so rather than let us proceed directly to these bills—and this bill. We have been forced to jump through a number of procedural hoops designed to block legislation that enjoyed bipartisan support.

I will continue to do that. I understand the rights of just a few Senators and if a few Senators want to stop us from moving forward, that is fine. But to think that we couldn't get 10 Republicans to support us on a motion to invoke cloture on an Intelligence authorization bill? That is beyond my ability to comprehend, why the Republicans would stop us from moving forward on an Intelligence authorization bill. I have said they can offer amendments to the bill. Even though I thought it was absolutely wrong that we had to vote cloture on the motion to proceed, I said, during the 30 hours, if you want to offer amendments, go ahead and do so. "No."

This is not ethics reform, it is not minimum wage, it is not stem cell research, it is not the continuing resolution—it is the ability of our intelligence agencies to do their work: the CIA, FBI, NSA, Defense Department. I urge the minority to not stop this bill from going forward. The vote is at 5:30. But that is what I am told is going to happen. Their actions, if in fact they follow through on this, are not in the best interests of the American people. Anyone who has been told that they are being stymied from offering amendments is not being told the truth.

We will continue to work in a bipartisan manner to move our country forward. The bills that passed this body so far this year have been bipartisan, with overwhelming support, and, yes, we did have to file cloture because a small number of people held us up from moving on this most important piece of legislation.

I hope there will be people who will move away from this maddening crowd who will not allow us to help these agencies do their work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Virginia.

VIRGINIA TECH MASSACRE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am joined on the floor by my distinguished colleague, Senator WEBB. We wish to address the Senate, indeed speak with all America, for we Virginians have

suffered today one of the most grievous incidents ever to occur in our State or, indeed, in America.

I speak to the tragic loss of life and tragic injury of so many students and faculty at the distinguished and venerable institution of Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, VA.

All America joins to mourn these young people whose lives of promise have been cut so short, and those injured as they, hopefully and prayerfully, recover from their wounds. I must say, I have been privileged to serve in this institution for many years. I served in many other posts of public service in my lifetime. This tragedy, this tragedy is an incomprehensible situation, an incomprehensible, senseless act of violence.

In time, be it days or weeks, Americans will learn more about the circumstances of today in Blacksburg, VA. For now, however, and forever after, our hearts and our prayers are with the victims, their families, and the other students and faculty at Virginia Tech and, indeed, their families.

Virginians are proud of this historic university. I have known it all my lifetime and how it has served our State and Nation for nearly a century and a half as an exemplary institution of learning, one that has contributed many fine young men and women to the Armed Forces of our United States.

For the moment, I simply close by saying that the historic and proud tradition of Virginia Tech will carry on. Our State embraces them as does all America. We will work with them to make sure they can carry on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. WEBB, is recognized.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I would like to thank the senior Senator from Virginia for having taken the initiative to bring this matter briefly to the floor today as we consider other issues.

As we have learned more facts about this incident during the time that I was presiding over the Senate, I am sure that over the next day or so we are going to learn a lot more that will help us understand, perhaps, how this incredibly tragic incident occurred.

We will have time to reach out to the grieving families and hopefully begin to heal ourselves and to again regain the confidence and the respect of the people who go to that institution. But I thank the senior Senator for bringing this matter to the floor. I want to associate myself fully with his comments. There is very little I can add in terms of describing the depth of our feelings and our regret over the fact that this incident has occurred.

It is an incredible human tragedy. As I said, there will be, I am sure, many stories over the coming days about how it occurred and the implications of it. But it is very fitting for us to pause for a few moments as we consider all of these other issues that are on the table, some of them which obviously

divide us by party, but certainly on an issue such as this we are all together in extending our compassion and our regrets to the families of those who are involved.

This is a great institution. The lives that were lost today were of those people who had in their early days demonstrated an enormous amount of promise, and we again express our regrets to the families and our determination that we will help the people of the community around Virginia Tech regain the sense of purpose and vitality once we reach more understanding of what happened.

Again, I thank the senior Senator and I thank you, Mr. President, for allowing us to stop for a few moments in business today to mention this incident.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. We do recognize, both of us, our gratitude to the bipartisan leadership of this institution in opening today's session with a prayer and a moment of silence to honor the victims; not only the victims involved but those at this great university and throughout the State.

I also thank our Governor. Our Governor is en route quickly returning from a trip to Japan. He has been in contact and received a call from the President of the United States, George Bush. We have talked with his chief of staff throughout the day and have waited until this time, until such facts have been gathered, the few that are known about this tragedy, before addressing the Senate.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before the two Senators from the Commonwealth of Virginia leave the floor, let me express to them our sympathy and sorrow over the tremendous tragedy suffered in their State today.

