

Ms. ANDREWS: Well, one of which he was putting in the letter.

Ms. MIDDLETON: One in the letter and others I'm not going to lay out right now to you, Commissioner Cox.

Ms. ANDREWS: Right, Chairman Cox.

Ms. MIDDLETON: Chairman Cox.

You're saying it's not your job to second-guess the management decisions, so it seems to me, if the letter is challenging the management decision and says it's for unlawful reasons, you're saying, well, I can't second-guess that. I can't investigate that. I can't see if it's true.

Ms. ANDREWS: My marching orders were to investigate the allegations he had made in both the September 2nd and October 11th letters. That's it.

Ms. MIDDLETON: Right. But—

Ms. ANDREWS: It's not my decision necessarily of what else we would be investigating.

Ms. MIDDLETON: But his allegation was, I was terminated for unlawful reasons.

Ms. ANDREWS: Right. We did not investigate to their allegations in the same way that you went to them to get their reaction to his, is that—

Ms. ANDREWS: Well, I didn't get their reaction to his. I'm calling them because they've been, you know, accused of wrongdoing, so I have to call them and—

Mr. FOSTER: And then when you did, they accused Mr. Aguirre of—

Ms. ANDREWS: He was—

Mr. FOSTER: —if not wrongdoing, of—

Ms. ANDREWS: Again, we're not second-guessing management decisions on terminating a probationary employee. Absolutely not. That's my understanding of our role in the IG's office.

Mr. FOSTER: Did you assume that Mr. Aguirre didn't have documents or wouldn't have been able to have documents that might substantiate his allegations that you might need to seek from him?

Ms. ANDREWS: I didn't make any assumptions about it. I have a lot of e-mails that he sent to people and people sent back to him.

Mr. FOSTER: Right. Which were given to you by the people—

Ms. ANDREWS: Right.

Mr. FOSTER:—against whom he made the allegations.

Mr. SPECTER. In the absence of any Senator on the floor seeking recognition, 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, a personal comment or two. On the Senate floor, some years ago, I compared Senator GRASSLEY to Senator Harry Truman, later President Harry Truman. I did so after observing Senator GRASSLEY's work over a long period of time. Senator GRASSLEY prides himself on being a farmer—on being a farmer Senator. May the record show that Senator GRASSLEY is nodding in the affirmative. It may be—Senator GRASSLEY would have to speak for himself—he prides himself more on his status as a farmer than as a Senator. But if he were to do that, I would disagree with

him, even not knowing his prowess as a farmer because of his prowess as a Senator.

Senator GRASSLEY is very direct and very plain spoken. I know of his career when he became a member of the Iowa legislature, the lower house. I have only a recollection, Senator GRASSLEY can correct me, that he earned \$6 a day in the Iowa legislature at that time?

Mr. GRASSLEY. It was \$30 a day but no expenses.

Mr. SPECTER. It was \$30 a day but no expenses. As I recollect, Senator GRASSLEY told me it was an increase in pay from what he earned as a farmer.

Mr. GRASSLEY. It was.

Mr. SPECTER. It was. Senator GRASSLEY corroborates that. But I have seen Senator GRASSLEY take on the giants in the Senate. They say people in glass houses should not throw stones. Senator GRASSLEY has thrown a lot of stones in the 26 years he has been here and he doesn't live in a glass house, but he has taken on the giants in the Federal executive branch. He believes thoroughly in oversight, as I do. The work we are submitting today is an example of that.

I think it is a good analogy, between CHUCK GRASSLEY and Harry Truman. I may search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to see how long ago it was that I said it, but it is time it is said again.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you, I appreciate that.

Mr. SPECTER. May the record show Senator GRASSLEY said thank you, and he appreciates it.

I may make one addendum, and that is that I say this notwithstanding the 26-years-plus ribbing I have taken from Senator GRASSLEY for being a Philadelphia lawyer.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I have always said: Thank God we only have to have one Philadelphia lawyer in the Senate.

Mr. SPECTER. The Senator said off-camera: Thank God we only have one Philadelphia lawyer in the Senate.

Mr. GRASSLEY. But I say that complimentary.

Mr. SPECTER. But says it complimentary. I don't know. The tone of his voice was usually derisive. There was one time the Senate had two Philadelphia lawyers, Senator Hugh Scott and Senator Joe Clark, they were lawyers together. Senator Clark was elected to the Senate in 1956 for two terms and Senator Scott in 1958 for three terms. So there was an overlapping period of time where there were two Philadelphia lawyers in the Senate.

