



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2007

No. 23

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, whose loving hand has sustained our Nation, help us to find our refuge in a personal commitment to Your plan for our lives. Give us the wisdom to trust You to guide our steps and to lead us to a desired destination.

Bless our lawmakers. Let the contagion of Your presence bind them together. Speak to them above the noise and prattle of impulsive rhetoric so that they will know and do Your will. Lift them above the valley and the mists of struggle to the mountain of trust and confidence in Your power. Give them the courage to seek first Your rule and righteousness.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, DC, February 7, 2007.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,

a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CARDIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate will begin morning business in just a few minutes, with the time until 2 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees. The first 30 minutes this morning will be controlled by the minority, and then the majority will control, of course, the next 30 minutes. We are going to do the best we can to alternate back and forth.

Yesterday, we had a nice debate. When a Democrat wasn't here, a Republican moved in and vice versa. It worked out well with the time.

I announced last night that I intended to have the Senate proceed this afternoon to executive session to consider a number of Executive Calendar nominations. I had spoken to the Republican leader prior to making that announcement and told him I wanted to consider GEN George Casey and ADM William Fallon to be voted on today or tomorrow. I expect there will be debate with respect to the Casey nomination. We have had word that on the minority side there are a number of statements they wish to have made, and I am confident there will be some over here, also. We will make a decision at a later time whether we should have time agreements or just move forward with these.

Let me just say a few words about what is going on in the Senate and has

been going on over the last few days. As we all know, the President, in giving a speech, said he wanted to move a significant number more of American troops to Iraq. As a result of that, there have been efforts made to have the Senate vote on whether that is appropriate. We have been unable to arrive at that point, which is somewhat surprising because the people who helped write the amendment voted against proceeding to debate on that amendment. People whose names are associated with that amendment decided not to proceed to vote on that amendment.

I think it speaks volumes that there has been almost nothing said by the minority about supporting the surge. There have been no speeches over here supporting the surge. In fact, late yesterday there was a proposal to not even have a vote on supporting the surge.

That is where we are. The House is going to take up this matter next week. They will send this over to us, and in due time we will try to get to this matter. But it is pretty clear that one reason for the slowdown here is to allow the President to move troops over there. The more troops moved over there prior to this vote, the more difficult it is to say don't send the troops—when he has already sent them. But there are other ways to approach this issue in Iraq.

Just a matter of hours ago, a Sea Knight helicopter was shot down over Baghdad, the fifth helicopter shot down in the last 2 weeks. We don't know how many Americans are dead in this latest incident. We do not know because the military has not announced it. We do know these Sea Knight helicopters—they are called CH-46s—are used by the Marines primarily as a cargo and troop transport, and they carry as many as 25 combat-loaded troops.

We also know that the administration submitted its budget, requesting another \$245 billion in the war in Iraq and other matters relating to the military, bringing the total to well over

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1655

\$500 billion. In fact, we learned yesterday that the United States had shipped money to Mr. Bremer, Ambassador Bremer, to disburse money to Iraqi ministries. How much money? It was 363 tons of money in hundred-dollar bills—363 tons. There is some dispute as to how many hundred-dollar bills it takes to make 363 tons, and they really don't know exactly how much money that is, but it is around \$12 billion, most of which is not accounted for. I guess \$12 billion, when you compare it to \$500 billion, is not very much, but I think the American people understand that 363 tons of cash, hundred-dollar bills, is a lot of money.

We also know from reading the morning paper that the Associated Press reports:

More Americans have been killed in combat in Iraq over the last 4 months than in any comparable stretch since the war began.

To say the war isn't going well is an understatement. To say there is a civil war going on in Iraq is an understatement. I really think it is unfortunate that we have been unable to vote on whether the surge should take place. Senators have not been allowed to cast their vote on this issue, and because of that, we are going to move on to the continuing resolution this afternoon—late this evening, I should say, after we finish these two important Executive Calendar matters.

RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

INSIST ON A FAIR PROCESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Listening to my good friend, the majority leader, should remind us all that the debate we had anticipated having this week—and I might say Members on our side were certainly prepared to have the debate—would not have had any impact on the surge. These were nonbinding resolutions. I would not argue that they were not significant, because Senators would have been put on record. But we were certainly prepared for the debate. What we were not prepared to do is to have a process that denied our side other options in addition to the Levin proposal.

As we were frequently reminded last year by Democratic Senators, the Senate is different from the House. In the Senate, a minority of at least 41 can insist on a process that is fair.

Senate Republicans were united, including members of our conference who support the Levin proposal, in insisting on a fair process. We started out with five different options, gradually pared them down to two—the McCain-Lieberman-Graham proposal and the Gregg proposal relating to supporting the troops. My good friend, the majority leader, objected to allowing us to have

two proposals. He only wanted us to have one proposal. So we narrowed it down to one and picked the Gregg “support the troops” proposal as our one, and the majority leader objected to that unanimous consent request as well, leading us to believe that not only did he want us to limit ourselves to one, he wanted to pick which one. Of course, in the Senate, that is just not possible. This is a deliberative body. It insists on having votes on a wide variety of proposals. Certainly, when we were in the majority last year, we had to vote on a lot of things we might not have liked to have voted on in order to advance a particular proposal. That is the way the Senate works.

At whatever point the majority would like to begin the debate again on Iraq, we will certainly be happy to have it. I particularly wish to thank Senator GREGG for his very important contribution to this debate. That is a vote we will have at some point, on some measure, when we return to the subject of Iraq.

With regard to the continuing resolution, let me just say to the majority leader, he has suggested that I survey our members and see what amendments we might like to offer, since he has indicated amendments may or may not be allowed on that proposal. I would say to him we are paring that down and hope to be able to get him—we have about seven; we are going to try to pare that down to three, submit those amendments to the majority leader, and hope they might be allowed when we do move to the continuing resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend, we would also see what amendments, if any, we want to offer on this side—maybe three and three or whatever we can come up with that appears to move the ball along.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip is recognized.

RESOLUTIONS PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear just a moment ago the suggestion that maybe we go to the Omnibus appropriations bill in such a way that would allow some amendments to be offered on both sides. That is good. That is the way it ought to be. That is why I have been surprised and, frankly, disappointed that we have not been able to come to some sort of agreement about how to proceed to these resolutions dealing with the President's plan to take action in Iraq and have a full debate on the substance.

Of the plan and the resolutions, I don't think there is any excuse for the fact that we have come to the point where we are throwing up our hands and saying: I can't have it my way, you can't have it your way, therefore, we will have it no way.

If this were the Super Bowl, whether you were Grossman or Manning, you

would call a time out and say, wait a minute here, there has got to be a way we can get a plan to go forward. I know how difficult it is to do this because our leaders on both sides of the aisle get pressured from all sides. They are pulled. Don't agree to that, you have to agree to that.

In the end, the leaders have to decide how we go forward in a fair and an open way, and the rest of us have to support that decision. The majority has strong power in the House of Representatives, and a good bit in the Senate. But I think the most difficult job in the city is the job of being majority leader, the job that Senator REID has right now because he doesn't have a Rules Committee. He is not the President. He can't give an order and have the bureaucracy move, not that the bureaucracy ever moves. He has to work with the minority. He has to find a way to move things forward.

Some people say: Oh, that is the process. Look, the process is substance because if you can't figure out how to get it done, you never get to the substance. This is not an autocracy. No one person possesses unlimited power. You have got to give to get a little. You can't have a deal where you say: No, no, you can't offer but one amendment; and, by the way, it has to be this.

If we were going to do anything, we should have gone with more, not less. So I don't get it. If this is the big, important, serious issue we all say it is, surely we could have worked out a way to proceed. Well, I guess the one thing we could say is, we will get back to this. We are going to get back to it in many different ways. But at least in the future, when we get to the debate, it is going to be a serious debate about something that is real.

We were talking about taking up resolutions that had no binding effect. It was a feel-good deal. Yeah, we are going to take a pop at the President. Yeah, we support the troops, but no, we don't support the troops.

Oh, yes, thank you very much, General Petraeus, 81 to nothing, you are confirmed. Go over to Iraq. Oh, and by the way, we don't agree with what you are going to try to do. We don't support the plan. How did we get into that?

At least at some point, men and women of strong principle and beliefs are going to offer up amendments that are going to say: Support the troops, stick with the plan or pull out. High tail it out. Get out of there now. And then we will have a real debate and we will have real votes. That is what, under our Constitution, we should be doing, actually.

I think the proposal that Senator GREGG had, made eminent good sense. Let's show we support the troops. Gee whiz, why is that a bad idea? The American people don't want to send our troops into harm's way around the world or even in Baghdad without knowing we are behind them.

So what is the problem? The problem is that it was able to get 80, I don't

know, or 90 votes. We can't have that vote because later on we may want to actually cut off the funds to the troops. There are some little, bitty twists of language, too, such as we support funding for the troops in the field. What does that mean, "in the field"? What if you are on the way? What if you are in a brigade that is pulling out of Texas now or pulling out of Kentucky or that has landed in Kuwait? We don't support them. There are too many nuances.

Let me get away from process and talk about substance. We have a problem in Iraq. A lot of people now have shifted their position and are saying: Well, I voted for it earlier, but I am against it now. Yeah, it has gotten tough, so I don't like it.

Everybody says change the status quo. I had a chance to talk to some world leaders recently in Switzerland and they were saying: My goodness, you can't do that, can't do this, can't do something else.

I said: Here is the choice: Stay, leave or do what?

They said: No, you can't leave. You have to stay. Well, what do you propose? Deafening silence. The President understood we had to change the status quo. Action had to be taken. A plan had to be developed. He proposed a plan. He met with us. He came to the Congress. He spoke at the State of the Union: Here is what I propose to do. Give this plan a chance. Give the plan a chance.

And General Petraeus, maybe the General Grant of this war, or the General Washington of a previous war—this is the man of the hour, and I hope and pray the good Lord will guide him in the right way because he has a serious challenge before him.

But this is not just about a surge, although that is a part of the plan. This is a plan with at least three other key components. But ask yourself, we say to the Iraqis: You have to get a political solution. Everybody is saying: No, we will never get a military solution without a political and economic solution.

Well, yeah. But how do you get a political solution in chaos? How can you get a political solution when your capital is being blown up every day by insurgents of all stripes? You have got to get a grip on security. It is similar to here in our Nation's Capital. We couldn't have orderly Government if we didn't have order. So we are going to try to send in the best we have, under the best general we have, and get some control of the violence and the chaos in Baghdad and then give the Iraqis a chance to deal with the politics.

Am I convinced all of this is going to work? I don't know. I am not the best expert in the world. I have been on the Armed Services Committee, I have been on Intelligence. I have been around awhile. But I am not going to impose my military judgment on a man such as General Petraeus. But let's see if the politics will not work.

There is a lot of pressure. They know, they know.

I met with the Vice President of Iraq recently and he was talking about: Well, what is your strategic plan? I said: No, sir. Excuse me. With all due respect, it is not about what is our plan. What is your plan? It is your country, your Government. When are you going to ante up and kick in, in a way that brings leadership and order out of all of this?

So the second part of the President's plan is for different rules of engagement. It is for a requirement that some political achievements be reached. That is why I like the McCain-Lieberman-Graham proposal. I like benchmarks. So the question is: It is one thing to lay down benchmarks, but what if they don't meet them? Then, you decide. If we conclude it would not work, that they can't govern themselves, then we have to go with the next plan. Somebody said: Well, this is the last plan. It is never the last plan. There is always another plan.

But the politics, I think, we can be successful. We certainly have to try. I do think that regional solutions—getting particular provinces under control or particular sectors under control, getting generals in for different sectors—makes good sense. But also the economy. Look at America where you have people who are not working. Their life is insecure. They get into trouble. I understand that 40 percent of the young men in Baghdad don't have a job. There has to be a better job done of getting the money—the oil money—fairly distributed and done in an economic way that will create jobs so that these young men and women will not be bored and looking for ways to kill themselves.

Mr. President, we should have found a way to go forward with this debate. I don't quite understand what is going on. Maybe we are all having to learn a little different roles of who is in the majority and who is in the minority and how it works. I know for sure that in some respects it is easier to be in the minority than to be in the majority.

The majority leader has to be—he has to be tough. He has to eat a little crow every now and then. He has to be prepared to say to the Republicans: We will find a way to work this out. You have to keep poking at it. Somehow or another, we didn't want to do it this time. I don't know. Maybe everybody is going to leave the field and say we won. This is not about winning or losing. This shouldn't be about the political winner or who won the PR battle.

We are playing with lives. America's finest. I think we should support them, as Senator GREGG proposes. We need to give the plan the President has developed a chance because nobody else has come up with a better plan, other than pull back at the borders. What good is that? Which way are we going to shoot? To me, that is the worst of all worlds.

We can make this work, but the President, General Petraeus, our

troops, the American people need our support and our confidence in what we are attempting.

We can go on and have the debate today about these nominees—two good men. We can turn to the omnibus appropriations and find a way to get it done with order.

Nobody wants to play games. Nobody should be trying to say: Oh, if you don't do it this way, or my way, you are trying to shut down the Government. Nobody should be saying we are going to filibuster if we don't get everything we want.

This is the Senate. You have got to give everybody their chances. You have to have some order out of the chaos. This is sort of similar to Baghdad. Sometimes we get divided up into provinces. I appreciate the efforts that have been made, but the important thing is not the process in the Senate. The important thing is what our men and women are going to be trying to do in Iraq. Let's give this plan a chance.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the advice and counsel of my friend from Mississippi. He certainly has the experience to offer suggestions, having served in various capacities in leadership. I have been with him. He is a pleasant man to work with, and I like him very much. But I would suggest, this morning, that we not use Super Bowl terminology and Manning and Grossman because I think, if we do that, we would find we would have a lot of objection if suddenly we looked around and Grossman was using a baseball or basketball rather than a football. I think what they have tried to do is change the rules in the middle of the game, and they are playing around with this procedural argument.

I have to acknowledge to my friend from Mississippi that the people over there who are trying to make the President not look bad had a little victory because they have been able to stall and stall. As a result of that, soldiers are being shipped, as we speak, without the Senate having to take a vote on whether that surge should take place. So in that respect, their stalling has probably benefited the President.

As far as process, we have worked through the ethics bill, the minimum wage bill, and even though there were cloture motions filed and cloture not invoked, finally, we were able to get those things passed. But I think debate on the surge would have been very important. We have been denied that. I understand the rules of the Senate.

My friend from Mississippi also says we should be doing something that is real. I tried to talk about something real this morning. More American troops were killed in combat in Iraq over the past 4 months than in any comparable stretch since the war began—334 dead American soldiers,

men and women, with mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters and husbands and wives.

I think over the last few days, though, there has been a deafening silence, and people standing here and saying what the President is doing is the right thing to do, because it hasn't been the right thing to do, what the President has been doing, and he wants to continue more of the same.

I understand we are now at a point where we are going to talk about a couple of important nominations. We are going to try to get our fiscal house in order, which is not in order, because unless we do something by February 15, basically the Government closes. This is very unusual. I have spoken with the distinguished Republican leader, and one thing we are going to work on together this year, once we get out of this situation with the continuing resolution, is to work together to try to pass appropriations bills. That is good for the institution and good for the country. We are going to try to do that. It may require some late nights and long weeks, but we are going to do that. We have 13 appropriations bills, and we are going to work very hard to get them passed.

So I am terribly disappointed we haven't had the opportunity to vote on Senator WARNER's and Senator LEVIN's resolution, and on the McCain resolution, but we have heard enough about that. We are not going to be able to do that, and we will move on to other things.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Briefly, it is hard for me to remember how many times we were told by the other side last year that you come to the Senate to cast tough votes, but I don't think Senator GREGG's vote was a tough vote. Why would it be a tough vote to vote on supporting the troops? To me, that is an easy vote. We all will be forced, because of the process in the Senate, to cast votes we don't like. If you are in the majority, you get more of those than when you are in the minority. I can't imagine being, in effect, afraid of voting on the Gregg amendment to support the troops. That would be one of the easiest votes we ever cast around here.

Let me conclude by saying I am disappointed, as other members of my party in the Senate are disappointed, we are not having the Iraq debate this week. The distinguished minority whip, in his remarks, summed it up quite well. We will continue to talk about this important subject. There is no more important subject in the country right now. I know we will be debating other proposals in the coming months.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield.

Mr. GREGG. I was just wondering if the Republican leader, and I ask this question through the Chair, believes

that the Democratic leader is correct in his characterization that we have stopped this in a procedural manner. Is it not true that the Democratic leader controls the procedure as to whether there would be a vote? And is it not true, also, that we agreed to the Democratic leader's request that we offer only one amendment but that we just ask we be able to choose our amendment, and they be able to choose their amendment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator is entirely correct. We kept paring down the options that we wanted to offer in the course of this debate on the most important issue in the country. And at the end, as the Senator from New Hampshire just suggested, we were down to two: one that the majority leader and most of his party favor—and some of ours—and the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire in support of the troops.

Apparently, the majority wanted to tell us which amendment we would offer.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 2 p.m. with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, alternating sides when appropriate, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the minority, the second 30 minutes under the control of the majority, during which the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, be recognized for 15 minutes each.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

IRAQ

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to, once again, state the situation. It has been very well stated by the Republican leader. The simple fact is, we, as members of the minority, requested the right to offer an alternative to the proposal of the majority. That is not an unusual event in the Senate. In fact, it is the purpose of the Senate to debate different approaches.

What we asked as an alternative was very simple, straight forward language. Let me read it again. It simply stated:

It is the sense of the Congress that Congress should not take any action that will endanger the United States military forces in the field, including the elimination or reduction of funds for troops in the field, as such action with respect to funding would

undermine the safety or harm their effectiveness in pursuing their assigned missions.

All this language says is that whether you agree with the President or whether you disagree with the President, whether you support a commitment of more troops or you don't support a commitment of more troops, once the troops are on the ground in the fight, we are going to give them the financial support, the logistical support, the equipment that they need in order to protect themselves and pursue their mission effectively.

Members do not have to support the President to support this language. It is not designed to state the President is right or the President is wrong. It is simply language designed to say that an American soldier deserves the support of the Congress of the United States. That is an elementary responsibility of this Senate.

The fact that the Democratic leadership will not allow Members to vote on this simple statement of support for American troops is a transgression on the purposes of the Senate, which is to express itself relative to the actions of our soldiers in the field and how we will support them.

It is literally impossible to address the debate on Iraq without addressing the most fundamental issue, which is whether our troops are going to be supported when they are asked to defend us in the field. The idea that we can decouple the support for the troops from the issue of policy is absurd on its face, and the position of the Democratic leadership that we should not address the issue of supporting the troops when we address the issue of whether the tactics being pursued by the military commanders in the field are correct—which doesn't happen to be the responsibility of Congress; that is the responsibility of the commanders—is by nature inconceivable, inconsistent, and simply not defensive.

In fact, it is so absurd on its face that I would simply quote the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. Paul Morin, who says:

We will not separate the war from the warrior.

That is what this is about: whether the Democratic leadership takes the truly indefensible position that in a debate on the issue of Iraq, we do not discuss the support for the person we are asking to go out and defend this Nation.

What this really comes down to is very simple. This resolution would have received broad bipartisan support in this Senate. That is because there are very few Members in this Senate—I would guess virtually none—who don't believe that our obligation as a Senate, as a legislative body which funds the military, that our obligation is to give the soldiers in the field what they need in order to defend themselves and carry out their mission.

So rather than have a vote on our amendment which would have received a large majority in this Senate—much

larger than the proposal put forward as their proposal—they decided not to have a vote at all. Then they claimed that we were responsible for slowing the process.

How inconsistent and indefensible is that statement: I don't have the votes; therefore, I will not allow a vote to happen. But it is your fault that I am not allowing the vote to happen. Really? That only makes sense if you happen to be a true partisan and believe this debate should be a partisan debate.

Somehow my language has been described as "partisan," and the other language has been described as "bipartisan," but the other language has fewer votes than my language. No, this is not true. It is simply a fact that the other side of the aisle does not wish to put their membership in a position of voting for a simple resolution that calls for the support of our troops.

That is an unfortunate statement on where the Democratic Party is today relative to support for the efforts of soldiers in the field. It is hard for me to conceive that there are folks within the community of interest in Washington who feel so strongly about their dislike for the President or his policies that they are unwilling to go on record in support of the soldier who is fighting for us on the streets of Baghdad. But that is the essence of the problem. That is why we are not going to have a vote in the Senate. It is not that the Republican membership has in some way stalled this process. The Republican leader has gone out of his way, he has gone well beyond what many in our party believe maybe we should have done in trying to be accommodating to the insistence of the Democratic leadership that there be no opposition to the one item that they want to bring to the Senate floor.