A member of my staff has a son who attends this fine institution. Fortunately, she has learned that he is fine, but you can imagine her anxiety as she was waiting to hear from her son and had the television on hearing the reports.

I say to both of the Senators from Virginia that our hearts go out to them, to the members of this fine institution in Virginia, and to those who are affected by this terrible violence.

Before I turned to the issue that has brought me to the Senate floor, I just want to extend my condolences on behalf of the people of Maine to the people of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and dear friend from

Maine. I thank other colleagues who have spoken to me and to my distinguished colleague, Senator WEBB. We thank the Senate for its compassion in this matter. Each Senator feels deeply that it could have happened, I suppose, this sort of tragic situation, in any State in the Union. So we are all sharing this tragic moment in the life of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, can the Chair inform me of whether there is an amendment pending at the current time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only the managers' substitute.

AMENDMENT NO. 847 TO AMENDMENT NO. 843

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 847, which is pending at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Ms. COLLINS], for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. AKAKA, proposes an amendment numbered 847 to amendment No. 843.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reaffirm the constitutional and statutory protections accorded sealed domestic mail, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROTECTIONS ACCORDED SEALED DOMESTIC MAIL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) all Americans depend on the United States Postal Service to transact business and communicate with friends and family;

(2) postal customers have a constitutional right to expect that their sealed domestic mail will be protected against unreasonable searches;

(3) the circumstances and procedures under which the Government may search sealed mail are well defined, including provisions under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), and generally require prior judicial approval;

(4) the United States Postal Inspection Service has the authority to open and search a sealed envelope or package when there is immediate threat to life or limb or an immediate and substantial danger to property;

(5) the United States Postal Service affirmed January 4, 2007, that the enactment of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109-435) does not grant Federal law enforcement officials any new authority to open domestic mail;

(6) questions have been raised about these basic privacy protections following issuance of the President's signing statement on the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109-435); and

(7) the Senate rejects any interpretation of the President's signing statement on the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (Public Law 109-435) that in any way diminishes the privacy protections accorded sealed

domestic mail under the Constitution and Federal laws and regulations.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress reaffirms the constitutional and statutory protections accorded sealed domestic mail.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am calling up this amendment on behalf of myself, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator CARPER, Senator COLEMAN, and Senator AKAKA.

Our bipartisan amendment reaffirms the fundamental constitutional and statutory protections accorded to sealed domestic mail, even as we make provisions for sustaining our vital intelligence-gathering activity in the interests of advancing the goals of protecting our homeland from attack.

I am very pleased to have the distinguished chairman of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, Senator LIEBERMAN, as a cosponsor, as well as Senator CARPER of Delaware, who was the coauthor with me of the postal reform legislation that passed and was signed into law last year.

Senator COLEMAN and Senator AKAKA have also been very active on postal issues. I have also had the opportunity to talk with the distinguished chairman and the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee about this proposal.

For those who may not have followed this issue, let me first provide some brief background. On December 20, President Bush signed into law the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act that Senator CARPER and I introduced last year. This new law makes the most sweeping changes in the Postal Service in more than 30 years.

The act will help the Postal Service meet the challenges of the 21st century, establish a new rate-setting system, help ensure a stronger financial future for the Postal Service, provide more stability and predictability in rates, and protect the basic features of universal service.

One of the act's many provisions provides continued authority for the Postal Service to establish a class of mail sealed against inspection.

Now, let me make very clear, this is not new authority. This is a continuation of authority that the Postal Service already has.

Regrettably, on the day that he signed the Postal Reform Act into law, the President also issued a signing statement which has created some confusion about the continued protection of sealed domestic mail. He construed that particular provision in our bill to permit “searches in exigent circumstances, such as to protect life and safety.”

Now, since that time, the President's spokesman has made very clear that the President's signing statement was not intended in any way to change the scope of the current law. But the statement caused confusion and concern about the President's commitment to abide by the basic privacy protections

afforded sealed domestic mail. For some, it raised the specter of the Government unlawfully monitoring our mail in the name of national security.

Given this unfortunate and inaccurate perception, I wish to be very clear, as the author of the postal reform legislation; nothing in the Postal Reform Act nor in the President's signing statement in any way alters the privacy and civil liberty protections provided to a person who sends or receives sealed mail.

In fact, the President's signing statement appears to do nothing more than restate current law. By issuing the signing statement, however, the President, unfortunately, generated questions about the administration's intent.

I am confident the administration does not intend to interpret the law differently or change the constitutional or statutory protections. But, unfortunately, this is the case, again, of where the President stepped forward and issued a signing statement, upon signing this bill into law, that has created concern and confusion where none existed before. I think it is unfortunate the President did so.

