Madam President, I spoke yesterday in favor of the

resolution introduced by Senator Reid, S.J. Res. 9. By bringing the

current open-ended military mission to a close and requiring the

funding of U.S. troops, the Reid resolution takes a significant,

binding step toward ending our involvement in the war in Iraq. I am

pleased that the Senate will have the opportunity to vote on that

resolution shortly.

The Senate will also be voting, as the Senator from Louisiana just

pointed out, on another resolution regarding Iraq sponsored by the

senior Senator from New Hampshire. Unfortunately, this resolution is

badly flawed, and I strongly oppose it. My chief objection is simple.

The resolution rejects the idea of Congress using its power of the

purse to safely redeploy our troops from Iraq. Moreover, it does so in

a manner that can only be described as inaccurate and almost

intellectually dishonest. By warning against ``the elimination or

reduction of funds for troops in the field,'' the resolution fully

embraces the misleading rhetoric the White House has used to try to

prevent serious discussion of Congress ending the war. Those who engage

in such rhetoric pretend that cutting off funds for the war is the same

as cutting off funds for the troops. They raise the specter of troops

somehow being left on the battlefield without the training, equipment,

and resources they need.

Obviously, nothing could be further from the truth. Every Member of

Congress agrees we must continue to support our troops and give them

the resources and support they need. Not a single Member would ever

vote for any proposal that would jeopardize the safety of our troops.

Using our power of the purse to end our involvement in the war can and

would be done without in any way impairing the safety of our brave

service members. By setting a date after which funding for the war will

be terminated, as I have proposed, Congress can safely bring our troops

out of harm's way.

How can I say this with such confidence? There really is plenty of

precedent for Congress exercising its constitutional authority to stop

U.S. involvement in armed conflict.

I recently chaired a Judiciary Committee hearing entitled

``Exercising Congress's Constitutional Power To End a War.'' Without

exception, every witness--those called by the majority and those called

by the minority--did not challenge the constitutionality of Congress's

authority to end a war. Lou Fisher with the Library of Congress, one of

the foremost experts on separation of powers issues, pointed out that

Congress does not simply have the power, it has a responsibility, to

exercise it when it is needed. He said:

The argument that cutting off funding for a flawed policy would hurt

the troops, and that continuing to put U.S.

troops in harm's way supports the troops, makes no sense. By ending

funding for the war, we can bring our troops safely out of Iraq.

Walter Dellinger of the Duke Law School made this point when he

testified about my proposal:

So instead of allowing the President's failed policy to continue,

Congress can and should use its power of the purse to end our

involvement in the Iraq war, safely redeploying the troops while

ensuring, as I do in my bill and as the Reid resolution permits, that

important counterterrorism and other limited operations are still

carried out.

Now, for those who don't believe this has ever been done or for those

who say it can't be done, let me cite an example from not that long

ago. In October of 1993, Congress enacted an amendment sponsored by the

senior Senator from West Virginia cutting off funding--cutting off

funding for military operations in Somalia effective March 31, 1994,

with limited exceptions. Seventy-six Senators voted for that amendment.

Many of them are still in this body, such as Senator Cochran, Senator

Domenici, Senator Hutchison, Senator Lugar, Senator McConnell, Senator

Specter, Senator Stevens, and Senator Warner.

Now, did those eight Senators and many Democratic Senators who joined

them act to jeopardize the safety and security of U.S. troops in

Somalia? By cutting off funds for a military mission, were they

indifferent to the well-being of our brave men and women in uniform? Of

course not. All of these Members recognized that Congress had the power

and the responsibility to bring our military operations in Somalia to a

close by establishing a date after which the funds would be terminated.

Now, on that same day with regard to Somalia, several Senators,

myself included, supported an even stronger effort to end funding for

operations in Somalia. The amendment offered by Senator McCain on

October 15, 1993, would have eliminated funding for Somalia right away,

except for funds for withdrawal, or in the case of American POWs, MIAs

not being accounted for. Thirty-eight Senators opposed a measure to

table that amendment. I was joined by many Republican Senators in

supporting the amendment, including none other than the current sponsor

of S. Con. Res. 20, Senator Gregg. Senator Gregg suggests in that

resolution that eliminating funds for troops would undermine their

safety. Was he voting 14 years ago to do that? Obviously, he would not

do that. In 1993, was he committing the same egregious offense that he

so strongly opposes in 2007? Could he have been so cavalier about the

safety of our troops? Not the Senator I know. He would never have been

indifferent to their need for guns or ammunition or food or clothing,

nor would I, nor would any other Member of this body. Of course not.

Senator Gregg knew, as did I, that Senator McCain was proposing an

appropriate, safe, responsible way to use our power of the purse to

bring an ill-conceived military mission to a close without in any way

harming our troops.

Unfortunately, the new Gregg resolution seems to have forgotten this

point. I hope that my colleagues will think better of efforts such as

that proposed by Senator Gregg today. All Senators, including the

distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, are, of course,

entitled to their opinions, and all Senators are certainly entitled to

oppose my efforts to end funding for a disastrous war. But by putting

forth misleading and baseless arguments, by suggesting that ending

funding for the war is tantamount to ending funding for the troops,

they are making it that much harder to have the open, honest, and

essential debate about the Iraq war that this body and the American

people so badly need.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a

quorum.