

not. Instead of committing to redeploy our troops from Iraq, the President chose to escalate this conflict. Now, instead of working with this new Congress to forge a new strategy, a strategy worthy of the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform, the President and Vice President are on the attack—on the political attack—not against the Iraqi leaders who are slow-walking us through this conflict in their country, but against the American people who have rightly questioned their failing policy. The question is this: How much longer will this President refuse to listen?

Since joining the Senate just over 100 days ago, I have worked to put pressure on the Bush administration to redeploy our troops from Iraq. In mid-March, as a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I traveled to Iraq to get a firsthand look at the situation on the ground, to see the hard work of our dedicated troops, and to talk with our military commanders and with Iraqi political officials. In Baghdad, our delegation met with several of the officers leading America's military engagement in Iraq, including GEN David Petraeus, LTG Raymond Odierno, and LTG Martin Dempsey, as well as members of our U.S. Embassy country team. We also met with Mahmud al-Mashhadani, Speaker of the Iraqi Parliament, and National Security Minister Shirwan al-Waili. In my capacity as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I also met with members of our Nation's intelligence staff and their Iraqi counterparts.

In Fallujah, we spoke with GEN Walter E. Gaskin, Marine commander in Anbar Province, and other commanders of the Marine Expeditionary Force. I met three brave Rhode Islanders there: Kristie St. Jean from Woonsocket, Christopher Tilson from Providence, and Anthony Paulo from Westerly, all serving our Nation with dedication, courage, and honor.

On our return, we traveled through Germany to visit Landstuhl Regional Medical Center near Ramstein Air Base where our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen, badly injured in Iraq and Afghanistan, are med-evac'd to receive critical medical care before their return home. MAJ Andrew Risio, who hails from Ashaway, RI, is helping provide care to our wounded soldiers in that facility.

The young men and women I met with in Iraq and their families have made tremendous sacrifices, and their expert performance and can-do attitude reinforced my pride in the American spirit. The security posture we maintain around our military bases is strong, and our troops are working hard to secure the cities and countryside of Iraq. The work of our intelligence and Special Operations personnel, which often runs nonstop through the night, is remarkable and exhibits a level of professionalism in which every American can be very confident.

The achievements of our forces in Iraq are serious—and here is what impressed me the most from our trip: So is their commitment that the Iraqis must assume responsibility for the security and governance of their own country. In nearly every briefing, at every level of command, the message came loud and clear that our military is highly focused on accomplishing a handover of security responsibilities so as to bring our troops home. As a young soldier in mess hall told me, the Iraqis "won't stand up until we start to stand back."

I do believe the Iraqis need more motivation to stand up. For instance, there is key legislation the Iraqi Parliament must pass that our military commanders believe is necessary if this surge is to succeed. They told me we cannot succeed in this military surge unless it is accompanied by a political surge, an economic surge, and a diplomatic surge. Critical measures to facilitate provincial elections, regulation and revenue-sharing for the Iraqi oil industry, reversing de-Beatification in favor of reunification, and restricting sectarian militias are all legislative initiatives that have stalled.

Iraq must take action and move this legislation forward and step up its own security presence. That will require real commitment and urgency, Mr. President. And it would be putting it mildly to say I was not reassured by the signals I received from our meetings with Iraqi officials. There is a serious disconnect between the urgency of our generals about this legislation, and the absence of urgency or energy on the part of Iraqi officials. One soldier I met put it in simple, homespun terms. He said: "If your parents are willing to pay for the movies and you don't have to spend your own money, or if you can get your big sister to do your homework for you, who wants that to stop?"

It does have to stop and this Congress is taking action to make that clear. I was proud to vote with a majority of the Senate to pass binding bipartisan legislation to require the safe redeployment of our brave troops beginning in 120 days, with the goal of having the vast majority of our troops redeployed from Iraq by the end of March. I am also a cosponsor of the recently introduced Feingold-Reid legislation to continue to put pressure on the Bush administration to safely redeploy our troops.

Only the kind of pressure a decision to redeploy creates will provide the motivation needed for Iraq to take the necessary steps to assume responsibility for its own governance and security. An announcement that our troops will be leaving will encourage the Iraqis to step up and take their security seriously, will discourage the insurgents, and will send a message to the world community that stability in Iraq will no longer be the responsibility of America alone.

Last week, I had the opportunity to take that message directly to the Oval

Office. In a meeting with President Bush and several of our colleagues who had recently traveled to Iraq, I urged him to announce a redeployment and a change of course was the strongest force he had in his hands. I also gave the President letters sent to me from Rhode Island folks with family members serving in Iraq. Those messages said loudly and clearly that it is time to bring our troops home.