In my experience in the Senate, when something is brought to the floor of the Senate as controversial as the discussion of how we pursue a war and a war policy, there are going to be a lot of amendments. But the Senate leadership, under the Democratic leader, has said, no, not only will there not be a lot of amendments, there will only be one amendment from our side, and we on the Democratic side will pick the amendment on the Republican side that they can offer, and we will let them offer that but nothing else.

The Republican leader, in an attempt to be responsive, said, OK, if there are only going to be two amendments, we will pick the amendment. And the amendment will simply say that whether you support the President, whether you support his policies, at least you can say you support the troops, the soldiers who are asked to go out and protect America and walk the streets of Baghdad.

But that was a bridge too far for the Democratic leader, a bridge too far for the Democratic membership because they did not want to take that vote even though that would have been a bipartisan vote and would have received

significantly more votes than the Democratic proposal.

I don't think there should be any confusion about why we aren't having a vote. We are not having a vote because more people would vote for my amendment than would vote for their amendment, and they don't want to embarrass their membership by having to have them vote for my amendment even though there is nothing controversial about it, unless you consider supporting troops in the field, giving them what they need to fight and defend themselves, to be controversial.

It is an ironic situation. I thank the Republican leader for having offered me the opportunity to bring this amendment forward and for making it fairly clear that we as a membership are willing to be reasonable; that we only ask for a vote on something that we think is important while they ask for a vote on something they think is important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. How much time does the minority have remaining in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty and one-half minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, would you advise me when I have used 6 minutes, and I will defer to my other colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator.

Mr. CORNYN. 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 Petraeus, 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 Petraeus and the plan he has taken upon himself to execute in Iraq that we are sending, over a period of time, addi-

tional 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:

... in fact, only a military blow to the insurgency will allow the necessary window for the government to gain time, trust, and confidence to press ahead with reform and services.

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—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 6 minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I would ask for 1 remaining minute by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. CORNYN. And here we are in the Senate this week debating about non-binding 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask that the Chair inform me when I have used 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, clearly, without doubt, without question, the war in Iraq is the leading concern of the American people, as well it should be. It is a very difficult situation, and a situation that will define our future and our security for years to come. Because it is the dominant, the leading concern of the American people, without any close second, I think it is imperative we have a debate and votes on this crucial question.

I would urge the majority leader to come back to the floor and engage in this debate and move forward with this discussion and accept the very reasonable compromise of the minority leader in narrowing down all of the universe of ideas and resolutions to simply two.

I will freely admit that is not my first preference in terms of this debate. I had always heard before coming here 2 years ago that the Senate was about

open debate, unlimited debate, the ability to get your ideas and your amendments and your resolutions to the floor with very few limits. So I thought, particularly in the context of this very serious situation in Iraq, we needed an open debate, we needed more ideas, not fewer, we needed every significant vote that should be taken.

So that was my preference: unlimited debate. But the majority leader rejected that, only would allow very limited votes, very limited debate. At the end of the day—again, it was not my first choice, but at the end of the day, the minority leader said: OK, you want two votes—only two votes—OK. Let's focus on two proposals. Let's have just two votes. But our choice for our one proposal will be the Gregg amendment because we feel so strongly about supporting our troops in the field. And then the majority leader said no, I can't accept that. I need to choose your proposal. I need to choose what you want to put up for a vote.

That is not the tradition of the Senate. And, more importantly, that is not treating this very serious issue, the dominant concern among all Americans, bar none, properly. We need to debate this issue now. We need to vote on this issue now. Again, I urge the majority leader to come back to the floor and engage in this debate this week—now—because the country is concerned now about Iraq. The country has questions, understandably, now about the President's plan. And our troops in the field have questions and uncertainty now about whether we will be standing shoulder to shoulder with them no matter what policy is adopted.

Again, I think the minority leader's proposal yesterday bent over backwards—compromise and compromise and compromise—to reach an ability to have this debate we must have on the floor of the Senate. We wanted far more than two proposals debated. We wanted far more than two votes. But we accepted the majority leader's number. We accepted the majority leader's parameters of just two proposals, just two votes. But surely the minority gets to choose one of those two proposals to discuss, particularly given that this Gregg proposal has broad bipartisan support.

So let's have this Iraq debate that we must have. Let's have key votes that we must have. And let's do it now. I urge the majority leader, again, not to give up, not to reject this very reasonable compromise, bending over backwards by the minority leader to agree to his number of two. Let's take that up. Let's have this debate. Let's have crucial votes. The American people deserve that, given the very tough situation in Iraq. And our men and women in uniform sure as heck deserve that. They sure as heck deserve to hear from us: OK, we know some of you are for the President's surge plan; we know some of you are against it. But what about supporting whatever troops are put in the field? They sure as heck de-

serve an answer to that question. And they certainly deserve that reassurance.

Let's have that fair debate, and let's have it now.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam President, it is interesting that we would be preparing today to have a debate that will not be taking place, and it will not be taking place because it is the prerogative of the leadership to set the agenda of what we do discuss and debate.

I agree with my colleagues who have requested an opportunity to have a full airing of the views, to have a full debate, to have an opportunity to express our support for the men and women in the field, in addition to whatever else we might want to debate on this topic of the most important issue facing our country today.

But getting beyond the procedural and the tit for tat that so often signifies what Washington is about, what fundamentally is this debate about? It is about the global war on terror. It is about the events that unfolded in our country on the morning of September 11, 2001, and the aftermath of all of that, the things that have occurred as our Nation has responded to the attacks that were brought upon our shores, as we have sought to carry out this difficult mission, but one in which we must not waiver, which is this war on terror.

As a result of this war on terror, our troops are in Iraq today, where they have removed a dictator from power and where they have confronted the enemy, which regardless of how someone might have felt about the original decision to go into Iraq, today we are there and we are engaging an enemy that is the very enemy that attacked us here on 9/11.

It is known that in Al Anbar Province it is fundamentally an al-Qaida operation. So to send additional reinforcements to Al Anbar Province to defeat al-Qaida in Iraq is in the best interests of this Nation. It is in our national interest to pacify, to bring some peace to Baghdad, which is the capital city of Iraq, which is essential to the peace and security of that nation, of that budding democracy that is attempting to put itself on its feet, and to bring some stability to that capital city by additional reinforcements of American troops in a new plan I think is reasonable.

We cannot get so focused on whether some in this body cannot work with this President, do not want to support any of his policies. But let's look at the people who are going to carry out this policy, the generals who are going to be in the field.

In the past few days, as has been stated, we have approved by a near—well, I guess it was unanimous; it was 81 to 0, I believe—the sending of General Petraeus as our new commander of

allied forces in Iraq. I recall his testimony in the Armed Services Committee where he clearly said he believed in this plan and thought it had a reasonable chance of success. Why would we not give a reasonable chance of success a chance to succeed? Why would we not stand behind our men and women who are willing to go into harm's way to carry out this plan and see if they have an opportunity to succeed?

The goal of this new plan is threefold. First, we have to have some stability in Baghdad. We have to continue to defeat al-Qaida in Al Anbar Province. But then beyond that there are other elements to the plan. There obviously needs to be a political reconciliation. There needs to be a political settlement. But that will never take place if there is not some modicum of stability, if we do not bring down the sectarian violence and other violence in Iraq to a manageable level.

We then have an opportunity for the political settlement to take place between the Shias and Sunnis, and the Kurds in the north, so they can all come together and begin to bind as a new nation, as a new country, as a new government—a government, by the way, that has only been in place about 9 months.

In addition to that, we then have a third angle to this, which I think is so vitally important, which is the economic reconstruction, the economic development, the opportunity for there to be jobs, for there to be opportunities for folks to find a way to make a better life for themselves and their children, so they can reach their aspirations, and do it in an atmosphere of freedom, do it in an atmosphere of democracy and respect for one another. That is the goal.

What would happen if we do not give this plan a chance, if we do not see if it has an opportunity to carry out and have an opportunity for success? What is the alternative? Well, we would then have failed in this test of wills. Our enemies have clearly stated they believe if they kill enough Americans, if they cause enough grief to our mothers, if they cause enough harm to our troops, we will not stand up, we will move on, we will find an easier way, and we will not resist those who would bring the destruction of our country upon us.

Their stated aims are very clear. They want us out of the Middle East. They want to be able to get America out of the Middle East. They do not want us there because they know we are what stands between them and the opportunity of creating a radical Islamic new caliphate in that region of the world, and the danger that would all bring about.

The new intelligence estimate on Iraq we have seen gives a window into what would happen if we had a precipitous withdrawal over the next 12 to 18 months. It would not be a pretty picture. Sectarian violence would ensue. Unquestionably, we would have a Shia-

dominated Middle East. Already they are, through their proxies, in Lebanon, in Syria. They have a strong alliance with them. They are trying to take over the Palestinian movement.

Over the next 12 to 18 months, the assessments would be very dire of what would take place if we were to be out of the region: an escalation of violence, a diminished chance for stability, no chance for positive change.

The estimates suggest that a key aim in Iraq is to stabilize the situation from the standpoint of violence, enough to let the political changes that have to happen take place. I am going to quote from the estimate. It says from the public version:

If strengthened, Iraqi security forces more loyal to the government, supported by coalition forces, are able to reduce levels of violence and establish more effective security for Iraq's population, and Iraqi leaders can have an opportunity to begin the process of political compromise necessary for longer-term stability, political progress, and economic recovery.

Isn't that a better way? Isn't that what we all want, what the Senate should be on record as supporting—this opportunity for our troops to be successful, and not only to be in harm's way fighting for our country, but also to know that the Senate stands behind them, will not cut off their funds, will stand with them as they go into battle, and will stand with them as they do the hard work of freedom—work done by many other generations of America any time they have been called upon to stand for freedom, stand for the rule of law, and to give this budding new democracy an opportunity to take hold and take root.

Madam President, I am disappointed that today we will not have an opportunity to have a fuller debate, that I won't have the opportunity to be on record with a vote reflecting where I stand, which all of us should be willing to do—take a stand, take a position supporting our troops.

I personally would also be in support of this plan which I believe gives us the best opportunity for success, which is the only plan out there. Those who would not give this plan a chance owe the American people an alternative but one that would have a reasonable chance for success. Success is what we are after. A victory in this part of the world would send a strong message to our enemies. So I am disappointed we will not vote today.

I hope the majority leader will reconsider and come back to have an earnest debate and take the votes that are necessary to be taken.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we have heard a debate over the last hour about where we stand on the resolutions and debating the escalation of the war in Iraq. Here is where we are at the end of the day. We can dot all the i's, cross all the t's, and do all of the legalistic parsing that we want. The minority is blocking a vote on the issue that the American people wish to hear us on: Do you support or oppose the escalation? It is that simple.

The minority's action ratifies the President's escalation. And any Senator who voted to prevent the Warner resolution from coming to the floor is saying to his or her constituents: I support that escalation.

We know what is going on. The minority is torn between loyalty to their President and following the will of their voters. I have not seen a single State where, at least from the polling data, the public supports the escalation. There should be a simple vote, and not as an end to this debate but as a beginning to this debate. The minority is tying itself in a pretzel so that there will not be a vote.

Now, the Gregg resolution is missing two words. Look at it. Read it. It doesn't have the word "surge," and it doesn't have the word "escalation." It is ambiguously worded so that it tries to tie support for the troops with the escalation, but without saying so. It is a resolution that is intended to befuddle, perplex, obfuscate, and to hide.

The good news is that the American people don't follow the details of all of this debate. They don't have the time. They are busy with their lives, their families, their jobs, the joys and sorrows of life. But they follow the big picture. The big picture is simple: Senator REID has labored mightily to have a clear, unobstructed, unobliterated vote on whether you support or oppose the escalation.

The minority leader, backed by all but two of his membership, has said we do not want to vote; we want to let the President go forward with the escalation, without taking responsibility for it. The public is seeing that. The public understands.

My good friend from Mississippi was talking in the hallway. He said the job of the Senate is to take the tough votes. You bet it is. It is not whether we are saying we support the troops—which everybody agrees that we do—in an ambiguously designed amendment to support escalation and get their way, and those against it get their way. The bottom line is simple: the tough vote is "yes" or "no" on the escalation.

Again, I salute our majority leader. He has done everything to try to bring that vote to the floor. The minority leader has done everything to obstruct that vote. The good news is that we will have plenty of further opportunity to get that vote and, make no mistake about it, this majority, in the belief that the escalation is wrong, in the belief that there is no strategy in Iraq

other than to police a civil war, which no one bargained for, will be resolute and we will find ample opportunities to not only get a sense-of-the-Senate vote on whether you support or oppose the escalation, but to move further and ratchet up the pressure on the President so that he changes his strategy.

The number of people in America who believe that our strategy in Iraq is succeeding gets smaller every day. I think it is below 1 in 4 right now, which means that close to a majority of Republicans don't agree with the strategy. Obviously, if the President came here 3 years ago and said we are going to have our troops on Haifa Street patrolling a civil war between the Sunnis and Shiites—how many people would have voted for that? How many Americans would have supported it? But that is exactly what we are doing. The vast majority of the troops that the President is asking for will continue to do just that and only that.

So this debate is coming only to a temporary close. One thing stands out clearly: the Republican minority is allowing the President to go forward with the escalation. It is supporting the escalation but doesn't want to vote to say so. My colleagues, that will not wash. The American people are too smart. They are too concerned. They are too worried about the brave men and women over there risking their lives as Sunnis shoot at Shiites and Shiites shoot at Sunnis. To hold the minority's feet to the fire, we will be resolute in making sure that happens.

The Gregg resolution is obfuscatory. It is designed to give people cover who don't want to say yes or no. But make no mistake about it, the people want a yes or a no. They want us to act on that yes or no as we come forward with the supplementary budget request next month. And this majority, limited as it may be, will endeavor to do just that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. First of all, I commend the Senator from New York for an excellent presentation. As I understand it from his comments, the principal question before the country now is the whole issue of a surge and the certain timeliness of it. We know that the President was able to extend, for example, marines in place over there and get a certain number of troops over there, but we know this is something that is going to happen in the future. A chunk of the troops are going over in February, another group in March, and another group in April.

In the Armed Services Committee yesterday, we learned it is not just the 20,000 the President talked about, but that number is going to be exceeded. We heard from General Pace.

As I understand what the good Senator has said, we have had four surges previously over there. This concept, this idea, has been utilized previously and none were successful. Secondly, as

I understand what the Senator has said, the leading generals, General Abizaid and General Casey, previously suggested that this concept did not make sense; it only inflamed the insurgency. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. SCHUMER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KENNEDY. The third part of the Senator's speech, which I hope our colleagues will listen to, is the reference to the independent study by Baker and Hamilton, where a bipartisan recommendation said that such an activity would not make sense.

So does it make sense when we have that kind of lineup, so to speak, where we have the military, the background of surges, the independent study made by Republicans and Democrats alike—we are faced now with a surge, so we have to take action and express ourselves. Doesn't it make sense for this body to express itself on that particular policy issue? Isn't that the responsible thing to do?

Mr. SCHUMER. Indeed. I thank my colleague for asking the question. Again, the minority says it is our job to take some tough votes. Here, here. We want to take what is a tough vote for some: Are you for the surge? Are you for the escalation or are you against it? They are doing everything they can to avoid it. But as my good friend from Massachusetts has so aptly pointed out, the bottom line is that now is the time to go on record—now, before most of the troops are there; now, when we can ratchet up pressure on the President to change his policy, as the independent study group said, and so many generals have said. I might add, from the press reports, the Prime Minister of Iraq doesn't want them. We are almost in Alice in Wonderland here.

I will say one other thing. The good news is simple: the American people get it. They know that the war in Iraq doesn't have a strategy. They know it is headed toward a dead end. They know that policing a civil war makes no sense, and they know what we are trying to do, which is forcing a "yes" or "no" vote—get a "yes" or "no" vote and move forward to change that strategy. No amount of wordsmithing on the other side is going to change that fact.

Today, the Republican minority said: We are for the surge, and we will let the President go forward and do it.

I yield to my colleague for another question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just a final point. Madam President, the Senator has stated it well. Basically, the recommendations of those generals I mentioned—and General Abizaid said he had inquired of all the combat commanders—whether there should be an enhanced presence in Baghdad, and he testified before the Armed Services Committee that we should not.

But isn't the point the Senator is making is to underline what all of the

generals have said and Maliki has said; that is, it is a political resolution, it is a political decision? What we are seeing now is resorting to a military solution when the independent study commission, the generals on the ground, and the political leaders in that country have said what is necessary now is a political resolution, a political decision, and we find an administration that has effectively discarded that as an option and is going to the military option.

As I understand, the Senator believes we ought to have a political resolution, political courage by the parties in power there; that we here and the U.S. troops can't care more about the freedom of the Iraqis than the Iraqi people and they have to stand up, step up, and be willing to make their judgments.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senator is exactly right. And I will add one other point to his very prescient comments. Let us say we have this surge and then troops leave after a certain amount of time—some say the end of the summer, some say it will go on 3, 4, 5 years. What is going to happen then if we don't have a political solution the good Senator asks about? The Sunni and Shia will resume fighting, and we will have accomplished nothing. We will have seen the lives of some of our brave men and women be taken from them, American soldiers. We will have created more havoc in Iraq. And we will have, again, delayed the very political solution my friend from Massachusetts talks about, which is essential.

If there had been a change in Government, if there had been a change in strategy, perhaps—I can't say because I don't know what it would be, given this administration hasn't changed anything—maybe the American people, maybe some on this side of the aisle would say: Give it a chance. But to send more of our brave troops over there when there is no change in strategy, when it is just increasing policing of a civil war, and when, at the end of this so-called surge, this escalation, nothing will have changed, the American people have every right to ask: To what end?

That is what we are asking. That is why we want a simple vote. And that is why today is going to go down in history as a day when this Republican minority in this House said to the President: We are supporting your surge. We don't want to vote on it, but we are allowing it to happen. We are encouraging it to happen. And the very rubberstamp nature, when the minority was in the majority, that brought them to such trouble in November of 2006 is simply continuing.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a final point?

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I had the opportunity to read the national intelligence report on Monday. There has been both an intelligence report and a declassified report. Even in

the declassified report, would the Senator say, in his evaluation of the best of the intelligence community that has been reviewing this situation that every aspect of that intelligence report is basically in support of the conclusions the Senator has outlined here? This is not something just the Senators from New York or Massachusetts are making up. This is a conclusion which has been made by the intelligence agencies about what the nature of the battle is in Baghdad today.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator. Once again, he is right on the money. He is right on the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed his 15 minutes under the order.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 1 more minute to finish my point, and then I will yield the floor.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. The Senator is right on the money, and it is, again, a pattern. The experts—intelligence, military, diplomatic—tell the administration what they are doing is wrong, tell the administration that all the signs on the ground point to a policy that is failing, and they keep their head in the sand and just go forward. It is a tragedy. It is a tragedy when truth is not exalted and when there is a desire to stifle debate, as has happened in the administration and is happening on the floor of the Senate today.

We all love this country, everyone in this Chamber, regardless of politics, but at least for me—and I dearly love America—every day we delay hurts us a little more and a little more and a little more. We dig ourselves deeper in a hole from which it will be harder and harder to extricate ourselves.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 14 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, to pick up where the good Senator from New York stopped, we had yesterday at Saint Francis Xavier in Hyannis, MA—I was unable to attend because I was here in the Senate—the funeral of a young serviceman who was lost. At the end of last week, a young serviceman named Callahan from Woburn, MA—his fourth time in Iraq, a father of four—was lost.

Woburn, MA, is a very interesting blue-collar community. They had the highest percentage of casualties in the Vietnam war of any community in my State. They had high school class after high school class that joined the Marines and suffered devastating casualties in Vietnam. It is also a storybook community on civic action—water contamination in that community resulted in the deaths of a number of children there. But the community is

made up of extraordinary men and women and families. They are weathering through this extreme, extraordinary tragedy.

Sixty-four brave soldiers from Massachusetts have been lost, killed, and this is the overriding, overarching issue in question: What can we do after 4 years where our service men and women have done everything we have asked them to do? They have served in Iraq longer than it took to end World War II, to sweep through Africa, to cross Western Europe, cross through the Pacific, and they are still out there. Many of us believe, as we mentioned a few moments ago, that the solution lies not in the increasing surge but in a political resolution and determination and decisions made by the Iraqis for their own future. It is, after all, their country.

Let me talk for a few minutes about the other costs of this war, the \$200 billion which is in the President's budget for the war in Iraq and what the implications of that will be, so that Americans can understand more completely the costs.