Under current law, mail sealed against inspection is entitled to constitutional protection against unreasonable searches. With only limited exceptions, the Government needs a court warrant before it can search sealed mail. This is true whether the search is conducted to gather evidence under our Criminal Code or to collect foreign intelligence information under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, perhaps better known as the FISA Act.

Exceptions to the warrant requirements of the fourth amendment are limited. When there is an immediate danger to life or limb or an immediate and substantial danger to property, then the Postal Service can search a domestic sealed letter or package without a warrant. Let me give you examples of what we are talking about. What we are talking about when we are talking about immediate threats could include wires protruding from a package that gives one the reasonable belief there may be a bomb inside. Another example might be odors or stains that indicate the presence of a hazardous material.

Americans depend upon the U.S. Postal Service to transact business and to communicate with friends and family. If there is any doubt in the public's mind that the Federal Government is not protecting the constitutional privacy accorded their mail, if there is a suspicion that the Government is unlawfully opening mail, then our people's confidence in the sanctity of our mail system and even in our Government itself will be undermined.

That is why I have joined my colleagues in offering this amendment today. It makes clear to all law-abiding Americans that the Federal Government will not invade their privacy by

reading their sealed mail, absent a court order or exigent circumstances. Any contrary interpretation of the Postal Reform Act is just plain wrong. I think it is important that the Senate go on record affirming this basic constitutional privacy—statutory privacy, as well—that Americans have always counted on.

Our amendment will do nothing to weaken the vital protections we have created against terrorist attacks, but it will remove any doubt that our fundamental protections of privacy rights have in some way been weakened by the signing statement that, unfortunately, the President chose to issue.

So I urge my colleagues to remove any doubt, to make it clear that the new law, on which we worked so hard for 3 years and which was signed into law last December, does not change this in any way.

Again, I thank the chairman of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking member for their willingness to discuss this issue.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, first, I see the distinguished chairman of the committee and the vice chairman of the committee on the floor. I commend both of them for their excellent work on this legislation. I particularly wish to commend Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Vice Chairman Bond for the bipartisan approach the two of them have brought to tackling these important issues in this session of the Senate.

It is extremely important that intelligence is conducted in a bipartisan fashion and the chairman and vice chairman have set a model in terms of approaching these issues in that fashion.

In the 1970s, Members of Congress realized there was not nearly enough oversight of our Nation's spy agencies, and this lack of oversight led to a number of serious abuses. In response to the abuses, the Senate created the Select Committee on Intelligence, on which I am proud to serve. Each year, for 29 straight years, our committee has produced an intelligence authorization bill, and this annual legislation has given Congress a means by which to exercise oversight of the classified intelligence budget and provide guidance to the Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Agency, and various other important intelligence agencies.

In 2005 and 2006, regrettably, the Congress failed to pass the Intelligence authorization legislation. In my view, this is inexcusable. At a time when

Americans were questioning our intelligence agencies' ability to keep them safe, the Congress failed to provide the necessary support. At a time when the intelligence community was undergoing major reorganization, Congress failed to provide sufficient guidance. At a time when our allies and our own citizens were raising serious questions about our detention policies, the Congress failed to conduct oversight. At a time when Americans were opening their morning papers and reading about the aggressive new forms of Government surveillance, such as the President's warrantless wiretapping program, the Congress failed to demand accountability.

The committee did report Intelligence authorization bills for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, but they were blocked repeatedly by anonymous holds. Regrettably, the previous leadership failed to make passing this legislation a top priority. The new leadership of the Senate has decided that ensuring national security and protecting Americans' rights and values is a major concern and, as a result, we are now dealing with this year's Intelligence Authorization Act, and it comes, in my view, to a great extent because of the cooperation of Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Vice Chairman Bond, who has also assisted me in a number of critical areas throughout this session of the Senate, for which I am very appreciative.

This legislation contains a number of important provisions which I am proud to have worked on with my colleagues on the committee. It clarifies many of the authorities of the Director of National Intelligence, establishes a new national space intelligence center, and creates a strong independent inspector general for the intelligence community. It strengthens congressional oversight by clarifying the President's responsibility to keep the Congress informed of all intelligence activities. In addition, it contains three amendments that I offered and that I believe are going to improve the functioning of our intelligence agencies.

The first of these amendments would make public the total amount of the national intelligence budget. In my view, it is ridiculous to suggest that Osama bin Laden is going to gain some sort of advantage from knowing that the national intelligence budget is one specific number or another. But declassifying this number would increase, in my view, transparency and public accountability. It would increase public accountability without sacrificing the national security needs of this country and also permit a more informed debate about funding for defense and national security.