But rather than acting to change course, the President keeps playing politics. He has threatened to veto legislation this Congress passed to provide critically needed funding for our troops in the field. In our meeting last week, he said he was prepared for what he called a "classic political showdown."

The question of what to do in Iraq is not a political fight between President Bush and the Democrats in Congress. It is a struggle between the President and the will and the good sense of the American people. It is long past time that their voices were heard.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. RES. 123

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, in January this body took a significant step toward reforming the way we spend American taxpayer dollars. While debating the ethics reform bill, Senators voted 98 to 0 in favor of my amendment requiring transparency for 100 percent of Member-requested earmarks. This was an early sign that Congress was going to change the way we do business here in Washington.

But since then, I am afraid my optimism has been tempered by a healthy dose of political reality. The ethics bill containing new Senate rules has been stalled, and its future enactment is anything but certain. In the meantime, the Senate has continued business as usual, as earmarking continues unfettered from transparency rules. The appropriators are soliciting earmarks. The WRDA bill is full of undisclosed earmarks, and none of the committees are complying with the anticorruption transparency requirements.

Upon notice that I was going to offer this bill again on the floor, the Democratic leadership of the Appropriations Committee just issued a press release

saying they were going to comply with these rules. That is really good news. So if the appropriators want to comply, there is no reason at all that we shouldn't enact this rule as a Senate rule.

Yesterday's Roll Call reported that the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee is advancing two pieces of legislation packed with billions of dollars worth of earmarks, but the committee is not asking Senators to certify that they have no financial interests in the projects, at least for now. In other words, the Senate is continuing to conduct its business in the old way, which was rejected by the American voters.

We cannot continue to wait. The Senate rules must be changed now if we are going to implement what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished chairman, called an accountable, aboveboard, transparent process for funding decisions, and put an end to the abuses that have harmed the credibility of Congress.

I agree 100 percent. My proposal, S. Res. 123, creates a new Senate rule that requires public disclosure of the earmarks contained in bills passed by committee. This disclosure includes the name of the Member requesting the earmark, the name and address of the intended recipient of the earmark, the purpose of the earmark, and a certification that the requesting Member and his or her spouse have no financial interest in the requested earmark. These are simple transparency ideas that the American people need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be added as cosponsors to S. Res. 123: Senator ENSIGN, Senator McCAIN, Senator ENZI, Senator MARTINEZ, and Senator McCASKILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, this resolution will immediately require all Members who request earmarks to certify in writing that they have no financial interests in the requested earmark.

Following the imprisonment of Congressman Duke Cunningham for selling earmarks for bribes, Americans need to know their elected officials are not using public office for private gain. This is simply information every Senator should be willing to provide, and I believe most are.

But it is beginning to look as if the new majority is not really interested in shining light on the earmarking process. Before we left for the Easter recess, I asked unanimous consent for the Senate to adopt S. Res. 123 so that we could enact this important rule immediately. The majority objected and said this proposal needed to go through the "appropriate process." That is a sad excuse. This rule has already gone through the normal process. It was offered as an amendment on the floor, it was modified by the leadership of the Democratic Party, and it passed 98 to

0. This is a Senate rule, and the only thing left for us to do is actually enact it.

Let me just read a few quotes from the Democratic leadership when we worked out the language on this bill before. This includes a lot of Democratic language.

Majority leader HARRY REID said: In effect, we have combined the best ideas from both sides of the aisle, Democrat and Republican, to establish the strongest possible disclosure rules in this regard.

Majority whip DICK DURBIN said: I am pleased with this bipartisan solution. I believe it reflects the intent of all on both sides of the aisle to make sure there is more disclosure. We have full agreement. The language has been vetted.

The bill I offer today as a Senate rule is exactly the language we passed 98 to 0.

The majority leader offered up his own excuse when he said his office was not notified in advance. In order to make sure that excuse is not used again, I sent a letter last week to the Democratic and Republican leaders notifying them of my intent to seek unanimous consent today to enact a Senate earmark disclosure rule—again, the one we have already passed 98 to 0.

But I understand the other side has come up with a third excuse. This time, they are going to say that enacting earmark disclosure requirements will dilute the effect of the lobbying and ethics reform bill. This is probably the weakest of all of their excuses. How does enacting an ethics reform provision dilute its effect? The only thing diluting ethics reform is our unwillingness to abide by this new rule. This excuse rings hollow because the majority did not bother to include this rule in their original bill. When we brought it to the floor, they tried to kill it.