It comes from children's health, as the President's budget underfunds the CHIP program by \$8 billion. That program has been extremely successful in providing health care to low-income children.

Will the Chair let me know when I have 2 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yet there are still more than 8 million children in America with no health coverage, and there is a health care crisis for our Nation's children. But what does the President propose to do about it? His budget will make the crisis even worse by cutting 400,000 children from the Children's Health Insurance Program.

It comes from our seniors and our disabled citizens. The President's budget cuts \$66 billion from Medicare, which is a lifeline to millions of retirees and disabled Americans. If the President has his way, more than 700,000 people in Massachusetts who rely on Medicare could see the quality of their care go down.

It comes from those battling mental illnesses. Each year, 25 percent of Americans suffer from some sort of mental illness. We owe it to them and their families to do all we can to ensure they are able to lead full and productive lives. Yet the President's budget cuts mental health assistance by \$159 million.

It comes from Hurricane Katrina victims. Despite massive ongoing needs on the gulf coast, the President's budget offers no additional assistance to help people rebuild their lives.

It comes from the Nation's defense against epidemics, such as the flu, as the President proposes to slash funding for the Centers for Disease Control by \$165 million.

It comes from Medicaid, our health care lifeline for the poor, which the

President intends to cut by \$50 billion over the next 10 years. In Massachusetts, 880,000 citizens depend on Medicaid, and this budget places them at risk.

It comes from our children's education. The President's budget underfunds the No Child Left Behind reforms by almost \$15 billion. In my State of Massachusetts, these cuts would leave behind more than 51,000 children. Nationwide, we have 3.5 million children who are not participating in the program whatsoever. Yet they will have a requirement to meet sufficiency in the year 2012.

It comes from our youngest children. By cutting \$107 million from the Head Start Program, the President fails to give the youngest children a strong start in life. This is a program which is tried, tested, and true.

It comes from our students with special needs. When we passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, we made a promise to disabled children and their families that they were to receive the education they deserve. President Bush's budget breaks that promise by cutting funding to IDEA by \$290 million. We made the commitment we were going to provide 40 percent of all the funding. We are now at about 18 percent of funding, and we are reducing that. It is shifting the burden onto the families and the local communities.

It comes from school safety. Our children ought to be able to go to school without fearing violence, but this budget cuts funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools. With all the challenges of schools and violence in schools, it cuts back the funding for Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

It comes at the expense of our teachers. Over the next decade, this Nation will need to hire 2 million more teachers, but this budget cuts funding for teacher quality grants.

It comes at the expense of students. At a time when college costs are skyrocketing, the President's budget completely eliminates the Perkins Loan Program, which over 500,000 students depend on to help them afford a college education. We know that a college degree is a ticket to a bright and better future, but this budget closes the college door instead of opening it wider. There are already 400,000 young people who are qualified to get into our fine community colleges, public colleges, and private colleges and don't do so because of a lack of funding.

It comes from our workers who are looking for good jobs to support their families because the President's budget slashes \$1 billion from programs that train Americans for jobs. Madam President, listen to this: In Massachusetts alone, there are 25,000 people waiting to be enrolled in job training programs.

In Boston, there are 25 applicants for each job training slot. There are 78,000 jobs that are out there today that are looking for trained people, 25 people for every training slot, 275,000 people who are unemployed. What is wrong with

this picture? We are cutting back on the training opportunities for those individuals to be able to pay more in taxes and provide more hopeful futures for their children.

This budget can find \$200 billion more for the war in Iraq but not a dime for people at home trying to better their lives. They come from families who need help putting food on the table. The President wants to cut the Food Stamp Program by \$600 million, leaving nearly 300,000 families wondering where they are going to find the next meal for themselves and their children.

I have had the chance to visit our absolutely spectacular food bank in Boston, and they talk about the increased numbers that they already have. This is going to even put more pressure on those food banks and more pressure on those families. It comes from the poor struggling against the bitter cold, as the budget cuts 17 percent of the funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which helps low-income families afford to heat their homes.

In my State, if you use home heating oil you need to fill your tank generally three times a winter—three times a winter. Families are down now where they are only able to fill—the needy who qualify for this—less than half a tank for the whole winter. We know what is happening. People make the choices between the prescription drugs they need, the food they need, and the heat they need for their homes. We are cutting that program by 17 percent.

Perhaps most tragically of all, the money for the war in Iraq comes from our veterans themselves. Nearly half the troops returning from Iraq will require health care services to cope with the physical or mental toll of the war. Yet the President's budget underfunds veterans' health. It provides only half the increase in funding required for the VA to keep pace with the needs of our veterans.

In Massachusetts alone, there are 453,000 veterans who have served our country when they were called to duty, and we have a moral obligation to do all we can for them.

This is the cost of this war. This is all for a war that never should have happened, for a war that should be brought to an end. Yet this administration is allowing it to go on and on, with mistake after mistake after mistake. This terrible war is having an effect not only on our troops, who are paying the highest price, but on our children, our elderly, our schools, our workers, and the poor here at home.

While the President forges ahead with a surge in Iraq, the American people need a surge here at home. Americans see the cost of health care and the cost of college going up. What about a surge in our health and education policies to meet those needs? Americans here at home worry about their economic security, about their jobs and stagnant wages, how they can support themselves on their wages. How about

a surge here at home to help meet their needs?

Last week, we met with our Nation's mayors. They described the problem of school dropouts, how these young people are turning to crime in our communities, the proliferation of murders and youth homicides and suicides. Where is the surge to address that problem? No wonder the American people are growing angrier and angrier as the war wages on. They expect Congress to be an effective restraint on the President and his abuse of the War Powers Act.

Opposition to the escalation is clear already. How much clearer does it have to be before Republicans in Congress and the President finally respond to the voice of the American people? When will this war be brought to an end? An escalation now would be an immense mistake, compounding the original misguided decision to invade Iraq. Public support for the war does not exist. There is no support for this escalation. We have surged our forces four times in the past, and each time the situation hasn't changed.

The President cannot continue to unilaterally impose his failing policy on Americans who have already rejected it. Congress has the responsibility to stop the President from sending more of our sons and daughters to die in this civil war. The legislation on which the Democrats seek a vote is our first effort to meet that responsibility. It is our chance to go on record in opposition to the surge. It is a clarion call for change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Last week, the new National Intelligence Estimate confirmed the nightmare scenario unfolding for our troops in Iraq. The country is sliding deeper into an abyss of civil war, with our brave men and women caught in the middle of it. The prospects for halting the escalating sectarian violence is bleak, with greater chaos and anarchy looming and many additional U.S. casualties inevitable.

It is abundantly clear that what we need is not a troop surge but a diplomatic surge, working with other countries in the region. Sending more troops into the Iraq civil war is not the solution to Iraq's political problems. Not only does President Bush fail to see that reality, but he is also going out of his way to deny and defy it.

Congress needs to express its opposition to this strategy. If the President refuses to change course, we must act to change it ourselves to protect our troops and end this misguided war. The war today is not the war Congress authorized 4 years ago. It is now a civil war. The war today is not about Saddam's weapons of mass destruction or alleged relationship with al-Qaeda, it is Iraqi against Iraqi. Iraq is at war with itself, and American soldiers are caught in the middle.

Madam President, it is time for the Members of this body to stand up and

take a position on the issue of the surge.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise for a few moments to address the subjects that have been discussed for the last 30 minutes. First of all, I rise in particular to lend my support to Senator MCCONNELL who has seen to it that the Senate is able to fully express itself on the issues before us in Iraq. No one should be confused about this debate. There are many opinions here, and every one of them deserves the right to be expressed.

Secondly, I rise in support of the President's plan, and I am going to explain why in just a second. First, however, the Senator from New York made a statement a minute ago that I want to open my remarks with.

The Senator from New York said not many people are paying attention to what we debate on the floor of the Senate, that they are too busy working in their daily lives. That may very well be right, but I want to tell you who is listening to every word. First, it is the men and women in our Armed Forces, their families, and their loved ones. All you have to do is go to Iraq, where I have been many times, go to any mess hall or almost any command post, and CNN and Fox are streaming constantly. Our men and women watch what we say, so what we say on this floor is important. The resolutions we send, binding or not, should not send mixed signals.

There is another audience that listens to what we say, and they are our enemies. They listen as well. Those networks are their intelligence agencies. The messages we send should not be a message which relays a lack of confidence to our troops or to our Commander in Chief.

I am on the Foreign Relations Committee. I have spent 20 of the last 28 hours of committee meetings listening to experts from a variety of resources, and two things became quite clear. There were varying opinions on whether a surge would work. Some thought it would conclusively; many thought it would not. Most gave it varying degrees of potential success. Without exception, however, everyone I heard testify, when asked the question: What would be the ramifications of withdrawal or redeployment, everyone, in one degree or another, said there would be tens of thousands of lives lost, and possibly millions, and the sectarian violence that we are trying to quell now could spread through the region.

The way I see it, we have two choices right now at this stage of the game. Choice one is an opportunity for success. Choice two is a recipe for disaster. I choose the opportunity for success. I think the message we ought to send to our troops is that we support them, we wish them Godspeed, and we pray for their success.

A second message we need to send, which this debate has very helpfully done, is a message to al-Malaki and the assembly in Iraq and the people of Iraq that we came to their country with three objectives, two of which we have secured. One objective was to seek out the weapons of mass destruction the entire world believed were there. Second was to allow a constitution to be written and a free election to be held. Both of those things have been accomplished.

The last most elusive goal that we had was to secure the nation and train the Iraqi military so it could carry on that security and let that fledgling democracy go forward. That third goal, which has been elusive, has gotten closer. The President's strategy to send additional troops to Anbar and to Baghdad requires the absolute cooperation of the Iraqis and the commitment of their military to assist side by side. If they blink and look the other way, they will have failed themselves. If we blink and we look the other way, we will have failed not only them but we will have failed the people of our country.

Make no mistake about it, the war in Iraq that we are now in is not the war we entered, but it is the war we are in, and those are the words of our President. Regardless of where mistakes may have been made, those of us, and I am one of those, who voted to support this when we went into Iraq did not vote for failure. I hope and I pray that our soldiers will be successful, that al-Malaki and the Iraqi military will come through and perform, and I am going to do everything I can to give them that support because I choose an opportunity for success over a recipe for failure.

With regard to the mistakes that have been made, I want to be crystal clear because there are some awfully selective memories on the floor of the Senate. I remember what I believed when I voted to go into Iraq. I remember what the National Intelligence Estimate said. And I remember the horror of 9/11 and the fear of weapons of mass destruction. We voted to do what every other member of the United Nations voted on in Resolution 1441, and that was to seek out what the world thought was there. While we didn't find the smoking gun, we found a lot of the components and a lot of the evidence. We found the 400,000 bodies in mass graves and the tyranny of a horrible dictator in Saddam Hussein. We accomplished our goal of deposing him and allowing the Iraqis to determine a free democratic society.

In the critical days of this battle, it is time for us to stand forward and stand strong and give this opportunity for success that the President has proposed a chance to succeed, rather than subscribe to a recipe of failure. These are trying times, and I respect the opinions of every Member of this body expressed on this floor, but remember who our audiences are and how impor-

tant it is that the message that we send not be mixed, not be one of a political message but be a message of commitment and resolve.

I will support the President not out of partisanship, not out of blind loyalty, but I will support the President because the evidence submitted in all of the hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee told me we have two choices: We can choose an opportunity to succeed or we can subscribe to a recipe for failure. I choose success, and I pray God's blessings on our men and women in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, as a new Member of this body, I must tell you that I am frustrated and disappointed. I am disappointed that the Republicans are blocking a vote on whether we support or oppose the President's plan to add additional troops to Iraq. I can tell you that is the issue of the day. That is what my constituents are asking of us, and I think they have a right to expect that the Members of this body are willing to go on record either for or against the President's plan to add additional troops to Iraq.

I have listened to my colleagues. I have listened to my colleagues in committee, and I have listened to my colleagues on this floor, and I think the majority of us want to go on record opposing the surge. Both Democrats and Republicans oppose it. I think there is a bipartisan group that can provide the consensus in this body to go on record against the surge.

Several months ago, the President said we were going to have a new plan in Iraq. Shortly after that, the Iraq Study Group came out with its report. To me, this has been the best analysis of the situation that we have before us. The study group is composed of distinguished members, and it was a creation of the Congress. Secretary Baker, who cochaired the group, served in three administrations and has broad experience in government. Mr. Hamilton, who served in the other body on the Foreign Relations Committee, the Committee on International Relations it is called over there, has served with great distinction both as chairman and ranking member. The other members of the committee—they said we cannot win in Iraq through our military efforts. That is not going to bring success in Iraq. The Iraqis must step forward and defend their own country and we must move forward with new diplomatic efforts. We need “a new diplomatic offensive” is what they called it, and they said: We need to start that before December 31, 2006. The ability of the United States to influence events within Iraq is diminishing. We still have not seen that new offensive diplomatic effort.

GEN George Casey said, “It has always been my view that heavy and sus-

tained American military presence was not going to solve the problems in Iraq over the long term.”

We got the President's plan and the President's plan was more of the same, stay the course but with more U.S. military presence. We had 3 weeks of hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee. Military expert after military expert, foreign policy expert after foreign policy expert, told us that there is a deterioration in Iraq and our policies are not working and we need to move in a new direction. We need to come to grips with the fact that the Iraqis must stand up and defend their own country and we must engage the international community much more aggressively.

I congratulate Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN for coming forward with a compromise resolution that allows us to go on record opposed to the increased American military presence in Iraq. I do not agree with everything that is in that resolution, but I do think it clearly puts the Senate on record against the increased surge of American troops in Iraq, and that is our responsibility. That is what we should be doing. We should not hide behind procedural roadblocks to avoid voting on that issue. That is the most important issue facing this Nation today, and we should be willing to vote on that issue. It is not about the President of the United States. It is about this body carrying out its responsibility. That is what each of us has a responsibility to do.

Why am I so much against the increase in the U.S. military presence in Iraq? Let me first start with the numbers. The President said the surge would involve 21,500 additional American troops in Iraq. That is not the case. Michael Gilmore, the Assistant Director for National Security at the Congressional Budget Office, testified yesterday before our Budget Committee, and he said it is not going to be 21,500, it is going to be closer to 48,000 additional American troops because the 21,500 are the frontline combat troops. You need the support staff in order to support the 21,500.

The budget the President submitted to us said that is going to cost about \$5.6 billion, but CBO now says it is going to be closer to \$20 to \$27 billion of additional cost, just with the surge, in addition to what we are already spending. The President claims his budget is to balance in 5 years, but he has no cost for the Iraq war beyond 2008.

The numbers speak for themselves. The President is asking us to go along with stay the course but at a higher cost, both in American military presence and the costs to American taxpayers in this country.

The situation in Iraq is deteriorating. Every person who has come before us who is an expert in this area has acknowledged that. There is a civil war in Iraq, and Americans have paid a very heavy price for our commitment

in Iraq—over 3,000 dead and many more with life-changing injuries. There have been hundreds of billions of dollars spent. That represents missed opportunities in America—money we need to strengthen our military and national defense. We have used our National Guard and reservists. We should be supporting them, improving the quality of life for our soldiers and for our veterans. Our soldiers have served with great distinction and valor. We owe it to them to get it right. We owe it to them to do everything we can for a successful outcome in Iraq. That is why it is our responsibility, on behalf of our soldiers, to take up this issue.

We have lost our focus in the war against terror, we have weakened U.S. influence internationally, and, yes, we have lost other opportunities beyond defense because those hundreds of billions of dollars we spent could have been spent to balance our budget, could have been spent to increase our commitment to national priorities such as education and health care and the environment. But we have lost those issues.

The first order of business for us should be to go on record against increasing the American military presence in Iraq. That should be our first order of business. But then we need to do more. I opposed the war from the beginning. I voted against it in the other body. I have been a critic of the President in the management of the war, in his failure to properly engage the international community both before and after going into Iraq, and the decision made by someone in the White House to take out the Iraqi security forces when we went in, that was a mistake. I have been pretty consistent against the President, but we need to do more than pass this resolution. I think we should take up this resolution first. This is the first order of business. But then we need to do more.

The Iraqis have a responsibility to take care of their own security needs in the midst of a civil war. We need to engage the international community with a diplomatic and political initiative so the Government of Iraq has the confidence of the ethnic communities. This is sectarian violence. We need to change the way the Iraqis are doing business and help them through diplomatic efforts. We need to engage the international community. We need more assistance in training Iraqi security forces. You can't do it all by Americans; we need the international community. We need the international community to help us with the humanitarian crisis that is in Iraq. The number of refugees, displaced individuals, is in the millions. We need the help of the international community to deal with the humanitarian crisis. You are not going to have peace in Iraq until you deal with that.

We need the help of the international community on the infrastructure improvements, the economy of Iraq. The American taxpayers cannot do it alone, and we have wasted a lot of our tax-

payer dollars in Iraq. We need the international community to help us. In short, we need a new direction, a plan that includes bringing some of our combat troops home, to make it clear to the Iraqis we are not going to be there indefinitely, to make it clear to the international community we expect the Iraqis to take care of their own security needs. That is what we need.

But first things first. Let's take a vote on the President's plan. Let's get that done. Let's stop using procedural roadblocks to prevent a vote in this body but to vote for or against the President's plan to bring more troops to Iraq.

Then we should consider additional options to make it clear it is our responsibility to help bring about a new direction for American involvement in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Madam President, I have been on the floor of the Senate for the last half hour, listening to my colleague in what is, in fact, a very important debate for this country. I say that, even though the wringing of hands would suggest that somehow the debate is being blocked and the will of the Senate has been thwarted. I suggest quite the opposite. It has become a finger-pointing in a procedural way.

I believe the Republican leader came to the floor yesterday and said let's have a couple of votes, several votes; you can vote up or down on the Levin-Warner resolution; you can vote up or down on the Gregg resolution. It was then the leadership on the majority side, the Democratic side, blocked it. I think the American people are wise to the tactics at hand. They are not unaware, and they are frustrated by what is going on in Iraq today. Clearly, we are focused. Whether it is the Congress of the United States or a vast majority of the American people, we are becoming increasingly critical of a war that has frustrated many of us.

The Senator from Maryland voted against it. He said so a few moments ago. I voted for it. At the same time, I grow increasingly critical, as do many of the citizens of my State, as to what will be the future, what will be our success and/or failure and at a cost of how many more American lives.

I am critically concerned that this Government in Iraq now stand up. We have allowed them to form and to shape and to vote. They now have a Constitution. They now must lead. In leading, I hope it could be to stability to the region and that it will not offset and throw out of balance what the free world looks at and says is very important and that is, of course, the war on terror and the general stability of the Middle East.

Indeed, I think much has been lost in the debate around this country as to the significance of the Middle East itself. I was extremely pleased last

week when that kind of an elder statesman of our country, Henry Kissinger, came before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and in a very real and important way, and in a bipartisan way, said: Let's not forget our perspective. While for the short term and for the moment we are focused on Iraq, as we should be, let's not fail to recognize that since World War II, we have been in the Middle East to bring stability to the region for a safer, more stable Western World.

I don't think there is any question about that. He was frank about it when he stressed diplomacy as an important tool. I have long advocated frank, open talks amongst our friends and neighbors around the world, not only about the region but about the role of Iraq within the region and what we must do. However, Dr. Kissinger also stressed that, under the present conditions in Iraq, withdrawal or the signs of withdrawal is simply not an option for America's forces. So anyone who comes to the floor today and says: Oh, but it is an option and we ought to start now, or we ought to send all the signals to our friends and neighbors around the world that we are beginning to pull back, is going against a trend that I think is critically important. They could set in motion the kind of activity in Iraq that could bring about a phenomenal genocide and the possibility of neighbors tumbling in on top of neighbors to create conflict in the Middle East that could bring down the whole of the region. If that were to happen, then I am quite confident that those who want to withdraw would find themselves in a very precarious situation. What do we do? Do we go back in with greater force to stabilize the region, when friendly, moderate Arab nations are now tumbling into war because we would no longer stand or we would no longer force, through a diplomatic process, those countries of the world to come together to work with us, to cooperate?

While most agree that the current situation in Iraq must be dealt with politically—and we have heard that time and again—and economically, our military involvement is critical to provide the Iraqis the stability they need in this new democratic process. I don't mind pegging timelines a little bit and I don't mind thresholds and measurements and I think it is important we not only send that message but that we get it done, we get it done for the sake of our position in Iraq and certainly forcing the Iraqi Government to move—those are all phenomenally important issues.