The second of these amendments which I offered with the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER, would increase resources to support the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States. After investigating the proposed take-

over of the management of several United States ports by Dubai Ports World, I became convinced that the process for approving these foreign purchases did not include sufficient due diligence. There ought to be more room in this process for input from the intelligence community, and these additional resources that have come about as a result of this amendment I developed with Chairman ROCKEFELLER would support that.

The last of these amendments would maximize the criminal penalty for knowingly and intentionally disclosing the identity of a covert agent. Like many Americans, I was shocked and disappointed to learn that members of the administration exposed the identity of an undercover CIA officer for partisan political purposes. Undercover officers perform a vital and demanding service for the Nation, and the very nature of their work prevents them from receiving public praise or recognition. Deliberately exposing an undercover officer for any reason, in my view, is unacceptable, and to do it for a political purpose is simply reprehensible. This provision will send a message to men and women of the CIA and other human intelligence services that the Congress values them and their work and takes any threat to them or to their identity very seriously.

I also note that the version of this legislation that was reported by the Intelligence Committee also creates a new exemption to the Privacy Act. In the additional views to the committee report, Senator FEINGOLD and I expressed our view that the impact of this provision had not been considered carefully enough. I am pleased the managers' amendment prepared by Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Vice Chairman BOND removes this provision and, in my view, that is going to make our conference with the House of Representatives easier.

In sum, I am pleased with the work—the bipartisan work—our committee put into this legislation, and I hope the Senate will support cloture this afternoon. This is extremely important legislation. It ought to be passed on a bipartisan basis. It should not be subject to a filibuster. Congress has surrendered its national security responsibilities for too long and too often, and it is time for the Congress to stand up and do its job.

Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Senator BOND have made it possible for the Senate Intelligence Committee to bring this legislation before the Senate. I am very hopeful this legislation will move forward today and that the Senate will support cloture.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind comments. As I said earlier today, we are most grateful to the leadership for having brought up S. 372. This is a very important and necessary first step for the

Senate to return to its responsibility of conducting oversight of U.S. intelligence activities and programs. Enacting S. 372 into law will help restore the Senate's legitimate role in oversight of U.S. intelligence.

As I said, the administration has voiced some concerns about provisions in the bill, and the chairman and I have made a good-faith attempt to address those concerns. We have a managers' amendment, plus several other amendments on which the chairman and I agree that we think are legitimate and measured modifications that don't change the basic purpose of our provisions but meet some of their objections.

As I said before, there are provisions in the bill that we do believe need such changes. Should any Member, however, feel we have not gone far enough, we invite them to come to the floor and join in the debate.

Is S. 372 perfect? I have never seen a piece of legislation that was and don't expect to see one. That being said, we should all remember that the perfect is the enemy of the good. There is no such thing as perfect legislation. We can today, however, begin the process of improving our oversight with a good piece of legislation.

Again, will the administration agree with everything in the bill? No. On the other hand, I do not remember many times in my political career when any executive branch has invited the legislative branch, Congress—or a State legislature with which I am also familiar—to conduct rigorous oversight of its actions and policies.

Unfortunately for executive branch officials, that is our constitutional role as laid down by the Founding Fathers. It does not mean we will refuse to accommodate the executive branch's legitimate concerns. After all, the President does have the power to veto any legislation that he feels unduly intrudes upon his authority.

In an effort to ensure the administration's concerns are addressed, I have filed an additional nine amendments to S. 372, some of which overlap with the managers' amendment the chairman and I have presented. I believe the chairman and I are in agreement on almost all of these amendments, if not all of them. Through that process, I think we can alleviate the concerns the administration has with the bill.

I am concerned, however, that the process by which we had to draft the managers' amendment, combined with the fact that the preparation had to be undertaken largely when Members were in their home State, has led to some confusion among our colleagues. That is why we are handing out a one-page summary that I hope all Members will review so they understand how this measure has been changed. We will be happy to talk with them privately or discuss it with them on the floor, and our staffs are available to work with their staffs if they have any other concerns.

I also want to make it clear to all of my colleagues that I support full and open debate on S. 372 and the timely consideration of all germane amendments. We ask that the amendments be germane. We would have great difficulty in conferencing this bill on non-germane amendments and the possibility that they would be accepted in the final report I would say is doubtful. If confusion over the amendment filing process has prevented any Senator from getting a germane amendment considered, I will certainly work with that Member to see if we could get the amendment brought to the floor for consideration.