But notwithstanding the questioning tone, sometimes, of Senator GRASSLEY about a Philadelphia lawyer, I maintain my view of him at the highest level of comparison to President Truman.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Thank you.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, about a week ago, I think it was on the 23rd, my colleagues, the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. BEN NELSON, and the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, and I, together with several cosponsors, put into the RECORD a resolution—I underline put into the RECORD—so that all could have the benefit of studying it.

We three have continued to do a good deal of work. We have been in consultation with our eight other cosponsors on this resolution, and we are going to put in tonight, into the RECORD—the same procedures we followed before—another resolution which tracks very closely the one that is of record. But it has several provisions we believe should be considered by the Senate in the course of the debate. How that debate will occur and when it will occur. I cannot advise the Senate, but I do hope it is expeditious. I understand there is a cloture motion that could well begin the debate, depending upon how it is acted upon.

We have also had a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee last Friday. We had a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee again this morning. Friday was in open session. The session this morning was in closed session. The three of us, as members of the Armed Services Committee, have learned a good deal more about this subject and, I say with great respect, the plan as laid down by the President on the 10th of January. We believed we should make some additions to our resolution.

We have not had the opportunity, given the hour, to circulate this among all of our cosponsors so at this time it will not bind them, but subsequently, tomorrow, I hope to contact all of them, together with my two colleagues, and determine their concurrence to go on this one. I am optimistic they will all stay.

But let me give the Senate several examples of what we think is important in the course of the debate—that these subjects be raised. We put it before the Senate now in the form of filing this resolution, such that all can see it and have the benefit, to the extent it is reproduced and placed into the public domain. Because the three of us are still open for suggestions, and we will continue to have receptivity to suggestions as this critical and very important subject is deliberated by the Senate.

Our objective is to hope that somehow through our efforts and the efforts

of others, a truly bipartisan statement—I don't know in what form it may be made—a truly bipartisan statement can evolve from the debate and the procedure that will ensue in the coming days, and I presume into next week. We feel very strongly that we want to see our Armed Forces succeed in Iraq to help bring about greater stability to that country, greater security to that country, so that the current elected government, through a series of free elections—the current elected government can take a firmer and firmer hand on the reins of sovereignty. We believe if for political reasons all Members of the Senate go over to vote with their party, and the others go over to vote with their party, we will have lost and failed to provide the leadership I believe this Chamber can provide to the American people so they can better understand the new strategy, and that the President can take into consideration our resolution hasn't been changed.

We say to the President: We urge that you take into consideration the options that we put forth, the strategy that we sort of lay out, in the hopes that it will be stronger and better understood by the people in this country. Their support, together with a strong level of bipartisan support in the Congress for the President's plan, hopefully as slightly modified, can be successful. We want success, Madam President. We want success.

So that is the reason we come this evening. I am going to speak to one or two provisions, and my colleagues can address others.

First, the unity of command. We have a time-honored tradition with American forces that wherever possible, there be a unity of command from an American commander, whatever rank that may be, down to the private, and that our forces can best operate with that unity of command and provide the best security possible to all members of the Armed Forces that are engaged in carrying out such mission as that command is entrusted to perform.

A number of Senators, in the course of the hearing on Friday and the hearing this morning, raised questions about this serious issue of unity of command. I say serious issue because the President, in his remarks, described—and this is on January 10—described how there will be an Iraqi commander, and that we will have embedded forces with the Iraqi troops. Well, we are currently embedding forces, but I think the plan—and that is what I refer to, the President's announcement on January 10 in the generic sense as the plan—will require perhaps a larger number of embedded forces. But the plan envisions an Iraqi chain of command. The Iraqis indicated, in working with the President, this plan in many respects tracks the exchange of thoughts that the President and the Prime Minister have had through a series of meetings and telephonic con-

versations. So the plan embraces the goals of the Prime Minister of Iraq, the goals of our President.

But this is a unique situation where the Iraqis have a complete chain of command, from a senior officer in each of the nine districts in Baghdad, and the United States likewise will have a chain of command in that same district or such segments of this plan as the military finally put together—each will have a chain of command, the Iraqi forces and the United States forces.

In the course of the testimony that we received, particularly testimony from the retired Vice Chief of the U.S. Army on Friday afternoon, he was concerned, as a number of Senators are concerned—and our provision literally flags this, and flags it in such a way that we call upon the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to look at that plan and to bring such clarification forward as may be necessary, and to do it in a way that will secure the safety of our forces, the protection of our forces, and yet go forward with this idea of a greater sharing of the command responsibility in the operations to take place in Baghdad. So we simply call on the administration to bring such clarification and specificity to the Congress and the people of the United States to ensure the protection of our force and that this command structure will work because I believe it doesn't have—I am trying to find a precedent where we have operated like this. I have asked the expert witnesses in hearings, and thus far those witnesses have not been able to explain the command structure that we have conceived, the concept of the plan of January 10, just how it will work.