Let me stress two last facts. It is quite simple. The 116th from Idaho, the largest deployment of Idaho's troops in this war, was there and served and served honorably and proudly and the work they did was phenomenally important and we are proud of them. Let me also suggest that while many will say the general we now send to Iraq is the best military mind we have available at the moment, the author of the

Army's war handbook on terror, we are saying to General Petraeus: You are the best there is, go forth and be successful, but, oh, by the way, we don't agree with the mission—what kind of a mixed message is that we now send to our military?

The Senator from Georgia was right. The world is listening to this debate. Our men and women in uniform are listening to this debate. The enemies of the cause are listening and saying: Oh, the Senate of the United States is getting cold feet. Our opportunities are at hand. All we have to do is wait them out. All we have to do is accelerate the violence, and they will turn out the lights in the green zone and go home.

Then the world, at least the Iraqi world, will erupt in a civil conflict, a civil war of phenomenal proportion.

Those are the realities we deal with today. I hope this Senate stays on point. This is an issue that is critical to the future of our country, to the future of the free world, to the region of the Middle East, to any kind of stability we hope could be brought there. I hope we have the votes—and they ought to be up or down—and I don't mind being on the record at all. They need to be substantive, they need to have the force and effect of law, just not the ring of the politics of the Chamber, because that is what we are getting today—a heavy dose of politics and very little substance.

We hide behind procedure? I don't think so. Let us bring these issues forward. The Craig resolution? Up or down. Levin-Warner? Up or down. What is wrong with those votes? That is what we were sent here to do. I would hope our leadership could bring us to that.

So, to reiterate:

Many people around the country, including myself, have taken a much more critical look at the way the war in Iraq has been handled. However, through all the hardships our soldiers face day-to-day on the streets of Baghdad and elsewhere in Iraq, it still remains evident to me that our success in Iraq and the success of the current Iraq government, is critical to the security of our Nation, the stability of the Middle East, and the fight against terrorism worldwide.

Indeed, much has been lost in the debates around this country as to the significance of the greater Middle East stability when looking at the situation in Iraq. Our country has maintained a presence in that region of the world since World War II, and it should not be a surprise to anyone that many countries there depend and rely on our presence there, both economically and for their own national security. After reviewing the recent transcript of Dr. Henry Kissinger before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I agreed with many of Dr. Kissinger's views on the current situation in Iraq as it relates to the Middle East as a whole, and the severe consequences the international community will face should we fail in Iraq.

Dr. Kissinger stressed diplomacy, something I have long advocated in this conflict and frankly for any conflict. I don't believe there is one Member of Congress who takes the decision lightly to send out troops into combat unless we all firmly believe it is a last option. I know I certainly didn't, and I know that an overwhelming majority of both Senators and Congressmen believed that as well when we authorized the use of force in Iraq back in 2002.

However, Dr. Kissinger also stressed that under the present conditions in Iraq, withdrawal is not an option for American forces. Such a withdrawal would have long reaching consequences on the war on terror worldwide, could lead to widespread genocide in Iraq and possible neighboring countries, as well as severe economic consequences for all Middle Eastern countries. It is clear that such a circumstance would mandate international forces be sent back into Iraq, but the costs at that point would be grave.

While most agree that the current situation in Iraq must be dealt with politically and economically, our military involvement is critical to providing the Iraqis the stability they need to let their new democracy take root. If we pull our troops out of Iraq now, or deny them much needed reinforcements as some would like to do, we risk losing Baghdad and possibly the entire country to full blown civil war. Under those circumstances, the government of Iraq would fall, and Iran and Syria would strengthen their grip on the Middle East, endangering the national security of America and our allies worldwide.

It is my hope that diplomatic efforts will continue in a more aggressive fashion to bring the international community to the realization of a failed State in Iraq, and the real consequences that we all face should our efforts fall short of stabilizing Baghdad and the country as a whole. Because the consequences are so high, I do not believe that our soldiers' withdrawal from Iraq should be placed on any timetable, and we need to reassure our soldiers and commanders in Iraq that we will continue to support their efforts. After all, they are operating in Iraq, but the work they are doing will have a far reaching effect to stabilize the Middle East.

Over the past few weeks, there have been many who have been outspoken about their disapproval of the President's new plan for Iraq. Not being an expert in military tactics, I do not believe it is my role as a U.S. Senator to play general for our soldiers as some are. Instead, I believe it is my duty in Congress to provide our soldiers with the resources and funding they require to do their job with the best equipment possible, while also pledging my unending moral support for the work they do each and every day to keep Americans safe both at home and abroad.

Every 4 years the citizens of America go to the polls to elect a commander in

chief, who is responsible to the American people to lead our military in times of peace and times of war. It is no mistake that the founding fathers gave the power to declare war to the Congress, but the power to lead the military to the President. Our soldiers should not have to follow 535 Congressional "generals" who hold up critical funding while they second-guess tactical decisions of the commander in chief and military leaders.

Over the last few weeks a lot has been made of the troop reinforcement President Bush outlined to the American people. Prior to his speech, I and several other Members of Congress met with the President to discuss the current situation in Iraq. I made it very clear that Idahoans and I cannot continue to support the status quo; and he agreed. President Bush has spent the last many months working with his national security advisers, commanding officers in Iraq, Members of Congress and experts in the field of military issues in order to revise our national strategy with regards to Iraq and come up with a new strategy for victory.

Make no mistake, the onus is now on the Iraqi people and the Iraqi government to act, and I was extremely pleased to hear President Bush reiterate that fact. The efforts of our soldiers have given the Iraqi people a great opportunity to live in a free and stable country, but they must stand up and accept that responsibility.

My home State of Idaho has shared some of the burden of this war in Iraq. The 116th Brigade Combat Team served courageously for twelve months in Kirkuk and surrounding areas, and they have since returned home to their families. I had the opportunity to visit them in Iraq and was extremely proud of the feedback on these soldiers I received from Iraqi government officials, civilians, and U.S. military leaders. I would also like to spotlight all Idahoans who are serving in the Armed Forces in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere. I am eternally grateful for their service and I will continue to provide them with all the support I can give.

It is my hope that Members of Congress will not pursue antiwar politics to the detriment of our soldiers in the field. Our soldiers have been fighting courageously in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere around the world to protect each and every American life, and I believe it is incumbent for the Congress to stand behind them. Numerous bills and resolutions have been proposed in the Senate to disapprove of their mission, cap troop levels, withhold funding for the reinforcements, or even completely de-fund the troops serving in Iraq. I cannot and will not support any legislation that I see as unproductive to our current efforts in Iraq, because I believe it places our forces in greater danger and could embolden our enemies to continue their attacks against innocent Iraqis, Americans and our allies.

In testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee in January of this

year, General Hayden, the Director of the CIA, responded to a question regarding what would happen if we pulled out now from Iraq. Director Hayden responded, Three very quick areas:

No. 1, more Iraqis die from the disorder inside Iraq. No. 2, Iraq becomes a safe haven, perhaps more dangerous than the one Al Qaeda had in Afghanistan. And finally, No. 3, the conflict in Iraq bleeds over into the neighborhood and threatens serious regional instability.

He went on to state that this directly and immediately threatens the United States homeland because it:

provides Al Qaida that which they are attempting to seek in several locations right now, be it Somalia, the tribal area of Pakistan or Anbar province—a safe haven to rival that which they had in Afghanistan.

During his confirmation hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee, GEN David Petraeus supported President Bush's plan to increase troop levels in Baghdad and Anbar province. In response to questioning before that committee, General Petraeus made it clear he believes that the reinforcement of soldiers into Baghdad and Anbar in Iraq will bolster the Iraqis' ability to stabilize their government and defeat the insurgency, instead of allowing them to continue to buck that responsibility, as some have asserted.

Many in Congress have stated publicly that this is the last chance the United States has to get it right in Iraq. If that is the case, I feel there is no general better qualified to be in charge of our ground forces and get things turned around on the ground than General Petraeus. I recognize that the American people have grown weary over the last months since the violence has escalated in Iraq, but I remain optimistic that the Iraqi government, with the aid of our soldiers, can turn things around.

I had the pleasure of meeting General Petraeus during one of my two trips to Iraq and was very impressed by his knowledge of the situation and his expertise in counterinsurgency. I have no doubt that General Petraeus is the right man to lead our forces in Iraq and I believe that he will overcome the new challenges he now faces. Let us not send the right man and then tell him it is the wrong job.

In closing, while I share the concerns of many of my colleagues regarding the situation in Iraq, I will support the President's plan to provide the reinforcements necessary to provide stability in Baghdad and Anbar province. I am hopeful that this plan will give the Iraqi government the best chance to stand on their own two feet and make the positive strides necessary to take control of the security situation and function as a stable government. It is this Senator's personal opinion that resolutions condemning the President's new way forward send the wrong message to our soldiers, the Iraqi people, and especially our enemies.

I certainly appreciate and support the role of Congress to provide over-

sight with respect to U.S. military engagements. However, I do not believe we should cripple the Commander in Chief's ability to work with our military leadership to defeat our enemies, and passing a resolution condemning the President's new plan for Iraq would do precisely that. Instead, I support resolutions that call for the support of the American people and Congress to give the President's plan a chance to work. Mistakes have been made, unquestionably, and the violence in Baghdad and Anbar province has grown to a level that few predicted, but I am not yet ready to throw in the towel on this President's new plan and our soldiers' ability to assist in stabilizing Iraq before they even get a chance to try.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

PROCEDURAL TACTICS

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, thank you for the recognition. I have sought recognition to discuss the procedural situation which confronts the Senate at the present time and to discuss a proposed rule change which would deal with this kind of a problem.

We have pending a motion to proceed on S. 470, which proposes a disagreement with the President's plan to send 21,500 additional troops to Iraq. Under the Senate rules, a motion to proceed is debatable, and when we deal with an issue of the magnitude of what is happening in Iraq today and the President's proposal to send additional troops, it is obviously a matter of great moment. The eyes and ears of the country are focused on the Senate. The eyes and ears of the world are focused on the Senate.

So far, what is happening is largely misunderstood, but the starting point is that a motion to proceed is debatable. But before debate even began, the majority leader filed a motion for cloture, which means to cut off debate. Now, a cloture motion would be in order, but why before the debate has even started? The cloture motion is designed to cut off debate after debate has gone on too long. But what lies behind the current procedural status is an effort by the majority leader to do what is called filling the tree, which is a largely misunderstood concept, not understood at all by the public generally and even not understood fully by many Members of this body. But the Senate is unique from the House, and the Senate has been billed as the world's greatest deliberative body, because Senators have the right to offer amendments.

In the House of Representatives they established what is called a rule, and they preclude Members from offering amendments unless it satisfies the Rules Committee. In the Senate, generally a Senator doesn't have to satisfy anybody except his or her own conscience in offering an amendment. But if the majority leader, who has the

right of recognition—and that, of course, is not understood either—but if the majority leader is on the floor and seeks recognition, he gets it ahead of everybody else. And if the majority leader offers what is called a first-degree amendment to the bill, which is substantively identical to the bill but only a technical change, and then again seeks recognition and gets it and offers a second-degree amendment to the bill, which is substantively the same but only a technical change, then no other Senator may offer any additional amendment. That is a practice which has been engaged in consistently by both parties for decades, undercutting the basic approach of the Senate, which enables Senators to offer amendments and get votes.

The Congressional Research Service has tabulated the statistics going back to the 99th Congress in 1985 and 1986 when Senator Dole used this procedure on five occasions. In the 100th Congress, Senator BYRD, then the majority leader, used this procedure on three occasions. In the 103d Congress, the next majority leader, Senator Mitchell, used this procedure on nine occasions. When Senator Dole became leader again in the 104th Congress, he used this procedure on five occasions. In the 106th Congress, Senator LOTT, then the majority leader, used it nine times. In the 107th Congress, Senator Daschle, then the majority leader, used it once. He was only majority leader for about 18 months. In the 108th Congress, Senator Frist used it three times, and in the 109th Congress five times.

Now, my suggestion is that the parties ought to declare a truce on this procedural war of filling the tree which undercuts the basic thrust of Senate procedure to allow Senators to offer amendments. But the majority leaders continue to use it, which they have a right to under the current rules, which is why I am suggesting a change in the rules. But it will take a little time to change the rules. We can't do it immediately for the Iraq debate. But it would be my hope that there would be a public understanding of what we are doing, because the most effective process in our governmental operations is public understanding and public pressure. We call it a political question. We call it public understanding to have transparency or an understanding of what we do, and then the public can say yea or nay with what is happening, and that is a tremendous force to lead Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to take action, to call it the right thing, or to take action consistent with sound public policy.

Now, what is happening today is that charges are being leveled on all sides. There has been a lot of finger-pointing with most of the Democrats saying the Republicans are obstructing a vote—a debate and a vote on the Iraqi resolutions. And Republicans are saying: Well, we are insisting on our right to debate the motion to proceed. We don't think you should file cloture before the

debate even starts, to cut off debate before you have debate, but the reason we are doing it is so this procedural device may not be used on what is called in common parlance to "fill the tree." But if you ask virtually anybody what is filling the tree, they are going to think about an orchard; they are not going to think about Senate procedure. But it is called filling the tree. I have described it succinctly and briefly to outline exactly what the procedure is to stop Senators from offering amendments.

There is a clue here that Senator WARNER—who is the principal proponent of the Warner resolution, the Warner-Levin resolution, which picks up the substance of the bill which is currently pending, S. 470—Senator WARNER votes against cloture, and he is the principal proponent of disagreeing with the President's plan. Well, that ought to tell us something: that Senator WARNER is not trying to stifle debate on a vote on his own initiative, on his own resolution. Senator HAGEL also—who has been characterized as the most outspoken critic of President Bush's plan to have a surge—voted against cloture. That ought to tell us something: that Senator HAGEL is not trying to defeat debate on a vote on what he seeks to accomplish.

So it would be my hope there would be a truce. Let me say candidly that I think there is very little chance there is going to be a truce in the Senate on using this procedural rule. It has been used on both sides. It has been used by Democrats and Republicans when it suits the partisan advantage of one party or another, and suiting the partisan party advantage of one party or another is not consistent with sound public policy and the public interest.

Right now this debate is being waged in the newspapers, it is being waged on the talk shows, it is being waged on the Sunday shows, even some of it is being waged on the floor of the Senate, but by and large not understood.

I spoke on the subject on Monday, outlining the rules morass, and largely misunderstood, even by senior members of my own staff not understood. You have the Democrats—and I think we ought to rise above the partisanship, Democrats and Republicans—saying they have the high ground and they intend to keep it. Well, I think they are winning the public relations battle. Let's be candid about it. Democrats are winning the public relations battle. Most people think what is going on, because we are opposing ending debate, Republicans are opposing ending debate, is that we do not want to have the debate and we do not want to have the vote.

That is not factually correct. Senator WARNER, who is proposing it, and Senator HAGEL, who is one of the sharpest critics of the President's plan, and other Senators who are critics of the President's plan, have voted against cutting off debate because it is a big issue which ought to be debated,

and because what is going on behind the scenes, under the surface, is an effort to have agreement on how many votes there will be to have a fair airing of the subject matter, and to have an opportunity for Senators to vote on a variety of resolutions or amendments. Ordinarily, we come to agreement on those matters. Right now we are up against the continuing resolution, which is about to expire.

I would suggest we have plenty of time to do it all if we start to work a little earlier. We are on morning business until 2 o'clock, which means we can express ourselves and it is not wasted time, but it is not the most productive time. We don't come to work until late on Monday. We don't work on Friday. Most Americans work a 5-day week. Some Americans work 6 and 7 days. So we have time. And we could work in the evenings, too, when we are facing a time limit, or we could have a continuing resolution which was extended, so that debate could be put off. But now it is in doubt what is going to happen. It is controlled by the majority, and by the majority leader, and that is the right of the majority and the right of the majority leader.

There have been pronouncements that we are not going to come back to this debate and that it is politically advantageous for the Democrats to blame the Republicans for blocking debate on the vote, and that will be the public posture. But it is my hope there will yet be a recognition of what is going on. I would be glad to debate anybody who cares to discuss the issue as to whether my representations are accurate or inaccurate; that the majority leader has the right exercised by majority leaders of both parties for at least the last two decades to preclude amendments being offered and to preclude any consideration by what Republicans have to say on this issue.

We have a Member of the opposite party on the Senate floor. I would be glad to debate that subject with him now.

Before the week is up, I will offer a resolution to change the Senate rules to preclude this procedure in the future, but in the public interest, there ought to be a truce declared on it that won't be used by either side to the disadvantage of the other. The real party being disadvantaged is the party of the American people. That is where the impact is.

In conclusion—the two most popular words of any presentation—I hope we can explain, as a starting point, discussions we have in the Senate and follow up with explanations in the media, which really carries the message to the American people. Some people are watching on C-SPAN. I have a family very interested in the speeches I make from time to time—two sisters and a brother-in-law. I talked to them Monday night, and they had no idea what I was saying. My staff does not understand what I am saying.

The essence is, the rules being exercised by the majority, by the Demo-

crats today, will preclude Republican amendments if they fill the tree by the procedure I have described. I do not want to stop debate. Senator WARNER, who is the principal proponent of the amendment to debate and vote, Senator HAGEL, an outspoken critic of the President—doesn't that say something?

I hope we can bring sufficient public clarity to the issue that the majority leader and the Democrats will rethink their position. As long as the Republicans are being blamed for not having debate and a vote, we are not going to have debate and a vote. If the public understands both parties are at fault, equal blame on both sides, then there may be some movement and some accommodation.

It does not take long for the American people to see the morass and procedural shenanigans going on and say: We don't care whether you are a Democrat or Republican, the American people are sick and tired of the bickering that goes on in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives. They expressed themselves in the last election. If we cannot do a better job in explaining ourselves and finding a way to work through and address the substantive problems, the enormous problems facing this country—and the No. 1 today is Iraq—we may all find ourselves seeking new employment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, we just heard a debate about debates. It strikes me that this word war we are conducting here doesn't get to the fact that we are losing people every day in Iraq—27 Americans died in a weekend—and our friends on the other side want to discuss the rules and the process instead of being able to agree that there was a nonbinding resolution being proposed about whether you want to see this surge—a la escalation—of the war in Iraq. Our friends were so conscience-stricken that they wanted to resort to more words and amendments. Why couldn't we have just passed or discussed that nonbinding resolution, let it go, and let the debate then continue? Bring on the debates. But, no, this is the press relations battle which was just discussed by our colleague.

That is not what we are looking for. We are looking to save lives, American lives, but we can't get to the subject because there is a question about what the rules ought to be. The rules ought to be the decency of our consciences—let us make decisions that will save lives and ease the pain on American families.

This was an unfortunate dynamic we saw this week: Republican colleagues determined to block the opportunity for the Senate to vote on the President's war escalation policy for Iraq. Just when the American people want this Congress to stop the President's misguided plan, our colleagues on the other side are hard at work to shut

down that opportunity. What they are afraid of is that we will confirm our support for the troops who are there now, and any insinuation that isn't the truth is a foul lie. We are just as anxious to support the troops. We are more anxious, in many ways, because we called for equipment to be available to protect our troops. We called for vehicles to be properly armored. We called for the body armor to be developed. But we didn't hear any complaints about the misdeeds of the contractors who weren't doing what they were supposed to be doing. They were not even monitored. We are going to talk about that.

Our friends in the minority can delay this debate, and I hope the American public understands what is going on—delay the debates, don't let us come to the conclusion, don't let the President see that a majority of this Senate does not want this escalation to take place. They will delay this debate and vote for now, but it is going to happen eventually. It will happen because the American people are understandably frustrated with the President's conduct and mishandling of this war.

Our children are taught a lesson in school: If you do things wrong and you don't pass your courses, don't change your ways, don't listen to advice, you get an F on your report card. In the view of many of the American people—most of the American people—President Bush has gotten an F on his report card on the handling of the situation in Iraq. But he and the Vice President refuse to be held accountable, and his allies in the Senate are blocking us from holding him accountable. It is not a good lesson for our Nation's young people. They see that if they don't do their work, they fail the course, and the President has not done his work, and he ought not to get a positive grade for his job thus far.

The American people don't want Congress to grant unlimited power to the President and his incompetent crew. Our troops have done a magnificent job, but it is the President and failed leadership at the Pentagon that have let them down.

Who can forget Secretary Rumsfeld's quote:

You go to war with the Army you have, not the Army you might want or wish to have at a later time.

Frankly, it is a slur, in my view, against the troops we have, those courageous people over there fighting right now or at that time. It is a terrible message to send to our soldiers.