I have tried to work in a bipartisan manner on this issue. I have been patient. But it has been over 80 days. The earmark process is continuing as usual, and all the American people are getting is excuses. It is time to enact this rule.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 123; further, that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in explaining my reservation, I first wish to commend the Senator from South Carolina on the courtesy he has extended to both sides of the aisle in no-

tifying us of his intent to make this unanimous-consent request. I wish to make clear to him and to all Members that the Senate Democratic leadership remains fully committed to earmark disclosure, but we believe his suggestion, taking it piece by piece, is not the right way to accomplish our goal.

Earlier this year, we considered comprehensive ethics reform. It is a product of the first 100 days of the new leadership of Congress that we are most proud of. Included in that reform was a provision related to transparency in earmarking. I supported this reform. In fact, I joined Senator DEMINT in crafting a new definition of "earmark" and requiring that earmarks in legislation be posted on the Internet prior to their final consideration on the floor of the Senate. We both agreed on this language. It passed with an overwhelming majority of 98 to 0, and the underlying bill passed 96 to 2.

No one is suggesting these earmark rules will not be implemented. In fact, today the Senate Appropriations Committee, chaired by the President pro tempore of the Senate, who is now presiding, Senator BYRD, has announced a new policy of transparency in accountability, totally consistent with the language which we agreed on and adopted overwhelmingly on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee's announcement on these sweeping reforms be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations Press Release, Apr. 17, 2007]

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES EARMARK REFORM STANDARDS

WASHINGTON, DC.—The U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations will adopt an unprecedented policy of transparency and accountability beginning with the Fiscal 2008 appropriations cycle, Committee Chairman Robert C. Byrd, D-W.Va., announced Tuesday.

"The changes that we are making in the appropriations process will help to restore confidence in the Congress," Chairman Byrd explained. "We are ending 'business as usual' in Washington, D.C. We will restore integrity to the process. We will increase accountability and openness, while we also will work to substantially reduce the number of earmarks in legislation."

Until S. 1, the Ethics and Earmark Reform legislation, is signed into law, the Senate Appropriations Committee will follow these standards:

All earmarks will be clearly identified in the committee bill and report. The identification will include the requesting Senator, the amount of the earmark, the recipient of the earmark, and the purpose of the earmark. If there is no specifically intended recipient for an earmark, the intended location of the activity will be listed.

An earmark shall be defined as it is in the Senate-passed Ethics and Earmark Reform legislation. An earmark is a legislative provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator, Member of the House, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, that provides, authorizes, or recommends a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending

authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality, or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula driven or competitive award process.

The committee bill and report will be published on the Internet, both through the committee site (<http://appropriations.senate.gov>) as well as on the Library of Congress' website (<http://thomas.loc.gov>).

Senators will be required to certify that neither they nor their spouses have a financial interest in any earmark. Senators will need to submit a letter to the Appropriations Committee certifying that they have no financial interest in a project. Those letters will be available for public inspection. What constitutes a Senator's "financial interest" shall be determined by the guidelines of the Senate Ethics Committee and Senate Rule XXXVII.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, under these new guidelines, all earmarks will be clearly identified in the committee bill and report, including the requesting Senator, the amount of the earmark, the recipient of the earmark, and the purpose of the earmark. An earmark shall be defined as in the Senate-passed ethics reform bill, which Mr. DEMINT and I cosponsored. The committee bill and report will be published on the Internet—as my amendment required—so that the world can see these earmarks in advance of final passage. Senators will be required to certify that neither they nor their spouses have any financial interests in any earmark. These guidelines will be in place until the ethics reform bill is signed into law.

I commend the Presiding Officer as chairman of the Appropriations Committee for reaching out to the other side of the aisle, to the ranking member, Senator COCHRAN from Mississippi, so that he has been informed of our intention to reform this earmark process.

Earmark disclosure, though, is only one part of the much broader package. We need to strengthen gift and travel rules for Members of the Senate, close the revolving door, strengthen lobbying disclosure, outlaw the K Street Project, this notorious project in which Mr. Abramoff and others were involved, and take other steps to clean up the way business is done in Washington.

Now, if the Senator from South Carolina has his way, we will take one piece today. Some will suggest taking another piece tomorrow. I think it will dilute our effort. We need, within the next few weeks, to work with the House to pass this measure. For those who ask: Well, why hasn't it taken place so far, the House ethics reform was done by House rule, did not involve a joint action by the House and the Senate.