Likewise, we put in a very important paragraph which says that nothing in this resolution should be construed as indicating that there is going to be a cutoff of funds. Given the complexity of this situation, there has been a lot of press written on the subject of our resolution. Colleagues have come up to me and said: Well, can you assure me that this doesn't provide a cutoff of funds.

Now, the cutoff of funds is the specific power given under the Constitution to the Congress of the United States. I personally think that power should not be exercised, certainly not given the facts and the circumstances today where this plan—which I hope in some manner will succeed and we are working better with the Prime Minister and his forces. So at this point in time I think it is important that our resolution carry language as follows:

The Congress should not take any action that will endanger United States military forces in the field, including the elimination or reduction of funds for troops in the field, as such an action with respect to funding would undermine their safety or harm their effectiveness in pursuing their assigned missions.

So I think that very clearly eliminates any consideration there.

At this time I would like to yield the floor so that my colleagues can speak, and maybe I will have some concluding remarks.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator will yield for a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I really feel, if we could more fully—

Mr. LEVIN. It is just a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WARNER. Does it affect what we are trying to lay down in any way?

Mr. LEVIN. I was just going to ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. WARNER. That is fine. I didn't realize that was coming to pass. It is late in the day, and I suppose we could anticipate a lot of things. But anyway I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. As I understand, the resolution has not yet been sent to the desk.

Mr. WARNER. It momentarily will be.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to the resolution.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my friend from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Madam President, tonight I believe we have seen the introduction of a resolution which not only has had bipartisan support in its prior form but will receive very strong bipartisan support in its current form, as amended.

I rise to support this resolution for a number of reasons. I think it is important that we continue to support our troops in the field and those who support the troops across the world. I think it is important that we thank them for their service and that we make it very clear that this resolution does not impair their ability to move forward in their command.

It is also important to point out that while some of the cosponsors haven't had the opportunity to review this, it is being circulated to them so that they do have the opportunity to review it. And I am sure they will become cosponsors with the new resolution.

It is important to point out that in this resolution, benchmarks are included that I believe will help break the cycle of dependence in Iraq by empowering and requiring the authority of the Iraqi Government and the responsibility of the Iraqi Government to take a greater role in the battle in Iraq, particularly as it relates to Baghdad. We generally believe that it is inappropriate for our troops to intercede in the battle between the Sunnis and the Shias on a sectarian basis in battles that are of a similar nature that

certainly do involve sectarian violence. There is a greater role for the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi military. This resolution in its present form will assure the assuming of that greater role, that greater responsibility by the Iraqi Government and certainly by the Iraqi Army.

It is a pleasure for me to introduce and thank our cosponsor, the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, first let me thank Senator WARNER and Senator NELSON for their continuing hard work in refining the language of this very important resolution, a resolution that I hope will garner widespread bipartisan support when it is brought to the Senate floor and debated next week.

Since we first introduced our resolution last week, we have had the benefit of further consultations with experts. We have had the benefit of conversations with our colleagues. We have had the benefit of alternative resolutions that have been proposed by other Senators, and we have had the benefit, most of all, of additional hearings in the Senate Armed Services Committee, including a classified briefing today. All of this activity has confirmed my belief that our resolution as originally proposed was on precisely the right track, but the benefit of these hearings, briefings, conversations and consultations has led us to improve our resolution by making four modifications that the distinguished Senators have just explained.

Let me, for the benefit of our colleagues, run through them one more time.

First, the resolution now makes very clear that nothing in it is to be construed as advocating any lessening of financial support for our troops. Indeed, it goes firmly on record as being opposed to cutting off funds that would be needed by our troops in Iraq. The language is very clear on that.

Second, there has been a great deal of discussion about the need for the Iraqis to meet certain benchmarks—benchmarks that in the past they have not met. So we include language in this resolution that makes very clear that we expect the Iraqi Prime Minister to agree to certain benchmarks; for example, to agree to work for the passage and achieve the passage of legislation that would ensure an equitable distribution of oil revenues. That is a very important issue in Iraq.

It also includes a benchmark that the Iraqis are going to produce the troops they have promised, and that they are going to operate according to the military rules of engagement without regard to the sectarian information or the sect of the people involved in the fighting. In other words, it doesn't matter whether an insurgent is a Sunni or a Shiite; if he is violating the law, engaging in violence, the Iraqi troops and our troops would be able to arrest

and detain or otherwise battle these individuals.