Who can forget when the insurgency first started and our troops were getting attacked with roadside bombs, when President Bush said "bring 'em on"? I wore our Nation's uniform in World War II, in Europe, and I can say none of us wanted our Commander in Chief taunting the enemy, inviting them to come on out and fight and maybe kill us. No. To be in harm's way and have your commander make such a statement from the safety and security of the White House is appalling.

Now the President wants a so-called surge. Does he want to surge our way to more problems? Does he want to surge our national debt by spending billions more every week in Iraq? Anybody who understands English knows that the real definition of "surge" as used here means "enlarge" or "escalate."

From this war, we have more than 700 Americans who have lost limbs, more than 29,000 suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, and over 3,000 have perished in Iraq, 74 of whom have ties to my home State of New Jersey. Yet President Bush dismisses the incredible cost of this war in lives, injuries, and resources essential for the health and well-being of our people at home, domestic programs.

After all the previous failures and incompetence by this administration, why should the American people allow the President to do whatever he chooses in this war, this war which has destroyed thousands of families' lives? Look at the President's record on Iraq: false intelligence on weapons of mass destruction; no posted invasion plan because the administration was convinced that we would be greeted with sweets and flowers in a Utopian celebration. The President's team decided to fire the entire Iraqi Army, dismissing 500,000 trained troops who might have been helpful to us in fighting this insurgency. Then the Bush administration helped create further sectarian division by simply banning members from serving in the new Iraqi Government. The administration has allied itself with an Iraqi Prime Minister who supports a militia leader named Sadr who controlled a terrorist militia which disagrees with the formation of a stable government.

We all saw the waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer funds by contractors such as Halliburton. The Iraqi reconstruction inspector general said that nearly \$3 billion in U.S. taxpayer dollars for Iraqi reconstruction has been lost—lost, vanished, \$3 billion. That is not sloppy, that is incompetence. So it is understandable that a giant majority of the American people are against this escalation. The other side of the aisle obviously does not want to vote consistent with the American people's wishes or their prayers. Taxpayers are footing a massive bill for these mistakes.

The administration gave Halliburton a no-bid contract thought to be worth \$50 million—well, it surged to \$2.5 billion—to operate Iraqi's oil infrastructure. And what has that contract yielded in oil? Less oil 4 years after the invasion than Iraq was producing before the war. Halliburton was forced to pay back \$50 million after a fine was leveled against them by the Department of Defense. That is why the American people say no surge for Halliburton.

I was a member of the Department of Homeland Security committee in the previous Congress. I wrote five letters to the chairman asking we have hear-

ings, oversight hearings, on the Halliburton behavior in the war. I was told that it would be duplicable, and we couldn't get a review of Halliburton's behavior.

When the Republicans were in the majority, they said a vote against the President's policy was cut-and-run, but now the American people are asking the question, What is the alternative? Stay and die?

In November, the American people spoke with the most effective means they have; that is, the ballot box. They said no. They said they want a change. They voted for a voice against the President. Now the Republican minority is blocking Congress from speaking.

The President and the minority in the Senate cannot continue to ignore the will of the American people. We already saw the President ignore his own chosen Iraqi Study Group. First he appoints them; then he challenges them or ignores them. He ignored the advice of GEN John Abizaid, who thinks this escalation is a bad idea. He ignored former Secretary of State Colin Powell, who said more troops are not the answer.

When do we say enough is enough? Well, I think that time is past due.

Outside my office, to remind us all—I am very sensitive to veterans matters, to our military, not just because I served but because they are there to protect us. And they do a splendid job, even when they are asked to do more than the numbers they should have are not in place, and the equipment has not been quite what it ought to be, delays in producing that. We display a memorial outside my office showing the "Faces of the Fallen," which says: "Let Us Never Forget." There are almost 3,000 faces outside the door to my office. We have them on easels. It was our construction. The name, age, rank, battalion affiliation, and the cause of death of each of these Nation's fallen servicemembers is inscribed with their photo on the memorial. If you look, you see the ages and how young they were and what they must have meant to the families they left behind.

Friends and visitors search these photos daily for knowledge of people they might know and miss. As they search, as they review these pictures, some write notes in a book of reflections that we have out there. A woman from Englewood, NJ, wrote:

How do we measure their sacrifice? We are so fortunate to have these brave men and women.

A woman from Minnesota says:

This display brings tears to my eyes, to see how many lives have been lost. Please stop more boards from being added and bring those who would find themselves memorialized here home safely.

A Californian simply wrote:

Bring them home!

These are what the American people want, and we ignore them at our own peril. We prevent a vote on this momentous issue at our own peril as well.

I close, saying to my colleagues on the other side, please stop the insinuations that we on this side of the aisle do not want to support our troops. Nothing could be further from the truth. Many of us, myself included, have been there to meet with our troops and see what they need and see what they want and listen to their tales of the days they spend in harm's way. We want to support them. We salute them. They honor their obligation to their country, even though we, in many cases, disagree with the mission.

And when we fool ourselves into believing that all we have to do is to put more people in harm's way and we will get a stabilized government there, we find, in many instances, the recruits they have in the army there are just not capably trained, don't have the will, in many instances, to take up the fight. And we want to put more of our people in there?

I think what ought to be done—as many others here do—is to start to whittle down our presence, leave enough of a resource there to help train those people, maybe instill some courage in their view of what their responsibilities are, get enough people in the flow—the Iraqi people—and plan to get them home as soon as we practically can.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MENENDEZ). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share some thoughts about the situation we find ourselves in. I do feel some obligation to comment on the nature of the debate we are having, although I do not want to descend into partisanship.

I would say that Senator SPECTER, I believe, is absolutely correct when he says the Republican Members of this body are not afraid to vote. They are prepared to vote on the Warner resolution. They are prepared to vote on the McCain resolution. They will vote on the Judd Gregg resolution. But the problem is the Democratic leadership only wants one vote, and that is a vote on their resolution. So we have had a vote. Less than 50 voted to go forward. So I do not see how we are at a point where it can be suggested the members of this side are afraid to have a vote.

Why are they afraid to have two more votes, I would ask? I am not afraid to vote. I know how I would vote on those amendments. I am going to vote against the amendment that disapproves of the policies we are sending our troops to execute. And I am going to vote for the other amendments of MCCAIN and GREGG—if I had the chance. That is a minimum. There may be others. Senator SPECTER indicated he would like to vote on something else.

But in truth, as I have said before, I am not happy about this whole resolution process. We are not in the business of resolutions here. We are in the business of funding or not funding the poli-

cies of the United States of America. We have committed to funding the policy that is now being executed. We have confirmed the general who will execute that policy. Therefore, that is what we are about. That is the action we have taken.

But, in general, let me say this one more thing because it touched my heart. Less than 30 minutes ago, right out here, I met an Alabamian whose son is at Fort Benning, a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army, an infantry officer. He thanked me for not going along with this negative resolution idea, and said: Senator, these soldiers are "watching what you do like a hawk."

Don't think what we do is just a gambit to embarrass the President. We face many difficult decisions, pressures. We wrestle with competing interests and emotions in this Senate. We have high hopes and dreams for America. We do not all agree, and we should not. Ours is, at its best, a democracy where robust and intelligent debate informs our decisions. It makes us better. And we should respect one another even while we disagree. But this is a big deal. Lives are at stake. But this is what democracy is about. I want to be sure that when I say I believe someone is making a mistake, I am not attacking their character.

In the end, if a democracy cannot reach a decision on important issues, act decisively and execute those decisions, it will be weak and it will fall prey to the cruel, the despotic, and the strong. In order to avoid indecisiveness and weakness, there are some important common principles we must share. They are built, I believe, on love of country and a sincere belief in and admiration for this great Republic we serve. That is the unifying principle.

An extended, dangerous, and costly war in Iraq is not what we had hoped would occur when over three-fourths of the Members of this body—and I was here—voted to authorize the use of force against Saddam Hussein. Certainly, I had hoped and have always favored bringing troop levels down as soon as we can. The difficulties we face have caused, understandably, much unease and frustration in our country. Things have not been going well. That is a true fact. The circumstances are grave, and our efforts in Iraq could fail, as General Casey and his replacement, General Petraeus, have made clear, although, in truth, these professionals have also made it clear they believe we can and will succeed if we carry out the new policy that is now being projected in Iraq.

A congress of a nation, constructed like ours, that aspires to be a great nation and a great congress must consider how it should respond to such difficult circumstances in this winter of our discontent. How, now, should we think about the tough challenges we face?

First, I believe the results of a failure and a precipitous withdrawal from Iraq are grave and ominous. No one disputes

that. Chaos and ethnic cleansing, death to those who put their lives on the line for freedom and democracy would likely result, and more. Bad things would occur. We have had testimony on that.

So to even those few now here in this Senate who voted against the use of force, and to our newer Members of the Senate who are on record as being opposed to the policy, I say let's get together. Let's see how we can deal with the problems we now face so our Nation and its policies can be successful.

Few decisions are totally right or totally wrong. Sometimes things go better than expected. Sometimes they do not go as well. The test of a healthy and strong nation is how it handles adversity.

To those who oppose our efforts in Iraq, I would say that it would be a defensible position, I have to say, if you feel that strongly about it, to vote to cut off funds that would in effect force an immediate withdrawal. But, in truth, even when Senators truly believe our efforts in Iraq were a mistake, a mature patriotic assessment of the short and long-term consequences of such a withdrawal must be considered.

Immediate withdrawal is not a good option. It is not a good option. That is obviously why so many of our Democratic colleagues who are not happy with this war have not proposed such a step.

The one thing that is not acceptable is to take action—to take any action or concrete steps—to further the President's policy and then to vote for a resolution that makes it less likely to succeed. This is especially true when this Congress has committed our military personnel to this task, placing them in harm's way to execute the mission this Republic has given them.

Our military personnel have placed their very lives, their every waking moment, on the line to achieve the mission that is assigned to them. They are doing that every day. I have been there five times. We have a moral responsibility to them that must not be lightly broken.

That commitment also goes to those many allies who have supported us, our friends in the region, and the good and decent Iraqis who voted for and stood up for democracy and freedom.

If this is a true concept—and I believe it is—then I urge, with respect and with deep sincerity, that my colleagues do not give their support to any resolution that is likely to make our praiseworthy goal of a free and stable Iraq more difficult to achieve.

A resolution that is not binding but adversely impacts our efforts, with all due respect, is a vote that cannot be justified. Other than perceived personal political benefits, or "making a statement," what benefit does such a vote provide our Nation's efforts? It has no impact. Negative resolutions, therefore, can only place our soldiers, whom we sent to execute this policy, at greater risk. It can only place them at

greater risk and make their task harder. Those in harm's way deserve our total support, and the policies we have asked them to execute should also have our total support, until such time as we withdraw it.

I urge my colleagues to think this through. Let's pull back from this precipice—not just from this vote but from votes in Congress that may come in the future. Let's reassert our time-honored tradition that “politics stops at the water's edge,” that politics must never place soldiers at unnecessary risk. Let us not go down the road of passing resolutions whose only purpose is to emote, to express doubt about our Nation's decided policy during a time of great challenge and risk.

A Senate of a great nation doesn't use a toothless resolution to vent. What good does such a thing do? Surely, we all understand, as did our Founders, that there can only be one policy, one Commander in Chief, and one Congress. The Congress can cut off funds and stop it, if they are so strongly committed to do so. But we are not doing that.

How have we slid into such a muddle? The answer is that politics seems to have taken over everything around here; it infects our very being, even during war. It is a dangerous trend. We are used to “splitting the difference” here. Compromise is the nature of the game, we are told, and indeed it is. You favor a \$100 million program, perhaps, and I oppose it; and maybe we end up compromising on \$50 million. The thing may have worked at \$50 million, or it might have been a failure at \$50 million. Who knows? But we compromise. But that is about money. This is about war, about the life and death of people, as fine as you can find in this country, who volunteered to serve us.

Some may say it is not certain that negative resolutions will weaken the resolve of our friends and hurt the morale of our soldiers and embolden our enemies. Logic, however, says it will. Maybe you disagree. But how can it be otherwise? Logic says it will. General Petraeus said it well a few days ago. Negative resolutions will likely have negative consequences on our policy and place at greater risk the lives and health of our soldiers. What other purpose is there for this resolution, other than to somehow ratchet up the effort to force an abandonment of the policy we have funded and we are now executing.

Indeed, the whole world will think such a resolution that expresses only “feelings” represents a weakening of American will, even while the actual policy we are funding is to increase our strength and commitment to the Iraq effort. Think about it. As their foundations, these negative resolutions can only be described as totally contradictory to our policy that we are at this moment executing. New troops are moving there right now. Some have already arrived in Iraq. Have you not heard that?

For those unhappy and worried, I say let's get busy, all of us, and do a better job. Let's find out more about this difficult struggle that we are engaged in, find out more about Iraq, find out more about what our troops need, what their challenges are and what can and cannot be done. Let's meet with General Pace and General Casey and Secretary Gates; let's read the periodic reports that General Petraeus will be sending and spend more time keeping up with the situation on the ground in Iraq, rather than on polling numbers in our States. If we then reach a point of no return, when our honest and best judgment is that success is not possible, then we can join with those few who are prepared to cast votes to force an end to our deployment in Iraq. That is what we are supposed to do.

Certainly, at this point, none can honestly say that we know what the outcome will be. I wish I could give full assurance of success, but I cannot. We do know this is a very difficult time. Al-Qaida is still active, despite heavy losses and an inability—we may thank the Lord—to attack us again on our homeland, so far. The Iraqi Government has not been strong and decisive, and violence, especially in Baghdad, has steadily increased. The al-Qaida attack on the Samarra Mosque last February, designed to create sectarian violence in the country, succeeded in sparking a spate of sectarian killing and reprisals that continue today.

Still, General Abizaid and General Casey, our former commander, and General Petraeus, our new commander, know the true situation there better than we do. General Abizaid has been there four years, I believe, and General Casey, 30 months. They have lived it. They have studied it. They sincerely believe and have publicly stated, under oath, that this surge of American troops, with a surge of Iraqi troops and the new tactics to be employed, can lead to the goals that we seek—a stable, peaceful, and prosperous Iraq. It can be successful. We should not be overly negative. Indeed, I asked this question of General Petraeus. A few days ago in his testimony, he said he would not take this job if he didn't believe he would succeed. General Petraeus commanded the 101st Airborne Division when they went into northern Iraq, in Mosul. He did a fabulous job. They jokingly called him the “mayor of Mosul.” We toured the area the projects he had worked to establish. He understands the need of walking the streets and talking with the Iraqi people and encouraging them to take over their country. He came home, and then they asked him to go back and train the Iraqi security forces and he agreed to do so. He left his family again and went back and spent a year in Iraq. I am sure he knows every top general by name in the Iraqi Army, or virtually all of them. He spent another year there doing that. Then he came back and he spent a year drafting and writing the Department of Defense

counterinsurgency manual. It is 100 or more pages, a big document; it is a very important, complex, carefully worked out document that tells how to confront and defeat an insurgency operation. That is the plan we have asked him to go back with now. I believe we need to give General Petraeus a chance.

We have lost over 3,000 lives in our Iraq effort. The losses, in my view, are less than expected during the initial assault on Baghdad in Iraq and far more than I expected in the aftermath. Much of this, I am sure, was the result of errors we made. Much arises from the inherent difficulties of the tasks that were underestimated. Of that, there can be no doubt. But no Government agency even comes close to our military in being brutally honest and doing after-action reports and self-evaluations. That is going on now and will continue for years. They are a magnificent force. I can only believe that if we truly support them, as a great Senate and a great Congress should when they are executing the policies we have directed them to execute, they will be successful. I further believe it is premature for us to withdraw. We owe it to those State Department officials, other Government agencies, NGOs, patriotic Iraqi civilians who voted for a new and better Iraq, to the Iraqi security forces who have taken more casualties than we have, to those international allies who have stood with us in Iraq and, most of all, to our military personnel who have given their heroic best to accomplish our Nation's just and decent goals in Iraq, to give this new policy and General Petraeus a chance. I think they can and will do it. But I do not doubt the difficulties and I do not doubt there is uncertainty.

If, heaven forbid, our efforts do not prevail, it will be appropriate to completely rethink our commitment to Iraq. So why do we want to pass a resolution? Senator REID says he wants to provide Senators a chance to show their disapproval of the President's policy. With respect, Senator REID has—I know it is unwitting and unintentional—crossed the line there. It is clear that this resolution, which has no binding effect and is only a political document, is not necessary, does not help, and I totally oppose it. It is wrong, in my view.

While our soldiers are courageously placing their lives on the line for us, and while there is no serious suggestion that we should cut off the funds for the surge the Commander in Chief has ordered and which the Baker-Hamilton group suggested might be necessary, a toothless resolution is the wrong thing to do. I am certainly glad it did not garner many votes.

So can we, for a while at least, stand united in our good and worthy efforts to help the people of Iraq achieve a decent, peaceful and stable Government? Can't we do that? The challenge remains great. The costs are high. I say

let's follow through, united, on this new strategy under our new general. I believe we can be successful. If the Iraqis fail to respond and if the new strategy is not effective, we will know soon enough. And an honest, professional, and realistic evaluation of what to do next will fall into our hands. We should complete that task effectively, giving our best effort and judgment to it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana be recognized next for up to 15 minutes, to be followed by myself for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object, I further ask unanimous consent that after the completion of the remarks of the Senator from Nevada, and after one other Democrat, I be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of the thousands of Montanans who have lost faith in the way this administration is conducting the war in Iraq.

Our troops have given more than most of us can imagine. This administration has asked much of them. They should be commended for their performance in a war that has been mismanaged from the get-go.

In 1972, deep into the Vietnam war, the great Senator, the great statesman, Senator Mike Mansfield, whose seat I am now honored to hold, spoke of a great nation. When times demand it, it is wise for us to take a step back and look at those who served before us.

Standing not far from where I stand today, Senator Mansfield said:

Mr. President, it does no great nation any harm to admit that a mistake has been made. And sometimes when nations and men will do so, they will be the bigger and the better for it.

Many years later, Mansfield would say that when he was gone, he wanted to be forgotten. We have not forgotten Mike Mansfield, and we must not forget his measured approach to diplomacy, his steady hand, and the lesson that admitting a mistake is the first step in correcting it.

It is time we debate the facts of this situation so this country's leaders can make the right decisions.

I have said for more than a year that this war is being conducted without a plan for success and there is no end in sight. For too long, this body has refused to ask the tough questions, to debate the merits of this war, and has not held the President accountable for the deteriorating situation in Iraq.

Disturbingly, recent reports confirm that our invasion of Iraq has created

more terrorists than it has eliminated. Yet the terrorist who plotted the most deadly attack on U.S. soil—Osama bin Laden—remains at large and ignored by the administration.

In addition to the more than 3,000 killed since the war began, 17 of whom are from Montana, there have been more than 23,000 wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many will come home missing one or more limbs. Others will return home to battle posttraumatic stress disorder.

Last week, I joined several of my colleagues, along with two Iraqi war veterans, and called on the administration to get serious about funding for veterans health care. I renew that call today for permanent mandatory full funding of VA health care. There is no reason veterans should be forced to come to us every year hat in hand and beg for funding. It should be permanent, and it should be fully funded. Right now, it is neither.

Our country's veterans do not seek, nor do they expect, recognition from their Commander in Chief, nor the American people. But we owe them not only the recognition but also the promise that we will care for them and their families when they return.

Following the gulf war, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Colin Powell, outlined his plan for efficient and decisive military action, now referred to as the Powell doctrine.

The Powell doctrine clearly outlines what U.S. military action should look like:

Military action should be used only as a last resort and only if there is a clear risk to the national security by the intended target.

Force, when used, should be overwhelming and disproportionate to the force used by the enemy.

There must be strong support for the campaign by the general public.

And last, there must be a clear exit strategy from the conflict in which the military is engaged.

One by one, this administration has violated every principle of the Powell doctrine and, as a result, we are lost in Iraq and alone in the world.

Clear risk to national security? Prior to the invasion, the administration claimed that Iraq's nuclear capabilities made it a grave threat to America's national security, allegations that proved to be false.

Overwhelming force? The administration was unprepared for the dangers of urban combat, for improvised explosive devices, and continues to send troops into harm's way without proper armor. It is unconscionable that these soldiers are being sent into battle without all of the tools they need to be safe and successful. It is unacceptable to send them there with no plan for, or definition of, success.

Public support? Perhaps the most significant difference between the first gulf war and the war in Iraq is the lack of support from our allies. Like World War II, the gulf war was successful be-

cause America built a strong coalition and did not force our troops to carry the burden alone.

As support for this war continues to erode, so, too, does our standing in the world. Just a few years ago, nearly the entire world stood at America's side following the attacks on September 11. That good will has long since been squandered.