So we are going to find a vehicle that will accomplish our Senate ethics reform, statutory and rules reform, and do it in the appropriate manner and do it in a comprehensive way. We have been assured by House leaders that they will move on this bill in the next

few weeks. As soon as the House acts, the Senate will move for conference as quickly as possible. We should not take up bits and pieces of the larger bill.

The Senate has expressed a strong support for earmark disclosure, and the Senate Appropriations Committee, which I am proud to be a member of, has taken the lead on this side of the aisle in strong reforms. The goal of the Senator from South Carolina is already being implemented, and I hope he can take "yes" for an answer.

I would like to correct one thing he said for the record. When he started his remarks about earmarks, he said at one point that when it comes to earmarks, this Senate is "business as usual." As the Presiding Officer and those who follow the Senate know, that is hardly the case. When we considered the continuing resolution which had all of the pending appropriations bills from the previously Republican-controlled Congress yet enacted, we took a bold move on our part—that is, the Democratic side—and eliminated 9,300 earmarks that were in bills authored when the Senator from South Carolina was in the majority. We eliminated every single one of them—all 9,300 earmarks. It contained no new earmarks. This continuing resolution eliminated funding for over \$2.1 billion of earmarks for over 1,900 separate projects.

This is hardly business as usual. Business as usual would have been to take the bills from a Republican Congress, with thousands of earmarks, and enact them into law. We did not do that. So to suggest we are continuing along the path that was the case when there were previous leaders in Congress is just not supported by the facts.

Beyond that, I can give my assurance to the Senator from South Carolina, my colleague, that the earmark language which we adopted in the Senate is going to be the standard by which we live. The Appropriations Committee has made that very clear. I believe that is what we should do.

So at this point, Mr. President, acknowledging the commitment of the Senator from South Carolina to this issue and acknowledging that he should be standing here and saying he has accomplished quite a bit to this point, I would have to say that his additional suggestion today of plucking out one piece of ethics reform and moving on it would be inconsistent with our ultimate goal of having comprehensive ethics reform. In the meantime, we have followed this measure through the Senate Appropriations Committee and, as a consequence, I must object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this issue. It is very interesting. The American people should hear what has just gone on here.

What we have heard is rhetoric without responsibility. There is no question that by moving, as Senator DEMINT has, we finally got the Appropriations Committee to endorse what was passed in the ethics legislation. However, after the ethics legislation was passed, I spoke on the floor. I was the last person to speak on the floor late that evening. I made the statement—and it is now proving to be true—that it was ethics reform in name only, no substance.

We now hear an argument that says: We should not pass the most significant portion of the ethics bill in a stand-alone process so that we can, in fact, do what the American people want, which is transparency in this Government.

It is interesting, if you know how this place operates, that if in fact you have an earmark reform on appropriations only, and no earmark reform on an authorization, you have no earmark reform because once something is authorized in an authorizing bill through an earmark, it no longer will apply to the appropriations bill. So we will have the same thing going on. The reason we are seeing an objection to earmark reform is because we truly, in the majority of cases, don't want earmark reform. What we are doing is, we are doing it—talk about piecemeal—only in one area. What we will do is, there won't be an earmark on an appropriations bill. What we will do is authorize them now. Since we won't apply the earmark rule to authorization bills, the American public will once again be hoodwinked. They won't know whose financial interest it is nor who it will benefit.

The problem with ethics in Washington isn't the lobbyists, isn't the campaign contributions, it is the Members of Congress. Until that changes, until the American people demand accountability—what we just heard was a flimsy excuse for not accepting this into the rules of the Senate. We voted on it. The American people deserve it. It is a sham.

I again ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration, and the Senate now proceed to S. 123; further that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the several requests?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object.

Mr. DURBIN. It strikes me as odd that the Senator from Oklahoma will not acknowledge the obvious. The earmark reform language which he supported, and the Senator from South Carolina supports, passed the Senate 98 to 0. It was part of the first comprehensive ethics reform package this Senate has seen in many years; many years of Republican rule, I might add. We are

now saying that the Appropriations Committee has voluntarily said, even before the conference committee that we are going to live by these standards.

I will not quibble with the Senator from Oklahoma because he and I see this quite differently. But authorizing a project does not mean it has money. That is why we have authorizing committees and appropriating committees. I can authorize the Sun, the Moon, the stars, and the Milky Way, but I will not deliver any of those to anybody until I get to an appropriations bill.

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. When I am finished, I will. All of the authorization in the world notwithstanding, unless you appropriate the money from the Treasury for the project, it is just a good idea that might happen.