Again, I thank my chairman who has worked in a very cooperative manner. We are seeking to achieve a good bipartisan consensus on how we in this body exercise our very important constitutional role of providing oversight for a critically important factor in our responsibility, and that is oversight and legislation with respect to the national intelligence program and the intelligence community which administers it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, in essence, what I will do is repeat what my valued and distinguished vice chairman said. It is a fact of life. The vice chairman and I have both been Governors. It is a fact of life that Governors don't like to have oversight. They don't get it. The legislatures don't get it. They get it by the people every 4 years.

It is a little different here. The President sends legislation. We look at it. It gets passed or not. But the country is so huge, and there are innumerable problems, none of which are more important than the national security. It is incredibly important not just to take the President's decision and assume that it is right. Maybe that works at the State level, but it doesn't work here.

We have an absolutely sacred obligation—and in this case a life-and-death obligation—to review, to do oversight, to ask questions, to call people in and to have closed hearings. We have endless numbers of closed hearings which are attended by members of the committee. Suddenly, this committee has come together, it is alive, and this sense of oversight is felt and appreciated by the intelligence community.

This single sheet of paper which every single Member will get when they come to the Chamber shows how Vice Chairman BOND and I, working together as we always do, made five major amendments to try to accommo-

date the administration with respect to the managers' amendment, which is the pending amendment. We worked those through very carefully, we agreed upon them, and they are now before us.

Then there is a separate list of five more individual amendments where we try to be responsible and responsive. That is all we can do.

The great sadness to this Senator over the past several years has been the inability of the Intelligence Committee to do oversight. That is our obligation. We need to know what is happening. There are certain areas which become so sensitive that it may be that only the vice chairman and I can be informed. People grumble about that, and so be it. That is national security protection. But we have to know what is going on, and that is the purpose of this legislation.

It has been a long time coming. The majority leader has spoken to that point. I recommend to my colleagues who come to the Chamber to vote that they take a look at this paper.

We have worked to try to accommodate the administration's objections. I am sure we have not accommodated all of them, but we have addressed some important ones without in any way interfering with our ability to do proper oversight.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, to make an announcement of some importance?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes.

POSTPONEMENT OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARING

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I just arrived back in Washington about an hour ago. I was on a flight for a number of hours and heard the horrific news of the tragedy at Virginia Tech. We had scheduled tomorrow morning before the Senate Judiciary Committee a hearing with Attorney General Gonzales. I have discussed this with the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, my friend Senator ARLEN SPECTER of Pennsylvania, and I called the Attorney General and spoke to him. All three of us agree—and they agree with my proposal—that we will postpone that hearing.

The hearing with the Attorney General will not be held tomorrow. We will postpone it until Thursday. The exact time we are working out. The Attorney General certainly was agreeable to that. I am sure he would want to be dealing with the matters of the shooting. Both Senator SPECTER and I felt this is a matter where our whole Nation is going to be grieving tomorrow and many individual Members in both bodies will be joining in that grieving and that concern for the families, for the victims of this horrible, horrible tragedy.

So the Judiciary Committee, I have decided, will not hold its hearing. It will be held Thursday.

I thank my friend from West Virginia for yielding to me so I could make that announcement.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I thank the Senator and yield to the Senator from Massachusetts such time as he may require.

EXPRESSION OF SORROW FOR VIRGINIA TECH TRAGEDY

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, with a heavy heart, I rise to express my tremendous sorrow for the growing number of victims impacted by a terrible tragedy on a Virginia college campus today.

My deepest condolences and prayers go out to the students, faculty and their families at the Virginia Tech campus who have been affected by this horrific crime, especially those who lost loved ones.

The Nation is stunned by the loss of so many young lives. The tragedy is felt all the more because these were young people—children in the prime of their lives, with so much to offer—and who gave so much to their families—and now they are gone. They were sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors. They were a part of all of us—and we will feel their loss. There will be time to debate the steps needed to avert such tragedies. But today our thoughts and prayers go to their families.

Today, the world weeps for the victims at Virginia Tech. Our thoughts and prayers are with you.

I thank the good Senator from West Virginia.

COURT SECURITY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, the distinguished Republican leader is not on the floor, so I move to proceed to S. 378, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill 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, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 107, S. 378, the Court Security Improvement bill.

Harry Reid, Jeff Bingaman, Chuck Schumer, Jack Reed, Byron L. Dorgan, Ron Wyden, Maria Cantwell, Dianne Feinstein, Daniel K. Inouye, Daniel K. Akaka, Jim Webb, Dick Durbin, Jay Rockefeller, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara A. Mikulski, Ken Salazar, Edward M. Kennedy, Patrick Leahy.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived, as provided under rule XXII.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.