And finally, an exit strategy? The President has proposed sending 21,500 more troops into Iraq as a strategy for victory. Staying the course by escalating this war only spells disaster.

This country should no longer tolerate, nor can it afford, an open-ended conflict that has claimed more than 3,000 lives, injured more than 23,000, and cost the United States taxpayers \$2 billion every week.

Recently, the President proposed sending 21,500 more troops into downtown Baghdad. But according to the Congressional Budget Office, that actually means almost 50,000 additional troops when you include the 28,000 troops needed to provide critical support to those combat troops. This could cost up to \$27 billion to sustain over the next year. That would be more than three times the largest estimate of troop escalation costs provided by the Bush administration.

The addition of almost 50,000 American troops means more American young men and women without adequate body armor riding in ill-armored humvees into one of the most dangerous combat zones in history. Historical data from this war tells us that sending 21,500 troops into Iraq will mean that between 300 and 500 additional soldiers will die in Iraq than if this escalation were not to occur.

Adding more troops is not a strategy, it is a tactic, and it is not a new one. There have been four such troop escalations in Iraq so far, and to what end? What benefit has been realized by this country, the Iraqi people, or the region?

The long-awaited National Intelligence Estimate, prepared collectively by 16 intelligence agencies for the President, was released last week. It paints a bleak picture of the deteriorating situation in Iraq, and it describes the urgent need for conditions to be reversed measurably to stop the violence and widespread polarization of the Iraqi society.

So I call on the President to heed the grave warnings of the National Intelligence Estimate, to listen to his own Iraq Study Group, the Congress, and the American people.

Last month, my colleague Senator BAUCUS called on the administration to map a new course in Iraq. Senator BAUCUS said we must not escalate the conflict, we must train Iraqi troops to stand up for themselves, we must start bringing our troops home as soon as possible, and we must engage Iraqi's neighbors and the world community. He was right then; he is right today.

The solution for a new course in Iraq will not be solely a military one.

Switching to political and diplomatic solutions involving our allies in the region is not a defeatist strategy, but instead an appropriate course for a war of this complexity and magnitude.

The President needs to set a timeline to give the Iraqi people military control of their country. It should be the Iraqi Army—not Montanans, not Americans—disarming bombs and guarding bridges. The administration needs to reinvest in special forces and human intelligence if we are to win the real war on terror.

Nearly 4 years have passed, more than a half a trillion dollars have been spent, more than 3,000 American soldiers have died since the President announced that major combat operations in Iraq had ended and told us: “Mission Accomplished.”

Funding for this war and its success or failure should have been debated long ago. It is time for a real debate on the direction and strategy of this war, starting with the President's proposal for escalation.

The President must also tell the American people what success means and how it should be quantified. If success is free elections in Iraq, then we should have been gone 2 years ago. If success is toppling Saddam Hussein, then we should have been gone 3 years ago. If it is something else, then the administration needs to be honest with the American people and identify a clear and achievable outcome.

I support the Warner-Levin resolution opposing the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq. But I want to be clear: I view the Warner-Levin resolution as only a first step. We have a duty to debate the escalation on its merits and let both sides be heard.

This week's efforts to delay a vote on Warner-Levin do nothing to make our troops safer. Blocking an up-or-down vote on this resolution does nothing to bring this bloody war any closer to its close.

I have been here not too long—just a month—and I am still learning the ropes, but make no mistake, we should deliberate, we should not rush to judgment or sentence, but that does not mean we should not debate.

For 3 days we have been debating about whether we should debate the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq. I have been all over Montana in the last couple of years, and everywhere I went people were and continue to be deeply concerned about the war. They didn't all agree, but there was always a lively and passionate debate. Not a single person told me we should debate about whether to have a debate.

Our troops, the American people, and the Iraqi people deserve an open and honest discussion. We need to ask the tough questions, we need to demand the answers, and we need to bring our troops home as safely and as quickly as possible.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, this afternoon, I rise to add my voice to the current debate on the President's announced plan to reinforce coalition forces in Iraq by sending additional American soldiers and marines to Baghdad and Al Anbar Province in an effort to bring stability to that volatile part of that country.

For some time now, Senators have been clamoring for President Bush to send additional troops to Iraq. They criticized him for trying to accomplish our goals in Iraq without committing sufficient resources to get the job done.

Look, the President has recognized that a change in strategy is absolutely necessary. Many have previously called for this same strategy. But it appears to this Senator that because it is the President's plan, some Senators are predisposed against it.

A simple review of newspaper and Sunday talk show transcripts reveals some Senators appear to have supported the surge before they were against the surge. Senator KERRY on NBC's “Today” program on June 29, 2005:

We don't have enough troops in Iraq. . . . There aren't enough people on the ground. . . . The way you honor the troops and the way you provide a policy to America is to do everything possible to win.

Senator DURBIN on December 21, 2006:

If we need initially some troops in Baghdad, for example, to quiet the situation, make it more peaceful so that our soldiers start coming home, then I would accept it.

Mr. President, that is exactly what General Petraeus has said, and Secretary Gates before the Armed Services Committee said the same thing. It is an initial surge to try to get Baghdad under control so we can begin bringing our troops home.

Senator DODD on December 18, 2006, said:

I'd be willing to support some additional people if we needed it in order to get the job done.

He further said:

Show me some demonstrable evidence that they are coming together as a people—Shias and Sunnis—sitting down and recognizing that they have an obligation to come together as a people. Then I'd be willing to support some additional people if we needed it in order to get the job done.

Senator LEVIN in January of 2007 said:

A surge would be worth considering. The American people are skeptical about getting in deeper. . . . But if it is truly conditional upon the Iraqis actually meeting milestones and if it's part of an overall program of troop reduction that would begin in the next four to six months, it's something that would be worth considering.

Once again, in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday, that is exactly what Secretary Gates said, that it is a temporary surge in order to try to bring the troops home.

Senator BIDEN on June 29, 2005, said:

There's not enough force on the ground now to mount a real counterinsurgency.

Senator JACK REED, in a press conference on November 29, 2006, said:

If the military commanders in Iraq said, we need, for X number of months, 20-plus, 25,000 troops, to do this mission, I would have to listen to that proposal. I think I responded to the question before: That if the military commanders in Iraq said, we need, for X number of months, 20-plus, 25,000 troops to do this mission, and with a reasonable certainty of success, I would have to listen to that proposal, certainly.

Well, Mr. President, within the last 2 weeks, there have been additional developments that would seem to add weight to the argument that this temporary reinforcement of our troops currently in Iraq is not only warranted but necessary to the overall national purpose. Those developments are the unanimous confirmation by this Senate of General Petraeus, who is to become the new commander—he is the new commander of the Iraqi multinational force—also, the testimony of the Iraq Study Group cochairman, relative to the President's plan, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the public release of the National Intelligence Estimate report on the prospects for Iraq's stability.

During his confirmation hearing, General Petraeus, also the author of the Army's new counterinsurgency manual, stressed the fact that he could not succeed in providing needed security for the citizens of Baghdad and Al Anbar Province without the additional troops called for in the President's plan.

General Petraeus further testified at his hearing that it was his opinion that any resolution which stated the Senate did not support the strategy to be carried out by our men and women in uniform in Iraq would be harmful to their morale. Are we going to support General Petraeus or not? The one resolution before us, I believe, is not supporting General Petraeus and the troops.

Last week, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing on America's interests in Iraq, at which the witnesses were the Iraq Study Group cochairman, former Secretary of State James Baker, and former Congressman Lee Hamilton. Secretary Baker referenced the Iraq Study Group's report in articulating that group's position on additional troops to Iraq. He stated:

We could support a short-term redeployment or surge of American combat forces to stabilize Baghdad or to speed up the training and equipping mission if the U.S. Commander in Iraq determines such steps would be effective. The only two conditions are short-term and commander in Iraq determines it would be effective. Both of those conditions have been met.

Mr. Hamilton made it clear his belief that the President's plan ought to be given a chance. He said:

We did not, in the Iraq Study Group report, come to the conclusion that it was hopeless and, therefore, we should just pull out immediately.

The much anticipated and just released National Intelligence Estimate report entitled “Prospects for Iraq's

Stability: A Challenging Road Ahead" was quite candid in its assessment that if coalition forces are withdrawn within the next 12 to 18 months, we will see significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq.

Mr. President, we need to accept the fact that we are engaged in a struggle of biblical proportions. In true American fashion, though, we are doing the right thing. We are attempting to free a people from a life of tyranny and violence. We are also in a struggle against the forces of evil who are bent on our destruction. Do we pack up and leave, even though every voice of reason tells us that Iraq would implode into a terrorist state used by al-Qaida as a launching pad against the infidels, reminiscent of Afghanistan under the Taliban? And those infidels, they think, are us.

As Senator MCCAIN has reminded us time and again, Iraq is not Vietnam. When we left South Vietnam, the Viet Cong did not pursue us back to our shores. Al-Qaida is not the Viet Cong. Al-Qaida has sworn to destroy us and is committed to bringing their brand of terror to America.

President Bush never said the struggle for freedom in Iraq would be easy. But since the President is the one who said that, maybe it doesn't ring quite as true to some. Maybe by quoting another who spoke passionately about similar struggles for freedom, the point could be made more clearly. Back in 1857, Frederick Douglass spoke about the struggle he knew for freedom. He said:

The whole history of the progress of human liberty shows that all concessions yet made to her august claims have been born of earnest struggle. If there is no struggle, there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters.

We are introducing freedom to a country and a region that has no history of such freedoms. We cannot expect to spread freedom and democracy to this region simply by wishing it so.

We currently have soldiers and marines in harm's way. We have a plan before us that will aid their mission. That mission is to achieve success and leave behind a stable and democratic Iraq. Yet there are those among us who want to cut and run. There are some among us who simply want to cut and walk. And then there are others who want to have it both ways. They want to express their opposition to the idea of sending additional troops to Iraq without having to do anything that might actually translate their opposition to a reality on the ground.

I belong to another group of thinkers. I belong to a group who believes General Petraeus's plan deserves a chance. I believe the temporary surge in the number of soldiers and marines in Baghdad and Al Anbar is our best chance at getting this right. None of us knows for sure whether it will work.

There are always uncertainties in war. Let us all pray, for all our sakes, that this new way works.

Last week, I stood here and spoke about what I thought needed to be done in Iraq. I acknowledged that mistakes have been made in this war and that I did not believe we should be playing politics while our soldiers and marines are deployed and fighting against an enemy bent on destroying our country and our way of life. I called on my fellow Senators then to set party differences aside and focus on winning this war. I am here again this afternoon making that same plea.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I notice there are no other Members here, so I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada expressed my feelings in a much more articulate way than I ever could, and one of the last things he said is: Mistakes have been made in this war. I would suggest mistakes have been made in every war. Winston Churchill once said:

Never, never, never believe any war will be smooth and easy. Always remember, however sure you are that you could easily win, that there would not be a war if the other man did not think he also had a chance to win.

This statement was made many years ago, but it is relevant today. Today, we face an enemy who is determined, adaptive, and willing to go to any means of terror and violence to win. He cannot be negotiated with, and he will not be satisfied until the entire world is brought under his dreadful ideology.

We have seen this kind before. We saw it with Stalin, with Pol Pot, and with Hitler, but never before has an enemy metastasized this way. There is no centralized headquarters we can bomb, no one leader we can eliminate. We will continue to strike terrorism where it appears and track down its leaders but know this will not end the conflict. Victory will come the way it always has. We will destroy the enemy's belief he can win.

Any resolution against the President's plan does two things: It tells the enemy, No. 1, that they have been successful; and, No. 2, it gives them patience to wait us out. They are a very patient people. We have already done ourselves damage by bringing the issue to the public eye. Do you believe they do not watch our news; that they are not scouring our media for any hope or any chink in our resolve? Don't be so naive. Their very survival depends on it. This is the only way they can hope to win. If we cannot destroy their will, we will destroy them.

This sounds brutal and not very reconciling, but I intend it that way. There is a clear choice and no other option. If we do not fight them in Iraq,

we will be fighting them in Philadelphia, in Pittsburgh, in Kansas City, in Los Angeles, and in Seattle. We will be playing defensive until, once again, just as occurred after 9/11, our resolve hardens and we summon up the courage to destroy the enemy. And we must because the alternative is what happened to Rome: Factions of internal strife kept the great power tied up for so long that it lost its strength, its will, and its resolve. The period following was known as the Dark Ages, and this is indeed what al-Qaida seeks.

Our country represents the light of freedom and democracy. Yet I fear we have begun a terrible introspective and downward cycle. Our resolve lasts for a few months, maybe a year, but all it takes is enough time and then we break. Our enemy knows this. We can look to our mission in Somalia in 1933, at our reaction to the bombings in Lebanon at the Khobar Towers and in Vietnam. I am not saying we necessarily should have stayed in Vietnam, but I am saying we must recognize that while this introspection guarantees our freedom, it is also our greatest weakness.

There have been no major terrorist attacks on U.S. soil since 9/11. There have been attempts, and we know we have thwarted over 10 operations. However, we also know these were relatively underdeveloped and small in scale. I wish to ask a dark question: Why has al-Qaida not struck again? Because they cannot? We have stepped up our security, but they have shown their destructive creativity in the past. Because they are focused on Iraq and Afghanistan? Perhaps. But I would suggest another option. What if they have chosen not to. What if they have realized the strategy of restraint, pricking us just enough to launch ourselves at them, and then they fade back. We expend ourselves attacking new enemies, building countries, and undermining each other. Politics and personal reputations create an impetus of their own.

We should debate. That is exactly what the Senate body is intended to do. But do not undermine. The new commander in Iraq, General Petraeus, has stated that a resolution of disapproval would hurt his efforts. This is the new guy. Let us keep in mind that we voted unanimously to confirm General Petraeus to take over that very difficult job. When asked by Senator LIEBERMAN about the effect a resolution of disapproval would have on our troops and our enemies, General Petraeus stated that:

This is a test of will at the end of the day. A commander in such an endeavor would obviously like the enemy to feel there is no hope.

That is what General Petraeus said. He went on to say he does need more troops and he believes the new plan can work.

I recognize there have been mistakes made in Iraq, as we have talked about. The President has also recognized this.

Everyone has recognized this, and the President has taken full responsibility for it. Yet we still find ourselves in a difficult situation, with hard decisions to be made about the best way ahead. These decisions affect many lives, both our soldiers in harm's way and the American people they are pledged to protect. I think we all agree it would be disastrous to leave Iraq precipitously. If we do, we know we can expect increased levels of violence, the spread of extremist ideology, and Iraq itself collapsing into anarchy.

A personal friend of mine, who actually was a commander at Fort Sill in Oklahoma, General Maples, stated that:

Continued Coalition presence is the primary counter to a breakdown in central authority. Such a breakdown would have grave consequences for the people of Iraq, stability in the region, and the U.S. strategic interest.

John Negroponte and the CIA Director, General Hayden agree with that, as does General Petraeus. So it is not too late to avoid this. I don't think it is time to start cutting our losses and just hope it goes away. We have heard the President ask for our support.

Let me share, on a personal note, that I have had the occasion to be in Iraq more than any other Member of either the House or the Senate, some 12 times now, and the first thing I do is talk to the troops. The troops come up to me, and the first question they ask is: Why is it the media doesn't like us? Why is it they are constantly undermining our efforts here? Why is it the American people don't understand or appreciate what we are doing? I say, yes, the American people do, but a lot of the politicians don't act that way.

I have been very much concerned about this, and I believe any resolution, and we are talking about five or six resolutions now, any resolution that is a resolution of retreat would be a resolution of surrender.

I think it is ludicrous for any Member to say I support the troops but I don't support their mission. You try to explain that to them. I talked to the troops in Fallujah. In all this discussion about, do we need to be training the Iraqis to be fighting their own war—sure we do. That is what we have been doing. We have been doing that since we arrived on the scene in Iraq, and they are very proud and they are taking the frontal positions right now. The Iraqis are doing a good job. Their training has been good. Their equipment is not good, but it is getting better, it is improving.

I stood there at the last election in Fallujah when our marines were there and I talked, through an interpreter, to the Iraqi security forces, and they said they are very proud. We are going to be in a position—please stay with us until we can hold our own here, and that won't be too long. I know that is true. I know they have come up with the numbers, now, that would be equal to about 10 divisions. I believe this can happen.

This is very serious. Politics has crept into this thing. But any support

of a resolution of surrender not only is undermining our troops and saying to our troops: We don't support you, but also saying to the loved ones of those who paid the ultimate sacrifice that they have died in vain. We can't let that happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have come to a critical crossroads with respect to our operations in Iraq. After the Iraq Study Group spent months considering the issue of the best policy going forward, suggesting a phased redeployment along with other measures, diplomatic measures that would enhance the security of the United States and protect our soldiers there in Iraq, the President had the opportunity to accept those recommendations. It was a bipartisan panel of eminent Americans—James Baker and Lee Hamilton and so many others. The President specifically rejected them, not just in substance but in tone. In his speech a few weeks ago, he declared that he had learned very little from the Iraq Study Group, that he was not committed to a phased redeployment, he was committed to an escalation of approximately 20,000 troops and a change in tactics in Baghdad.

I think he had the opportunity at that moment to do several things. First, he could have accepted the wisdom of the Iraq Study Group. But, more important, he could have communicated to the American public that his policy was based on the reality in Iraq, that he had learned from a series of mistakes he and his administration had made, and that he could have sustained a way forward in Iraq. He didn't do that, and I think the American people reacted as they should have reacted, with declining confidence in his leadership and, frankly, posing the fundamental question of, How does one sustain any policy when 70 percent of the U.S. population considers it to be erroneous and not in the best interests of this country going forward? I believe the President squandered the last opportunity he had to rally people behind his policy.

Now we are in the midst of a debate, we hope, about that policy. We are being stymied in terms of bringing this to the floor in a clear and clarion vote that tells the American people where we stand as individual Senators with respect to the President's plan for escalation. We are being frustrated in the sense that there is an attempt to present other issues and not the issue of the moment, the issue under debate. There is no debate about our support for American soldiers around the globe and marines and sailors and airmen and airwomen. We support them. We think their mission should be changed to protect them and to advance the interests of our country, but there is no stinting in our support of these valiant young Americans.

The issue which divides this Senate and the issue which captures the feel-

ings and the passions of the American public is whether we will stand in approval or disapproval of the President's proposal to escalate forces in Iraq. I believe that vote should come. That vote should be clear. The vote should stand by itself, not shrouded by other measures that are designed not to address the concerns of American people but simply to give the President additional cover.

What has happened since the last 3-plus years, from the invasion of Iraq—indeed, preceding the invasion of Iraq, in this Senate, under the control of the Republicans, has not done a good job at all of oversight, of investigation, of asking critical questions. Where was the Republican leadership, in the fall of 2002 and early 2003, when they should have been asking a simple question: What if we win the conventional battle? What about the occupation? Where is the plan? Where are the resources? How many Americans will it take to secure a large country with a population of about 26 million people, with a history of intersectorian tensions, with a history of a colonial past under the British that has established, some would say artificially, the boundaries of this nation? Those questions were not asked seriously and consistently and, as a result, this administration made huge mistakes when it came to the issue of how to successfully translate a conventional victory against the Iraqi military forces into a successful transition to a stable country. Now we see Iraq enthralled in doubt and violence that seems to be unable to be quenched. Our American forces are in the middle of that.

It is interesting, when we come to this point, to look seriously at the National Intelligence Estimate. One of the grave deficiencies we recognize today—some of us recognized it in October of 2002—is that the intelligence being used to sell this operation was flawed. Now I think we have a much more precise and carefully adjusted view of what is happening in Iraq today.

If you look at the NIE, it presents to us some profound contradictions.

First, and I agree with this assessment, is that the violence today is principally the result of sectarian conflict. The accelerators that raise the tempo of this violence can be found in the insurgent groups, al-Qaida in Iraq, some of these Shia militias, but the underlying battles today are between sectarian groups. The NIE describes this as a winner-take-all approach, as an existential battle between Shias—who feel a sense of insecurity given the history, particularly the last decade, of total oppression by a Sunni minority—and Sunnis, who feel a sense of entitlement that is going to be frustrated by the new, emerging order in Iraq. These existential battles, as the NIE indicates, are in a sense self-sustaining.

But here is where the confusion, the conflict, the contradiction comes

about. Most of the remedies we are all talking about involve reconciliation—political sectarian reconciliation. The issue—and one which will be decided in the next months and weeks in Iraq—is, can any existential conflict ever be reconciled? Has this conflict reached a point where it is truly self-sustaining and our forces in the middle of it are unable to be a moderating force at all?