It clarifies the language regarding the troop increase that the President has proposed, and as the Senator from Virginia has explained to our colleagues, it calls for a clarification of the command and control structure so that we don't have a dual line of command. We want to have a very clear chain of command, and we call for that. That isn't the case now, and if you ask any military officer, he or she will tell you that having a clear chain of command, a unity of command, is absolutely essential. We have made these four changes in our legislation, in the resolution. We hope our colleagues will take a close look at it. I look forward to debating it more fully when we get on this issue next week.

Again, I commend the distinguished Senators with whom I have been very privileged to work on this: Senator WARNER, the former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, my colleague, Senator NELSON, also a member of the Committee on Armed Services. All three of us serve on that committee. We have brought to bear our experience and what we have learned in the last week as we continue to study this very important issue, perhaps the most vital issue facing our country.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank our distinguished colleague from Maine.

It has been a hard work in progress, but we reiterate, perhaps Members want to offer their own resolutions. We are open to suggestions. We are not trying to grab votes, just make ours stronger.

I bring to the attention of my colleague, this is not to be construed as saying, Mr. President, you cannot do anything; we suggest you look at openings by which we could, hopefully, have substantially less United States involvement of troops in what we foresee as a bitter struggle of sectarian violence.

The American GI, in my judgment, has sacrificed greatly, and their families, in giving sovereignty to this Nation. Now we see it is in the grip of extraordinary sectarian violence. Sunni upon Shia, Shia upon Sunni. I am not trying to ascribe which is more guilty than the other, but why should they proceed to try and destabilize the very government that gives all Iraqis a tremendous measure of freedom, free from tyranny and from Saddam Hussein. Why should the American GI, who does not have a language proficiency, who does not have a full understanding of the culture giving rise to these enormous animosities and hatreds that precipitate the killings and other actions—why should not that be left to the Iraqi forces?

We have trained upwards of 200,000. We have reason to believe today there are 60,000 to 70,000 who are tested—in many respects they have been participating in a number of military operations, together with our forces. Let

elements of that group be the principals to take the lead, as they proudly say, give them the lead, and go into the sectarian violence. That would enable our commanders, our President, to send fewer than 20,500 into that area.

On the other hand, we support the President with respect to his options regarding the Anbar Province and the additional forces.

Am I not correct in that?

Ms. COLLINS. If the Senator will yield on that point.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Ms. COLLINS. The resolution we drafted very carefully distinguishes between the sectarian violence engulfing Baghdad, where the Senator and Senator NELSON believe it would be a huge mistake for additional American troops to be in the midst of that, versus a very different situation in Anbar Province.

In Anbar, the violence is not sectarian; the battle is with al-Qaida and with foreign fighters, the Sunni insurgents, so we have Sunni versus Sunni. It is not sectarian. And what is more, local tribal leaders have recently joined with the coalition forces to fight al-Qaida. It is a completely different situation in Anbar. I do support the addition of more troops in Anbar. Indeed, the one American commander whom I met with in December who called for more troops in Anbar was General Kilmer.

Mr. WARNER. You refer to the one commander you met. I wonder if the Senator would reference your trip in December and what others told you about the addition of United States forces. I think that is important for the RECORD.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Ms. COLLINS. It was a very illuminating trip with other Senators. It has shaped my views on the issues before the Senate.

One American commander in Baghdad told me a jobs program would do more good than additional American troops in quelling the sectarian violence. He told me many Iraqi men were joining the militias or planting roadside bombs simply because they had been unemployed for so long they were desperate for money and would do anything to support their families. This was an American commander who told me this.

Prime Minister Maliki, in mid-December, made very clear he did not welcome the presence of additional American troops and, indeed, that he chafed at the restrictions on his control of the Iraqi troops. So I didn't hear it from Iraqi leaders, either.

The only place where I heard a request for more troops was in Anbar Province where the situation, as we have discussed, is totally different than the sectarian violence plaguing Baghdad.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank my colleague.

In my trip in the October timeframe, I would see much the same expression from military and civilian. Our codel visited, and it was following my trip that I came back and said in a press conference, this situation is moving sideways.

My observations, together with the observations of others—some in our Government, some in the private sector—induced the administration—I am not suggesting we were the triggering cause, but we may have contributed—to go to an absolutely, as you say in the Navy, “general quarters” to study every aspect of the strategy which then was in place, and which now is clearly stated as late as yesterday by the admiral who will be the CENTCOM commander, wasn’t working.

I commend the President for taking the study and inviting a number of consultants. That whole process was very thorough.

The point the Senator is making, as late as December—mine in October, yours in December—we both gained the same impressions that no one was asking for additional United States troops at that time.