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I said I will. Allow me to finish my sentence. What I am suggesting is, other committees may take this up as well on an interim basis. But the bills that are going to move on the floor of the Senate are the appropriations bills. Now that the budget resolution is passed, our major obligation is to achieve something we haven't done for years. We want to try to pass the appropriations bills on time. That means that the time of the Senators from Oklahoma and South Carolina and all of us will be consumed with appropriations bills, and the rules we will play by on earmarks for those bills which will be front and center, our major business, will be the same rule that you voted for, the vote that the Senator from Oklahoma cast on this floor for earmark reform. So I say to the Senator from Oklahoma, he can be prepared as these bills come to the floor to see the very approach he has suggested be followed voluntarily. In the meantime we have the assurance of the House that this matter is going to conference committee.

Suggesting that we have abandoned our commitment to reform or calling it a flimsy excuse overstates the Senator's position.

I object.

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators will please address other Senators through the Chair and refer to other Senators in the third person, not in the first person.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois objects.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will re-

sume consideration of S. 372, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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.

Pending:

Rockefeller/Bond amendment No. 843, in the nature of a substitute.

Collins amendment No. 847 (to amendment No. 843), to reaffirm the constitutional and statutory protections accorded sealed domestic mail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the Republican manager, Senator BOND, and I and our staffs have been working together to clear some amendments, and we have in fact cleared already 10 amendments. I now ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senate to consider en bloc the following amendments, that they be agreed to en bloc, and that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc. These were agreed to by both sides and have been cleared by all parties. The numbers of the amendments are 845, 846, 856, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, and 872.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the several requests?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is very important that we move forward with this bill. We have given time for our colleagues to debate and raise other questions. We would ask that we be able to proceed in a reasonable timeframe to take up amendments which have been introduced by the chairman and the vice chairman together and reflect bipartisan agreement. As vice chairman, I am firmly committed to passage of intelligence reauthorization. I would say further it remains my intention to reduce the partisanship and politicization of intelligence matters.

Events on the Senate floor yesterday, including direct personal attacks on me, indicate this remains a tall order. This bill makes getting a bill harder, and it is already hard enough. Given the kitchen sink provided in the administration's Statement of Administration Policy indicating a possible veto, the chairman and I are trying in good faith, as the chairman indicated, to work through 9, 10, or a dozen amendments to correct the major objections that the administration has.

The administration must know that as we try to weigh their key priorities, they must respect our priorities and our fundamental oversight responsibility which I and the Members of this body should take seriously, as any Senator will.

As for yesterday's events, Senator McCONNELL manages the floor for the

minority. He did not want to end the debate prematurely and the opportunity to offer amendments by the minority, especially with 18 Members absent from the Senate due to bad weather. I supported him because it is the responsibility of our two leaders to manage the floor debate and to protect the rights of minorities and absent Senators. While the attacks on me were inappropriate and offensive, I will continue to work for passage of this intelligence reform measure, which is one of the most important bills we can pass in this session. The measure is too important to be derailed by personal and political attacks.

My friends on the other side of the aisle want more oversight of intelligence. I agree. We got into problems prior to 9/11 because we didn't have good oversight. We have found that there are holes that need to be plugged in oversight. We need to move forward. But forcing an end to the debate with 18 Members absent was not the way to do so. I am hoping that we can show progress by adopting amendments and moving this bill forward to exercise our oversight to provide the intelligence community the direction they need. Our desire is to move forward in the regular order, work our way through amendments, work out a time agreement, dispose of amendments, and hopefully conclude with a bill that most, if not the overwhelming majority, of Members can support so we can get to conference and continue the process.

I will continue to work with the chairman under the difficult circumstances that he and I both face. I am not for delay or any effort, real or imagined, to kill this bill, but I have honest concerns, as others, that there should be an opportunity to address through the regular order in a reasonable timeframe. If there are unreasonable delays, then we will pursue other options which are necessary sometimes to move a bill.

Because of the difficult division present in recent years over these issues, we have been unable to get an authorization bill passed. I find that unacceptable, and I am committed to finding a bill, but it can't be just any bill. It must be the product of give and take and mutual respect and compromise between both parties and both bodies and one the administration can sign.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Will the vice chairman yield?

Mr. BOND. Yes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has indicated to me that he will not object to the managers' amendment going forward, if he would be allowed to finish what he was talking about, which I assume would happen within the next 5 or 8 minutes. If that is the case, then we will have made progress.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I didn't mean to cut the Senator off. For the movement of this bill, we had hoped to