My view and the view of so many others is that when you look at this situation on the ground and you consider what can be done, the decisive actions must be those of the Iraqi Government. They are political actions; that the presence of our military forces is important but not decisive. Certainly the size of our military forces is probably not as decisive as actions that must be undertaken by the Maliki government reining in the militias, truly trying to reach out beyond this huge sectarian chasm for reconciliation. These political, economic, and social decisions are not going to be made simply because we have increased our presence in Baghdad by 20 percent or we have changed the tactics.

Another aspect of this debate is the concentration, almost exclusively, on the military aspects of the President's plan. That, frankly, has been one of the great shortcomings and faults of the administration—and of this and previous Congresses, I should say—in terms of our approach in Iraq. Any military commander on the ground will tell you that they are buying time and that time has to be used for economic progress and political progress. The component in the President's plan that I heard stresses an increase of 20,000 soldiers, but where is the progress in terms of not only Iraqi decisionmakers making tough decisions but American advisers—State Department officials, USAID officials, Justice Department officials—going over there to help start the other side, the other part of the process, the economic progress, the social progress, the political mentoring? That has never been the case. As a result, our strategy has failed consistently.

Unless this plan has complementary and reinforcing elements—military, political, and economic—it, too, will fail. I do not see, frankly, the complementary political and economic support necessary to carry off this plan.

What we have is 20,000 troops. If you look at the doctrine—and it is interesting because General Petraeus, the designated commander, is one of the principal authors of this new doctrine—that doctrine today would call for 120,000 troops in Baghdad based upon the size in Baghdad. We are sending an additional 20,000, which means our presence, American presence, is about 30,000 troops. The Iraqis have committed to roughly 55,000 troops, which brings us to a total of 85,000, but that still is roughly 35,000 troops short of the doctrine.

In addition, I don't think anyone considers that the Iraqi forces can

truly muster 55,000 effective troops. We have already seen the reports come in that brigades, Iraqi brigades, are showing up at 50 percent strength, and of those, one has to ask seriously how many are effective fighters. Where are the shortcomings? If it is half a brigade and they are all privates and corporals, that is not an effective fighting force, or if it is half a fighting brigade and they are all majors and lieutenant colonels, that is not an effective fighting force. So we are seeing a situation, even in military terms, where this surge is probably lacking significantly in terms of the size of the force.

In addition, we all understand that there is a divided command. One of the key issues in any military operation is unity of command. There is an Iraqi commander who is selected probably for his political reliability more than his tactical or technical skill. There is also a situation in that our new tactics require significantly more enablers. These enablers are the translators, the civil affairs officers, the combat service support officers to supply these outposts now in each neighborhood. In fact, the Government Accountability Office has done a report indicating that if a 21,000 increment is made, it might turn out to be closer to 50,000 if you truly have all the support troops you need to get the job done.

There are so many shortcomings in just the political and military aspects of this plan. So I believe, again, this is an opportunity, a moment we have to address this plan, this proposal of the President's, in a very serious way and take a stand on it one way or the other. I hope we can do that. I hope we can do that in the intervening days, certainly before the end of this month, or the end of, I hope, this week.

Now, I think there are other aspects that are important to consider when we talk about the situation as we go forward. I will go back to the point I think hindered us consistently throughout our operations in Iraq, and that is despite the extraordinary valor and technical skill of our military forces, they have never been truly complemented by non-Department of Defense personnel, by the State Department officials, by the Agriculture officials. I can recall visiting Fallujah twice in the middle of Anbar Province. Those marines are doing a magnificent job along with many Army units that are there. There is one State Department official in Fallujah who is charged with mentoring, with advice, with reconstruction, with all of these things. That is not adequate, and I don't see any indication in the President's proposal that is going to change. This is all about, again, trying to take a military solution to what is a complicated military, political, and economic problem. It hasn't worked for 3 years, it is not likely to work, and I think we have to take a stand on that proposal.

One of the other consequences I think that is ensuing from this focus

on a purely military approach is we are losing out in terms of diplomatic leverage in the region. Just this week, the Saudis are meeting with delegates from Hamas and Fatah and the Palestinian Authority because the American leadership has been so lacking. We have to, I think, have a diplomatic policy to complement anything we do within Iraq. We haven't done that and it does not appear to be part of the President's agenda.

We have a situation which is grievous and which I think requires something more than simply more of the same, and that is just about what the President is offering. This is not a brand new diplomatic initiative; this is not a large-scale economic push to complement military action; this is a modest increase of forces, although I think this increase is not justified, together with new tactics in Baghdad. But again, I don't think that is going to be sufficient action. We have to start looking beyond the next several weeks and down the next several months and, indeed, the next several years.

The strategy that I think is inevitable is a phased redeployment of our forces and renewed diplomatic activity. It represents a focus on missions that are more central to the defense of the United States. The first is continue to aggressively go after those international terrorists, the al-Qaida units. We have done that. We continue, as the military indicates, to obtrude them very successfully. In fact, there are similarities of that mission to the recently conducted operations in Somalia where we sent in aircraft with some liaison from local Ethiopian forces on the ground to go out and take out identified terrorists there. That mission should continue in Iraq and frankly in Somalia and many other places where we can identify and find international terrorists.

Second, we have a continuing obligation, I think, to strengthen the Iraqi security forces. Ultimately it is their battle. We have made some progress with the Army, but we have to make more progress. That is a mission we should undertake and continue.

Third, there is the obligation, I think, to maintain the territorial integrity of Iraq, to make sure the locals do not take advantage of what is a tumultuous situation within Iraq. That, too, I think, is a valid mission, and it can be performed much differently than we are proposing to conduct this mission in Baghdad, by redeploying forces within Iraq. In fact, it was interesting yesterday before the Armed Services Committee when Secretary Gates was asked, and I think it was by Senator WARNER: Is this the last chance? If this fails, then all is lost? I think he quite authoritatively and thoughtfully said: No, of course, we have to have contingencies. Of course, there are other approaches we can take. Of course, there are other missions that can be assigned.

One of the dangers and one of the persistent aspects of the President's

rhetoric has been always summoning up the false dichotomy. Recall, back in October 2002, what was the choice the President proposed? Invade Iraq or do nothing and let Saddam and the terrorists win. We recall the rhetoric. It seems hollow now when we think back to it. What was left out of the equation, of course, was what was already being done: international inspectors of the United Nations on the ground in Iraq looking for weapons of mass destruction, supposedly the source of our great conflict with the Iraq regime.

There are other things that could have been done, too, much short of an invasion. There were, in fact, reports of terrorist activities. Zarqawi was in the Kurdish region. What would have prevented the United States from launching a very discrete military operation against Zarqawi in the fall of 2002 in the Kurdish area, an area we were helping to protect by our overflights of aircraft? Nothing, except, I believe, the administration didn't want to give up a good rhetorical device: this supposed terrorist presence in a part of Iraq that Saddam did not control.

Again, here now, it is back to the false choices: Surge 20,000 troops or watch the country collapse as we leave precipitously next week. That is not the choice. The choice is missions that are more effectively aligned with our national security interests: going after terrorists, training Iraqi security forces, protecting the territorial integrity of Iraq, complemented with active diplomatic actions, complemented with, we hope, progress by the Iraqis themselves in political decision-making. That, I think, is the way to go.

We have, again, I think a very difficult situation before us. It requires not only debate, but I think it requires at this moment a decision by the Senate on a very simple proposal: where we stand with respect to the President's proposal for escalation. Now, others have come to the floor and pointed out past statements that have been made with respect to increasing American forces. I have been open to these arguments. Frankly, at this juncture I don't feel persuaded. In the past, when someone had asked me: Would you increase the size of forces in Iraq, certainly in those first few days after the invasion, and after July of 2003 when I visited Iraq and found there were thousands of weapons dumps that were not being protected, I came back here and I think, along with Senator HAGEL, was one of the first to call for an increased size of our Army so we could deploy more forces to Iraq. But that window has closed very dramatically and nothing, frankly, was done by the administration to respond to those concerns.

I have said publicly that if a commander in the field came to me and said: We need additional forces, I would look at that proposal very carefully. In fact, in a press conference I was asked:

So in no way would you be on board with the McCain plan to surge in with, you know,

50,000 strong additional forces on the ground, you would not be in favor of that?

My response:

I think I responded to the question before, that if the military commanders in Iraq said we need for X number of months 20 plus, 25,000 troops to do this mission and within reasonable certainty was assessed, I would have to listen to that proposal, sir.

Well, I have listened to that proposal and I find it wanting. I find it wanting, based on the doctrine of the U.S. Army as it has evolved today. I find it wanting because of the lack of complementary and civilian support for that proposal. I find it wanting because of the lack of any serious indication that the Government of Iraq will make those tough political decisions. So I have considered it as I said I would, but I don't think it is the right way to proceed. Not at all.

Now, I am not alone, and I don't think it would be a shock to anyone to suggest this issue of escalation has prompted criticism from a wide group of individuals. GEN Colin L. Powell, former Secretary of State, said in December:

I am not persuaded that another surge of troops into Baghdad for the purposes of suppressing this sectarian violence, this civil war, will work.

Again, I think General Powell's insights and experience are very critical at this moment.

The Joint Chiefs indicated, at least as reported in the Washington Post in December, using anonymous White House sources, that they were opposed, that White House officials are aggressively promoting the concept over the unanimous disagreement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is in December.

Time Magazine reported that General Abizaid said he opposes more troops because it would discourage Iraqis from taking responsibility for their own security. Here is a general, an officer who has served for decades, the most knowledgeable individual when it comes to Middle East military-political issues within the United States Army, within the Department of Defense, and that is his opinion.

Robert Gates—before he became Secretary of Defense, or before he was confirmed, according to two administration officials asking not to be named—Robert Gates expressed his skepticism about a troop surge in Iraq on his first day on the job—excuse me; he was Secretary of Defense—at a Pentagon meeting overseeing the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marines.

We are not alone. There have been some perhaps eleventh-hour conversions for this surge, but I think there are a number of individuals with significant experience and insight, unquestioned patriots, who question this proposal.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I see there are other speakers on the floor, so at this time I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m.,

the period for morning business be extended for 60 minutes, with the time divided and controlled as follows: 30 minutes each for Senators MENENDEZ and ROBERTS or their designees; that the Senate then proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of GEN George W. Casey, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, last Friday I had the privilege of attending and speaking before a "Farewell Dinner" in honor of LTG David Petraeus at the Command and Staff College of the U.S. Army at Fort Leavenworth, KS.

To say the least, it was quite an evening of tribute in behalf of the general and his wife, who has become admired and beloved serving as the Commanding General of the Army's Intellectual Center. I estimate there were around 250 officers and their wives and many from the Leavenworth community to pay tribute to General and Mrs. Petraeus, to wish them well, and to express pride and confidence in the general's immediate mission. He left for Iraq this past Monday, 2 days ago.

Throughout the evening I had the opportunity to again visit with David Petraeus, his feelings about his new mission, his impressive knowledge with regard to the war in Iraq, the history of the region, and his understanding with regard to the nature of past wars of insurgency and the insurgency we face in Iraq. While at the Command and Staff school, he wrote the Army's new manual on counterterrorism. Let me say as a former marine who helped write a similar manual years ago for the U.S. Marine Corps, I find this man unique in his knowledge and his command ability.

I made a few remarks at the dinner, and being a Senator, why, the remarks turned into a speech with some additional strongly held beliefs that I had penciled out in addition to my prepared remarks in behalf of General and Mrs. Petraeus. I thought twice about saying some very frank and candid views, but as everybody knows, marines don't hold back. So concluding my comments, I was glad I said what I said in that virtually everybody in the room—all 250—told me that I had said what they could not say. Those who wear their officer rank on their shoulders or their enlisted stripes on their sleeves in most cases do not comment on policy decisions or politics no matter how strongly they feel. They follow orders and they serve their country.

I feel somewhat the same trepidation today. However, I believe my remarks to the general, his officer corps, veterans of previous wars, are dead on to

the issue we face in this debate that we have been talking about here on the floor of the Senate.

Before I express my views, I would stress I regret that we are at a stalemate in this body allegedly debating the issue of vital national security, and I think most in the Senate wish we could do just that and do it with comity, cooperation and, yes, in bipartisan fashion. The American people, who are concerned and frustrated and angry about the war, would certainly appreciate that, but that is not the case.

This issue is wrapped around a partisan and political axle procedure. My friends across the aisle insist that we debate and vote on one of the three nonbinding resolutions regarding the war in Iraq, and only that resolution. They wanted to debate and vote on the Warner resolution and call it a day. The Warner resolution supports the troops but not the mission. Let me repeat that: It supports the troops but not the mission. That is a most unique position, to say the least, and that is about as far as my colleagues across the aisle wish to wade in the waters of withdrawal at this particular time.

I also mention it might be helpful if we could consider the Feingold resolution. Senator FEINGOLD's resolution actually does something and should be considered in the Senate, as well. Others wish to debate and vote upon the McCain resolution and the Gregg resolution, but we are being denied that opportunity.

Now, to those in the press—of which I see none—those covering this debate within the media, how on Earth can you describe this situation by writing headlines in 15-second news sound bites, stating Republicans had voted to stifle debate on the war? Yes, let's debate and vote on the Warner resolution. That is entirely proper and right. But let's also debate and vote on resolutions offered by Senators MCCAIN and GREGG and, perhaps, FEINGOLD. By the way, I intend to vote for McCain and Gregg if I get the chance. I do not share the resolution in regard to Senator FEINGOLD, but I defend his honor to introduce it and to debate it.

We are not stifling or shutting down debate. They are. Hello up there. Is there any way you can discern that? I can help you. I majored in journalism. I used to be a newspaper editor. This is like playing baseball with one strike and you are out. What happened to my other two strikes? Well, sorry, back to the dugout. We are going to go to the continuing resolution. We run this ball game.

In any case, in my remarks last Friday at Fort Leavenworth, I said to General Petraeus and the crowd that was assembled in his honor:

Throughout our history as a Nation there have been numerous times when a Commander in Chief badly needed a Commanding General with keen intellect and raw courage. However, I do not think that it is a slight exaggeration to suggest the last time one was this badly needed was 144 years ago, the year 1853, when President Lincoln covered General Grant.

There are other historical allegories of tremendous consequence. General Washington selected Nathaniel Green at a crucial time in our Revolutionary War. Mr. Green was a blacksmith's assistant. There was no understanding of rank at this time. And he reputedly stuttered badly. He must have led by example.

As most military historians know, Grant was discharged from the Army for drinking. He went back home to Illinois. He failed in farming. And he failed in running a mercantile store. Four months into the war, he joined the Illinois Volunteer Regiment, was reinstated as an officer. Lincoln chose Grant over many, many others.

As an aside, Sherman was a good friend of Grant and was discharged for "insanity." When he came back to the Army, he made a famous remark about his friend: "He was with me when I was insane and I was with him when he was drunk."

Then, of course, there was Ike. Selected by General Marshall and agreed to by Franklin Roosevelt, he was picked due to his particular talent of getting people, some with tremendous egos, to come together in common cause. Eisenhower was picked over 30 to 40 senior officers.

Then, just as now, our Nation stands at a critical crossroads. Now, just as then, the freedom of many thousands of people is at stake. Also at stake is the safety and security of the United States of America.

Now, remember, these remarks came at a dinner for General Petraeus at the U.S. Army Command and Staff College at Fort Leavenworth in Kansas. So I said to the general: General Petraeus, you and I have not been personally acquainted over a long period of years. Yet in our relatively short span of time I have come to know you well. I have had many stimulating and enjoyable conversations with you over a wide range of issues—Lawrence of Arabia, the British experience in Iraq—so I know full well you are exactly the right man for the job at the right time.

Our brave young men and women in uniform deserve nothing but the very best leadership, and they are getting it with General Petraeus.

I told him: You have captured America's imagination and enter this job with an enormous reservoir of goodwill.

However, it is a paradox of enormous irony that the Senate confirmed General Petraeus without a dissenting vote—not one—a vote of confidence unique given today's controversy, turmoil, and times.

Yet, at the same time, the same Senators who give you their vote of confidence are now in the business of proposing what I call "confetti resolutions," supporting you and the troops but not the mission you are about to undertake. That, to me, is unprecedented for the Senate and, to me, it is astounding. These resolutions are nonbinding. They have no legislative impact. They are the so-called sense-of-the-Senate resolutions—meaningless except for the message you wish to send to the Executive and the folks back home or for whatever purpose you might have a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. With all due respect, we have crossed the Rubicon with regard to sending mixed messages to our allies,

our troops, the American people, the media, and, yes, our adversaries. Don't forget our adversaries.

Words have consequences. Rest assured, unlike some of my colleagues, our adversaries will read every word and try to figure out and analyze each sentence of these resolutions. And I suspect they will scratch their heads and try to discern the sense and the reading of a resolution that states support for the troops and our new commander with new rules of engagement with a limited timeframe for achieving and reporting benchmarks of progress but that opposes the mission. That mixed message should cause quite a bit of head scratching among the estimated 31 terrorist organizations we have planning various attacks around the world.

However, my real concern is that the Senate is not considering or even talking about the probable consequences of these actions, let alone our responsibilities should they happen. I make it clear, I don't question the intent, purpose, or patriotism of any Senator, regardless of the resolution, but I do question judgment and the law of unintended effects. Bluntly put, with all of this debate with regard to nonbinding resolutions, we appear like lemmings, splashing in a sea of public concern, frustration, and anger over the war in Iraq. I understand that.

In this regard, I should stress, I do not know of anybody in this Senate or the House of Representatives or anyone in America who does not want our troops home at the earliest possible date, and stability in Iraq, if possible. That is not the issue.

When all of this confetti settles—and it is settling, apparently, because we are going to a continuing resolution and we will not have a vote on any of the resolutions—the end result of all this frenzy will be: General, you and the troops have our solid support, but we don't support your mission. However, press on, and good luck.

What kind of message is that? This is not a profile in courage. This is not the Senate's finest hour. If we are going to debate and vote on nonbinding resolutions, let's at least consider resolutions that will send a clear message or that can be of useful purpose. In that regard, we should consider the McCain resolution that lists benchmarks of progress, that General Petraeus has told me would be useful in his discussions with Prime Minister Maliki, certainly the Gregg resolution that supports funding for our troops in harm's way. But that is the killer in this debate because my colleagues across the aisle do not want to vote on the Gregg resolution. Now we are not going to vote on any resolution. The only thing we voted on was cloture.

As a matter of fact, I think we should vote on a resolution, as I said before, proposed by Senator FEINGOLD, a resolution that certainly does something. I do not agree with his resolution, but he is at least forthright and has the courage and sends a clear message.

As the former chairman of the Intelligence Committee in the Senate, let me stress what has not happened in the Congress or the media and has received very little public discussion regarding this challenge that we face in Iraq. No one is talking about the consequences of what will happen if we simply withdraw. And we may just do that because I do not believe this war can or should be sustained if we do not see progress in the next 6 months.

I would also like to point out that most of the time deadlines for withdrawal that have been proposed or are in the nonbinding resolutions mirror exactly the same time period that General Petraeus told the Committee on Armed Services he would follow in reporting whether this new effort is making measurable progress along the lines of the benchmarks within the McCain resolution. The obvious question is, Who can make a better judgment? Who can better make that judgment, General Petraeus, in theater, or Senators conducting theater?

We have not discussed the difficult policy decisions that will confront us if it becomes necessary to withdraw or even how to withdraw. The reality is, what will we do when certain consequences take place? These are the possible, if not probable, consequences we should be confronting, debating, and explaining to the American people and the media, even if some have a deaf ear. First, a dramatic increase in sectarian violence quickly escalating to a civil war, not the civil war that people say exists today but a real civil war and a humanitarian disaster far more devastating than what is happening now; Shia versus Shia, Sunni versus Sunni, Shia versus Sunni. What do we do?

Second, given a civil war and a struggle for control, we can expect an incursion of Sunni troops from other Middle Eastern countries to prevent an Iranian takeover of Iraq and the very real possibility of an Iraq led by Muqtada al-Sadr whose street appeal will endanger their own governments. When that happens, the war becomes regional. What do we do?

Third, we can expect an Iraq dominated by Iran, thus completing a Shia crescent with Iran and Iraq and Syria and Lebanon—and Lebanon is going through its own problems, to say the least. Today, countries such as Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt are talking about building their own nuclear programs, given Iran's nuclear ambitions and their progress. Iran just refused inspectors from the IAEA. With the possibility of Shia Muslims and Sunni Muslims each working to achieve nuclear capability and weapons, what does Israel do? What do we do?

