Will the Senator yield for a question?

I have been wondering what the specific position of the

Democratic leadership was on the other side of the aisle relative to

Iraq. If I understand it correctly, it is that we should redeploy--

which, I presume, is a euphemism for withdraw--is that correct?

The Senator used the term ``immediately'' in his

statement. That is why I wanted to clarify that. So we should withdraw

over the horizon, i.e., redeploy, the Senator said, and that withdrawal

should be at a pace of about 10,000 troops per month, and that process

should begin immediately, I guess, and that it would be completed

within 18 months, being the first quarter of 2008. Is that basically

the specifics of how the Senator would approach the situation on the

ground?

I appreciate the specifics from the assistant leader. I

have not heard specifics from the other side of the aisle. I think it

is constructive.

Can I continue to ask the question, however, to get a sense of what

the specific proposals are from the other side. The President is going

to send up a supplemental estimated to be over $100 billion. We have

already had one of approximately $70 billion. So we are talking of a

total supplemental of $170 billion. This additional supplemental would

be, I presume, to cover what is being represented in the press as

potentially a surge in troops and additional spending of significant

dollars for reconstruction. Is it the position of the Senator that that

$100 billion is more money than needs to be spent? In other words, if

the proposal of the Senator, which is a withdrawal over the horizon, to

begin over the next 2 or 3 months, accelerated to the point where it

was completed by the beginning of 2008, averaging about 10,000 people

per month--is it therefore the Senator's position that if you pursue

that course of action, you would not need $100 billion?

I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in allowing me to ask

him some questions.

Mr. President, if I may use the term withdraw, I have

heard the term withdraw being used, but apparently it doesn't mean the

troops would be coming out of Iraq. The Senator further suggested that

that should be done immediately, is that correct?

I thank the Senator; he is always forthright. I will ask a

Follow up question. Does the Senator believe this supplemental that is

coming up, as I believe, should go through the regular order rather

than being declared an emergency and have authorization language, or go

through the authorizing committee for review and then go to the

appropriating committee and then come to the floor?