Ms. COLLINS. If the Senator will yield on that point, since the Senator was the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as well, I would also share with our colleagues that the Senator presided over a hearing in mid-November at which General Abizaid, the central command general, testified before our committee that more American troops were not needed. He reported he had consulted widely with generals on the ground in Iraq, including General Casey, in reaching that conclusion.

I say to our colleagues that I think the record is clear. If you look at the findings of your trip from October, the testimony before the Committee on Armed Services from General Abizaid in November, what I heard in mid-December, I have to say, respectfully, I do not believe the President’s plan with regard to Baghdad—not Anbar but Baghdad—is consistent with what we were told.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague.

We should add an important reference to work done by the Baker-Hamilton commission. They have made similar findings. They mention a slight surge, but in my study of that one sentence in that report, I don’t think they ever envisioned a surge of the magnitude that is here.

They can best speak for themselves and, indeed, yesterday there was testimony taken from two senior members of that commission, but I don’t know whether they were speaking for the entire commission, and whether, in their remarks, they may wish to amend portions of their report. I wasn’t present for that testimony.

I hope someone in the Foreign Relations Committee can make that clear. Were they speaking for the entire commission? Did they wish to have their remarks amend their report which we

followed? It was one of the guideposts we used, the important work of that group.

Again, we are doing what we think is constructive to help the Senate in preparing for its deliberations, to invite other colleagues to make suggestions. We stand open to consider other options that may come before the Senate.

At this point in time, our resolution is the same form as the resolution we filed here a week or so ago. We are not changing any of the procedures by which the Senate takes into consideration our points. Whether we will be able to utilize this as a substitute should other amendments be called upon the floor, the rules are quite complex on that matter, and I will not bring all of that into the record at this point. But there are certain impediments procedurally as to how this specific resolution could ever be actually used for the purposes of a substitute.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, in the colloquy I participated in with my distinguished colleagues, Senator BEN NELSON of Kansas and Senator COLLINS of Maine—and I take responsibility—somehow we had a misunderstanding about the status. We wish to send to the desk and ask that this be numbered a new S. Con. Res. and, therefore, have the same status as the current S. Con. Res. we had submitted a week ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and referred.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have already apologized to staff and others for having to wait around so long, but sometimes it takes a long time to get from here to there.

I, first of all, want to acknowledge the hard work of so many different people that allowed us to get where we are today, which certainly isn’t the finish line, but it is a starting point.

People have heard me on other occasions, on other matters, talk about the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER. In my 25 years in the Congress—and I say this without any reservation—I have

not had dealings with anyone who better represents, in my mind, what a Senator should be. Not only does he look the part and act the part, but he is truly what our Founding Fathers had in mind when they talked about this deliberative body.

So I appreciate very much the bipartisan work of the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER. He has worked with other Senators—I don’t know who he has worked with, but some I am aware of because I have read about them: Senators COLLINS, HAGEL, BEN NELSON, SNOWE, BIDEN, COLEMAN, and I am sure there are others.

Today Senator WARNER and others submitted a new version of his concurrent resolution regarding the increase of troop levels in Iraq. Senator LEVIN has taken that language, and tonight we will introduce it as a bill. It will be introduced as a bill because that is the only way we can arrive at a point where we can start a deliberate debate on this most important issue. We will introduce this as a bill which will begin the rule XIV process in order to get it to the calendar and allow the Senate to move to Senator WARNER’s legislation. We would prefer to do it as a concurrent resolution; however, that would only be the case if it would be open to complete substitute amendments, for obvious reasons.

In order to permit the Senate to consider amendments which are appropriate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senator WARNER’s concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 7, on Monday, February 5, at 12 noon, and that the entire concurrent resolution be open to amendments and that a cloture motion with respect to S. Con. Res. 2 be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, I would say to my friend, the majority leader, about a week ago, the distinguished majority leader indicated that we were going to follow the regular order, that the Biden resolution coming out of the Foreign Relations Committee would be the vehicle for our debate, and I gather, in listening to the distinguished majority leader—if I might ask, without losing my right to the floor, what is the status of the Biden resolution that came out of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. REID. A motion to invoke cloture was filed on that. After we complete work on the minimum wage bill, automatically we will vote on that. I say to my distinguished friend, cloture will not be invoked on that. What I would like is unanimous consent that we not have to vote cloture, that we just vitiate that vote and move to the Warner resolution and do that Monday. But, as I know, the distinguished Republican leader has only seen what I have given him, the last little bit, not because I didn’t want to give it to him but I didn’t have it. I certainly want