Mr. President, I rise to speak on the cloture vote on

the motion to proceed to S. 574. I will vote in opposition to moving

forward on that resolution because I don't believe it offers me the

opportunity to express what I believe this body should be doing on the

war on terror and the war in Iraq and for our men and women in harm's

way. I want to take a minute to explain as well as I can why I believe

so strongly and so passionately in that regard.

Ironically, 30 minutes before I came to the Chamber, I got a press

release from the Department of Defense announcing that deployment of

over 1,000 members of the 3rd ID stationed at Fort Stewart, GA has been

accelerated from June to March of 2007. Those soldiers will shortly be

leaving our great State on their way to be deployed in Baghdad,

specifically as a part of the President's mission to secure and hold

and to build.

I can't be certain of this, but I imagine some of those soldiers are

probably watching television today in Hinesville, GA. They might even

be watching C-SPAN. They might even hear these remarks. So I make them

in the belief and with the hope that they are listening, as well as

those soldiers in Baghdad and Balad and Tallil who are watching their

monitors in the mess hall or the command post, as well as those who are

our enemies, those who would do us harm, those who are the reason we

are in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

It is not right to send a mixed message in a nonbinding resolution

while our men and women are deploying in defense of this country and at

the order of the President, our Commander in Chief. The result of that

is to send a message of doubt to our men and women and a message of

hope to our enemy. We can have our differences--and anybody who watches

the debate on this floor knows, we certainly have our differences--but

there should be no difference or equivocation in the support of our men

and women in harm's way and our men and women now on the ground in Iraq

and Afghanistan.

For a minute I want to talk about how deeply I believe in our

options, because we only have two. The first is an opportunity for

success. That is what the President has chosen. This surge, criticized

by some, is even a part of the Hamilton-Baker report where they

addressed a potential surge in their report. The President, after

listening to many of us and to his commanders and, certainly to General

Petraeus, has decided to deploy these troops to go into Baghdad, to go

into Anbar, to secure it; and then, with the help of the Iraqi

soldiers, to hold; and then, with the help of USAID, the State

Department, and the world community, to build and to have a platform

and a foundation upon which political reconciliation will take place.

Every one of us knows that, ultimately, reconciliation will make the

difference in whether our hopes and dreams for the Iraqi people and the

hopes and dreams they have for themselves will, in fact, take place.

I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee. I sat through 28 hours of

testimony from countless experts, one after another. Most of them had

mixed feelings on the surge. Some were unalterably opposed. Some said

it may work. Some said it would work. They had differences of opinion,

as we do. But in 28 hours of testimony, from expert after expert, from

Madeleine Albright to Henry Kissinger, from think tank after think

tank, from Jack Murtha and Newt Gingrich--Newt a former Speaker of the

House; Jack certainly outspoken on this issue in the House--every one

of them agreed on one fact: A redeployment of our troops or a

withdrawal would lead, at the very least, to thousands of deaths and

more likely the slaughter of tens of thousands and maybe even millions

of people in Iraq and possibly beyond in the Middle East.

Withdrawing, repositioning, turning our back is a recipe for

disaster. And the world knows how important our success is. I spent

last weekend in Munich, Germany, at the World Security Conference,

where Vladimir Putin and the Iranian Foreign Secretary and Prime

Minister spoke. We met with Chancellor Merkel of Germany and

representatives from Bulgaria, Estonia, and Japan. Do you know what is

so eye opening to me? With rare exception, each one expressed their

appreciation for what the United States of America and our allies are

doing, and their hope and prayer is we will succeed. They know what we

know: We are in the ultimate war between good and evil. Iraq is but a

battle in the war on terror that will move to other places. If we ever

give comfort or hope to our enemy that we may turn and come home, leave

the battlefield, leave them to their own volition, then we know it is

the beginning of the end for the peaceful societies and the democracies

of this world.

Chancellor Merkel of Germany--a country where popular opinion is very

much against the war--announced her commitment of more Tornadoes to be

deployed to Afghanistan. We have 46,000 troops there--23,000 Americans

and 23,000 from countries around the world--pursuing to keep that

fledgling democracy secure as the Taliban makes one last effort.

The enthusiasm of the world is in support of the United States and

our men and women in harm's way. I think that enthusiasm should take

place on the Senate floor in the United States of America as well. My

vote tomorrow of ``no'' on the motion to proceed will not be a desire

to cut off debate. It will, in fact, be a desire to elevate the debate.

I think every side that is represented on this Senate floor ought to be

a side that is spoken. I personally prefer the Gregg amendment and do

not prefer and would not vote for the resolution

of the Senator from Nevada, which is the same resolution now being

debated on the floor of the Senate. I think I ought to have an

opportunity to express to the thousand members of 3rd ID leaving to go

to Iraq, to the men and women in Iraq who are listening, and to the

constituents I have in the State, regardless of which side of the issue

they are on--the Senate deserves a right to debate all of the valid

points of the questions that confront us in Iraq.

I know earlier in a speech given on the floor the content was

primarily a recitation of the names of those who have died in uniform

in Iraq from the United States of America. I don't take the position I

take lightly, nor do I not think for a moment about the sacrifice that

has already been made by men and women from my State--from PFC Diego

Rincon, the first Georgian to lose his life fighting in Iraq--Diego, by

the way, was not a United States citizen when he died, and we gave him

citizenship posthumously because of the commitment he made to this

country--to LT Noah Harris, from Elijay, GA, who was a cheerleader at

the University of Georgia on 9/11. He was so moved by what happened

that he jumped into ROTC in his junior year and pursued a commission in

the United States Army, received it, and went to Iraq. He died fighting

for what he believed this country was all about: to stand up to the

agents of terror and those who would use it to pursue their cause.

Also, there was SGT Mike Stokely, a brave American who died in pursuit

of freedom and peace in Iraq, and the hundreds of other Georgians who

have been wounded or sacrificed their lives. They should not die in

vain. They went for the reason that they believed volunteers are

important to them and their country. They volunteered and made that

commitment knowingly and willingly. They deserve the chance to pursue

this effort for success in Baghdad and Anbar with enthusiasm from our

Senate and our Government. From me, they have that.

When we read a list of those who lost their lives, we have to

remember how long the list is of those who live today because our men

and women in the Armed Forces, in wars past and in war today, fight for

security and peace and fight for us to live.

We saw on 9/11 the manifest horror tyranny and terror can bring, and

we will see it again if we lose our resolve to pursue it wherever it

takes us--Afghanistan, Iraq, or places yet known to us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, with the confidence and pride in

the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces and my willingness to

fully support an opportunity for success rather than a recipe for

disaster.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.