Madam President, the majority leader this morning said

within my hearing that there is no support for the surge. I don't know

why he would say that because, in fact, not only have Members of this

Senate unanimously supported, through the confirmation hearing of GEN

David Petreaus, one of the people who certainly will be instrumental in

executing that surge, but that is what we have been debating for these

last weeks, indeed, months: what the new plan should be in Iraq, to

deal with what is, obviously, an unacceptable status quo.

I am tempted to wonder out loud if, rather than talking about issues

that really matter--such as the issue that the Senator from New

Hampshire has asked for a vote on but been denied, whether we will

support our troops and refuse to cut off funding while we send them in

harm's way--we are seeing a bunch of spin doctoring going on.

But when the majority leader says there is no support for the surge,

I would simply disagree because, in fact, at least one of the

amendments that has been offered that we have been denied an

opportunity to vote on, as the majority leader has done what he is

entitled to do, which is to move on to other subjects and to set the

Senate agenda, one of those amendments would, in fact, support General

Petreaus and the plan he has taken upon himself to execute in Iraq that

we are sending, over a period of time, additional reinforcements to

secure Baghdad.

So there is substantial support for this plan. The problem is, I am

tempted to believe there are some who have simply given up, who don't

believe there is any chance of success in Iraq. The problem is, those

who have expressed such defeatism, who in this contest of wills say we

simply lost ours, have not talked one bit about the consequences of

giving up, the huge humanitarian crisis that would occur, the ethnic

cleansing that would occur, the fact that another failed state in the

Middle East, as in Afghanistan before it, could serve as a launching

pad for recruiting and training and exporting of terrorist attacks.

Standing here and suggesting that defeat is something we will accept

is, to my view, not a responsible position to take.

So I disagree with those who simply say we have no chance to turn

things around. There are those who say ad nauseam that there is ``no

military solution in Iraq.'' I would commend to them an article that

was written by Victor Davis Hanson that is entitled ``Give Petraeus a

Chance.'' Mr. Hanson says:

So, as General Petraeus said, we are engaged in a test of wills. How

could it possibly be that we have lost our own will to protect

America's national security, to prevent a regional conflict that will

inevitably, if it occurs, cost us more in treasure and blood? How is it

that America could possibly have lost its will?

I think the Senator from New Hampshire made a good point a moment ago

when he said the reason why the majority leader has now taken us off of

this issue--which, again, is his sole prerogative as majority leader;

that is the power a majority leader has--that the reason we have not

been given a chance to vote on the Gregg amendment that says we will

not cut off funds, we will not fail to support our troops on the

mission they have volunteered to undertake, and which we have sent them

on--the real reason, as the Washington Post reported, Senator Gregg's

amendment was not allowed to be voted on is because his amendment is

likely the ``only measure that could attract 60 votes.''

The USA Today said the majority leader opposed allowing a vote on the

amendment because it could have resulted in a situation where the

Senate would have been on record opposing cuts in funding for the

troops but not the President's policy.

I think it is absolutely imperative--whether it is today or tomorrow

or next week or next month, or all of the above--we make it very clear

we will not ever cut off our support for the men and women who have

undertaken this dangerous mission.

When I went out to Walter Reed on Monday to visit some of the injured

veterans of the Iraq conflict, I could not help but be struck by the

sort of surreality of that. Here are young men and women who have lost

limbs, and many, unfortunately, have lost their lives volunteering to

protect us and to bring stability to the Middle East and to allow the

Iraqis a better life. They have risked it all, and some have paid that

ultimate sacrifice. Yet here in the Senate----

And here we are in the Senate this week debating about

nonbinding resolutions and avoiding the tough votes on whether we will

cut off funds to support this mission. Instead, we engage in the

continued surreal environment of this Senate by saying: OK, now we have

confirmed General Petraeus, one of the people who is going to execute

this plan in Iraq. But now, today, we are going to also vote on Admiral

Fallon, the head of Central Command, General Petraeus's commander, who

will also be in charge of this mission, and GEN George Casey, who has

been in charge of coalition forces. Do you know what I predict? We will

confirm, as we did General Petraeus, Admiral Fallon and General Casey,

and yet there are some who stand up here in the Senate and elsewhere

and have the temerity to say: We support you, but we do not support the

mission we have asked you to execute.

I yield the floor.