Fourth, Iraq will become a safe haven for terrorists. This time, it is for real. No, not the 2002 NIE, National Intelligence Estimate, that we all agree was an egregious error. What do we do?

Fifth, in their eyes, with defeat of the "Great Satan" only months away—

a clear signal by this body and perhaps inevitable—terrorists around the world are already emboldened, waiting us out and planning more attacks. That is, of course, if you believe what they say. So what do we do?

Sixth, we can expect a perceived, if not real, lack of American resolve in the eyes of adversaries and potential adversaries around the world, resulting in additional national security threats. Read Putin and Belarus; Kim Jong Il, with his penchant for missile launches on the Fourth of July; read Hugo Chavez—the Southern Hemisphere's new Castro—nationalizing his oil production and directly involved in five different countries. What about American resolve? What do we do?

I realize in today's climate the obvious answer to "What do we do?" is simply to blame President Bush. But the point is that globally and over the long term, this is not a Bush issue or a Democratic or Republican issue or even how you feel about Iraq or the views of the so-called international community.

Even as we argue about whether we debate and vote on one resolution or three—or apparently just have a vote on cloture and say that is the end of it—terrorist organizations and their second-generation affiliates—guided and inspired—are plotting attacks against the United States and throughout the world, even as I speak. It is obvious we cannot really sustain the status quo in Iraq. But while we debate how to proceed, they are not giving up.

Now, given the fact there were at least five successful attacks killing Americans—and others that, thank God, were not successful—before President Bush came to office and before military action in Iraq and given the fact that this threat will face the next President—yes, the next President—and future world leaders, surely, surely we can figure out it makes no sense to fight each other when the terrorists, then and now and in the future, do not kill according to party affiliation, nationality, race, age, or gender. If you were on one of those planes the terrorists were planning to send—nine of them—over the Atlantic to American cities, and they went down and exploded in an American city or simply went down in the ocean, it would not make any difference if you were Democratic, Republican, liberal, conservative, or anything—you would be dead. It would not make any difference.

We do not need a Republican approach to national security and the war. We do not need a Democratic approach to national security and the war. We need an American approach to our national security and the war and our individual freedoms.

This is a time to engage in honest dialog to work together and think through and agree on strategy that will defeat our enemies and make the American people safe—look at those consequences of our actions that we have not even discussed on what may happen—and, yes, bring our troops

home but in a way that we do not have to send them back.

My colleagues, I started my remarks by saying the majority of these comments came from a speech I gave at the dinner honoring GEN David Petraeus and his wife Holly at our Leavenworth Command and Staff College in Kansas last Friday prior to David Petraeus leaving for Iraq this Monday. I closed those remarks by saying I was confident that under his leadership, this new mission with new rules of engagement, our chances of success were greater because failure is not in David Petraeus. It never has and it never will be. So America's destiny and God's blessings are riding on the shoulders of GEN David Petraeus. And I closed by saying I was proud to offer him my full support and to call him a friend.

So I say to the leadership, with all due respect, and to all of my colleagues, let us end this business of nonbinding resolutions and get these confetti resolutions behind us. Vote on all four. Vote on all three. But let's not have the headlines that Republicans are trying to shut down debate on Iraq. That is just not the case. We should vote in regard to the Warner resolution, the McCain resolution, the Gregg resolution, and as far as I am concerned the Feingold resolution, if we must. We have all had a chance now to discuss the war. We need to vote on the three resolutions—maybe four—and come together with bipartisan commitment—a difficult and perhaps impossible task but a task that must be undertaken for the sake of our national security.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 10 minutes 23 seconds.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I yield the 10 minutes 23 seconds to my colleague and my friend, Senator THUNE.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Kansas for yielding and commend him on an incredibly eloquent and insightful explanation of the events of the day, why what we are doing in Iraq is so important. He is someone who has 10 years of experience on the Armed Services Committee. Has served as chairman of the Intelligence Committee. He has a great depth of knowledge when it comes to national security matters, foreign policy, and particularly with respect to the current debate about the Middle East. So I thank him for his great comments.

I just want to point out that with respect to this debate, I had watched, as everyone else did, I think, yesterday what unfolded on the floor. I believe what happened in the last 24 hours has demonstrated what a charade this whole Iraqi resolution process has been.

This is serious business. This is the most serious business we will deal with in the Senate. Young Americans are fighting and dying in Iraq. I would say, having been to Iraq on three different occasions—most recently about 6 weeks ago—things in Baghdad are not going well. There are other parts of Iraq where we have made much better progress, even in some parts of western Iraq where we have gotten some buy-in from some of the local sheiks who have decided to participate in the democratic process and support the effort to provide security in that region of Iraq. But the fact is, things in Baghdad are not good.

What that has prompted is a change in strategy. We have undertaken a new strategy. That strategy, of course, is something where the Democrats in the Senate—less Senator LIEBERMAN—and a handful of Republicans have decided to put together a resolution to oppose. That resolution, in my view, is an absolutely wrong way to approach what we are trying to accomplish in Iraq today, but it is obviously their prerogative to be able to do that. I think they ought to get a vote on it. I will not vote with them. I disagree, as I said, intensely with that resolution and its message. I know many of my colleagues on the other side intend that message to be different than it is perceived by our troops and by our enemies, but I think what we have to contend with here when we send a message like that is, how is that perceived by those audiences that are going to be impacted by it and, namely, our troops, the young men and women who wear the uniform, and, of course, obviously, the enemy they are trying to fight? It is the absolute wrong message to send at the very time our troops are embarking on a new mission.

This may be our last shot at success in Iraq. We have a new commander, GEN David Petraeus, whom my colleague from Kansas just mentioned. We have new rules of engagement on the ground in Baghdad, and we have new conditions for the Iraqis to meet. They have to take on the militias. There are military benchmarks they have to meet. There are economic benchmarks. They have to figure out a way to divide the oil revenues. They have agreed to invest \$10 billion in infrastructure. There are political benchmarks they have to meet, holding provincial elections.

There have been resolutions offered on the floor that address those benchmarks but at the same time express support for this mission. Everyone agrees on the consequences of failure. As, again, my colleague from Kansas so very eloquently pointed out, it would be a humanitarian disaster in Iraq—possible genocide, possible full-blown civil war at a minimum regional instability, Shiite versus Shiite, Sunni versus Shiite; an increase in Iranian power on the Arabian peninsula. I do not know if this new strategy is going to work, but I do know this: We owe it

to those who have sacrificed so much to achieve success in that mission already to make sure we give this strategy an opportunity to work.

I mentioned yesterday that I attended a couple of National Guard welcoming-home ceremonies over the weekend in my home State of South Dakota, one of which was Charlie Battery, a unit which was deployed to Iraq for over a year and a unit which was hit incredibly hard. They were in a very dangerous area in Baghdad going about the mission of trying to train the Iraqi security police in that area. Because of some IEDs, we lost four of those young men. And their families—as I visit with them—cannot help but show the pain they are experiencing and yet the incredible sense of loyalty and duty they feel to their country and to the missions and what we are trying to accomplish in Iraq. Two others of those were soldiers, one seriously injured, another also injured, both recovering from those injuries. But the point, very simply, is there is a cost to what we are trying to accomplish in Iraq. Many of our troops have already borne that cost. The point, very simply, is their sacrifice should not be in vain.

The troops we are sending now into this region are going whether we like it or not and irrespective of what the Senate does. The Senate will be sending them a vote of no confidence if we adopt a resolution saying: We support you, but we do not believe you can achieve victory, we do not believe you can accomplish your mission there in Iraq, we do not believe you can win.

On the substance, that resolution is a bad idea, but, more importantly, it seems to me it was designed more as a political statement. That came into full view yesterday when the Republican leader gave the Democratic leader exactly what they had wanted, which was a debate here on the floor of the Senate on two resolutions. We insisted on more resolutions. As my colleague from Kansas said, we wanted to have a debate on the Warner resolution, on the McCain resolution, on the Gregg resolution, even on the Feingold resolution. As I said, we could all decide how we are going to vote, but we would enter into that debate. And there ought to be, if there is going to be a debate in the Senate, a full debate. But, frankly, the Democrats objected to even debating two resolutions, the Warner resolution and the alternative Gregg resolution, because that would have forced them to vote on funding, a vote they did not want to have.

The American people deserve a full debate, not a one-sided debate, not a debate in which one side dictates the terms. This ought to be a debate about the full range of options that are available, the full views of the Members of this body who represent their constituencies across this country.

I heard one of my colleagues say—last week, I think it was, on the Democratic side—they wanted a full-

throated debate. Well, we saw what a hoax that was yesterday. The agenda was exposed, and the charade about a full-throated debate came to a crashing halt.

The American people and the Members of this body deserve a debate. This is the most important issue of our time. As I said earlier, young Americans are fighting and dying in Iraq. But if we are going to debate this issue in the Senate, let's make this debate about substance, not about political statements. Let's make sure all the views in this body are heard.

We tried to do that yesterday by essentially agreeing to what the Democratic leadership had asked for; that is, two resolutions, the Warner resolution, which I happen to disagree with and would vote against, and an alternative resolution that would address the issue of funding. The Democrats objected to that. I hope that if this issue reemerges on the floor of the Senate that it not be a one-sided debate, it be a full debate, so the American people and those families who have sacrificed so much for this cause get the debate they deserve and an opportunity to have their views heard on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I thank you and yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the question that should be before the Senate is: Do you support the President's escalation of the war? Don't confuse it. Don't obfuscate it. Let's have a clean vote. The only charade that is being played is by those who do not want to have a clean vote on this most fundamental question.

As a Senator, John F. Kennedy wrote a Pulitzer Prize-winning book titled "Profiles in Courage." His book told the stories of eight Senators from both sides of the aisle who took a stand based on principle and risked their careers to do so. Today, almost 50 years later, I believe we, too, must take a stand based on principle. Today, I believe all of us who walk on the same floor where Senator John Kennedy once stood should heed his words when he said:

The true democracy, living and growing and inspiring . . . will not condemn those whose devotion to principles leads them to unpopular courses, but will reward courage, respect honor, and ultimately recognize right.

Today is an opportunity for every Member of the Senate to be a profile in courage. Frankly, I am disappointed in my Senate colleagues who voted against debating Senator WARNER's resolution on Iraq. With their vote, all they have done is delay honest debate on a failed foreign policy that has been misguided since the beginning. I don't believe this Senate should turn its back on the American people and cast their lot with the President in his escalation of the war in Iraq. I believe those who support the President's ill-

advised plan should be willing to stand behind that principle and go on record, rather than hide behind parliamentary maneuvers to avoid a vote.

Our colleagues should not be running interference for the President on the floor of the Senate. In fact, I never supported the administration's war—a war of choice, not of necessity; a war based on fiction, not on fact; a war fought without enough troops from the very beginning and designed with no plan to win the peace. I didn't vote for the war, and I certainly would not vote for an escalation of the war.

I was in the minority when I voted against the war in 2002. I was in the minority, again, when I voted last year to transition and bring our troops home over a period of time. But the majority of the American people sent a clear message this last November. They said the President's plan for the Iraq war has failed. The American people elected the Senate and this Congress to change the course in Iraq. It is about time we started listening because it is clear the President has not. He didn't listen to his generals. He didn't listen to the Iraq Study Group. He didn't listen to anyone who disagreed with him. And he certainly has not listened to the American people. That is the only explanation for an Iraq plan that is simply more of the same.

As one of the witnesses before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said:

When you're in a hole, stop digging.

The President's escalation plan will not work. Look at the news over the past few days as the first wave of the new escalation troops has arrived. At least 130 people were killed and over 300 wounded on Sunday, in the deadliest single bomb blast since the U.S. invasion almost 4 years ago. The U.S. military tells us that the four U.S. helicopters that have crashed in the past 2 weeks were actually shot down, with a fifth one down today. And Iraqi insurgents are using new tactics to shoot down our helicopters. The Brookings Institute says the number of daily attacks by insurgents and militias has gone from approximately 32 in November of 2003 to 185 in November of 2006, with Iraqi civilian deaths going from 1,250 to 4,000 in that same period.

Michael O'Hanlon, an expert from Brookings, said that Iraq has become "one of the 3 or 4 most violent places on earth." And this escalation and violence has happened while U.S. troops were there and in spite of previous U.S. troop surges. You only have to look to the past to see that the President's escalation plan will not work. In fact, this escalation plan is based on false assumptions and failed ideas.

To quote one of the witnesses who testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently:

This plan is just stay-the-course plus 20,000 troops.

The escalation plan will not work because it depends on Prime Minister

Maliki to do the right thing. The Associated Press reported today that the "long-awaited security drive" is underway. "The implementation of the prime minister's plan has already begun," said a military spokesman. Yet even the architect of the escalation plan for the administration, General Keane, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that he doesn't know if we can count on the Prime Minister, and he admits that Prime Minister Maliki is an unknown quantity.

I don't know and certainly don't believe that we should put the lives of the sons and daughters of America on the line based on the hope—the hope—that Maliki will do the right thing. The escalation plan will not work because it depends upon Iraqis, we are told by the administration, to take the lead. The administration keeps saying that is an Iraqi plan, with the Iraqis taking the lead. But the truth is, everyone doubts that the Iraqi troops will actually show up.

Many of the troops Prime Minister Maliki promised will be Kurds. Yet an NPR story quotes General Dennis Chapman, who is commander of a team of American military advisers in Iraqi Kurdistan, saying that there have already been desertions from Kurdish troops and that out of the battalion of 1,600 Kurdish soldiers going to Baghdad, he only expects a few hundred to report for duty.

Over and over again, we heard from experts testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that there simply aren't enough Iraqi troops who are loyal to Iraq as a nation and to Maliki as Prime Minister.

A recent New York Times article painted a frightening picture of what a joint American-Iraqi patrol looks like. The article highlights the lack of troop strength and training of Iraqi forces and the confusion that comes with having underprepared Iraqi troops take the lead. To quote from the article:

... As the sun rose, many of the Iraqi Army units who were supposed to do the actual searches of the buildings did not arrive on time, forcing the Americans to start the job on their own. When the Iraqi units finally did show up, it was with the air of a class outing, cheering and laughing as the Americans blew locks off doors with shotguns...

Many of the Iraqi units who showed up late never seemed to take the task seriously, searching haphazardly, rifling through personal CD collections in the apartments.

In the article, a lieutenant colonel of the Third Stryker Brigade Combat Team talked about the difficulty of conducting such operations. He said:

This was an Iraqi-led effort and with that come challenges and risks. It can be organized chaos.

The escalation plan will not work because similar escalation plans have already failed in Iraq, when the enemy simply waited us out. We tried a troop escalation and it didn't work, when we sent 12,000 troops to Baghdad last summer and death and violence on the

streets of Baghdad actually increased. The escalation plan will not work because it has benchmarks but no consequences. And benchmarks without consequences are just aspirations. The plan doesn't hold the Iraqis accountable. We have seen countless plans from this administration with benchmarks after benchmarks that are never met.

The Iraq Study Group said, in recommendation 21, that if the Iraqi Government doesn't make progress toward milestones, "the United States should reduce its political, military, or economic support for the Iraqi government."

Yet when I asked Secretary Rice what would happen if the Iraqis failed to meet the much-heralded benchmarks, she didn't list any consequences. Instead she told me:

I don't think you go to Plan B. You work with Plan A.

Plan A hasn't been working. I will say it again: Benchmarks without consequences are just aspirations. And they are aspirations that have failed time and time again. The escalation plan, as a consequence, will break the back of our National Guard and Reserves.

Let me be clear: The President's escalation plan cannot be implemented without using the National Guard and Reserves far beyond what they already have been used. There simply aren't enough troops. We have already seen the tours of National Guard troops extended. A week ago, I was informed that the New Jersey Army National Guard troops currently stationed in Iraq will see their tours extended by 125 days as result of President Bush's policy. I fully expect to see more extended deployments in the future.

The escalation is going to hurt our security at home by keeping those National Guard and Reserve troops away in Iraq. Those who return home leave their equipment in Iraq, resulting in severe equipment shortages for our National Guard at home. In fact, Larry Korb, an expert from the Center for American Progress, says the units returned home so depleted that the Marines have been referring to this phase as "the postdeployment death spiral." That is why it is time to transition our mission and set a timeframe to get our troops out of Iraq.

Staying in Iraq isn't in the national interest or national security interest of the United States. Our troops are caught in the middle of a civil war they can't solve. Increasing troops will only put more of them directly into a sectarian Iraqi fight. Keeping our troops there or adding more troops is trying to solve a political problem with a military solution.

In one briefing, General Pace, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said: We need to get the Iraqis to love their children more than they hate their neighbors.

That is a powerful truism. The problem is, you don't get Iraqis to love

their children more than they hate their neighbors through military might. That is about reconciliation. It is about confidence building. It is about power sharing. It is about revenue sharing. It is about a host of other things, things that cannot be accomplished through military might.

Staying would only continue to empower and embolden Iran, a country that has turned out to be the biggest winner in our war with Iraq. Dr. Paul Pillar pointed out recently:

Among the neighbors, the largest winner has been Iran. The war has not only toppled the dictator who initiated an earlier war that killed hundreds of thousands of Iranians; it has also crippled what had been the larger regional counterweight to Iranian influence. Meanwhile, the all-consuming preoccupation that the Iraq war has become for the United States, along with the growing unpopularity of the war among Americans, probably has made Iranian leaders less fearful than they otherwise might have been about forceful U.S. action, including military action, against Iran.

Our presence in Iraq only continues to serve as a battle cry for terrorists around the world. According to last year's National Intelligence Estimate on international terrorism, the war in Iraq has become "a cause celebre" for jihadists" and is "shaping a new generation of terrorist leaders and operatives."

Let me be clear, because of how this war was entered into—weapons of mass destruction that never existed—because of how it was executed, there are now no good options left for us in Iraq. But I do believe the first steps toward stabilizing Iraq is to set a date certain for troops to leave. It is only by setting a date certain for our troops to leave that Iraqis will have to take responsibility for security in their own country and work out their political power struggles. Right now as much as they dislike us being there, we still bear the true burden for trying to stop the violence. The Iraqis have little incentive to work out their turf wars over political power as long as we are in the country. Iraq's political leadership will never make the hard choices, compromises, and negotiations necessary to achieve a government of national unity, as long as they believe we will stay in an endless occupation, in which the lives of Americans will be shed and national treasure will be expended.

It is only by setting a date certain for our troops to leave that Iraq's neighbors will start to take responsibility for ending the chaos inside Iraq. Right now the violence has not reached the tipping point to get Iraq's neighbors involved. Ultimately, it is not in their national security interest to have the conflict spill across their borders and to have Iraq disintegrate. But by setting a date certain to leave, we create a new incentive for Iraq's neighbors to help quell the violence. It is only by setting a date certain for our troops to leave that the international community will take a responsible role in Iraq. Right now the international com-

munity sees this as America's war. Once we make clear we will not be there permanently, they, too, will have an incentive to get involved and help preserve stability in a region much closer to Europe than the United States.

So by setting a date certain for our troops to leave, we actually motivate the Iraqis, Iraq's neighbors, and the international community to take the necessary steps to stabilize Iraq.

But setting a date certain and getting our troops out of Iraq in a safe and orderly way is not enough. I believe we must do more.

What we need now is a surge in diplomacy. That will involve much more than a few trips to the region. We must actively engage with Iraq's neighbors in the international community.

But I cannot close without discussing the cost of this war in Iraq. Some say they want to have a talk about, or votes, not about the escalation but about whether there are resources for the troops. I think we should have a real, honest debate that will come in the budget process about what this war is costing. Let's have a real, honest debate about the administration's lack of honesty in telling the American people what this war costs.

Our expenditures in Iraq will saddle our Nation's finances and our children's future. We spend over \$8 billion a month in Iraq; we spend \$2 billion a week in Iraq; we spend \$280 million every day in Iraq; we spend \$11.5 million an hour in Iraq.

The Congress has already appropriated \$379 billion for Iraq, and President Bush is now asking for an additional \$179 billion. Yet the Secretary of Defense announced to the Budget Committee, on which I serve, that he is not going to come before the committee to justify this spending. To me, that is simply outrageous.

The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction released a new report saying the Bush administration cannot account for critical defense materiel, including over \$36 million in weapons. Hearings in the other body revealed that the administration cannot account for over \$8 billion that was sent in cash bundles of \$400,000 into a war region, without any controls. They cannot account for over \$8 billion. Now the administration wants the Congress to hand over another blank check.

Let me put our Iraq spending into perspective.

For what we spend in less than 2 months for operations in Iraq, we could fully fund No Child Left Behind next year, ensuring that every school district in the United States has the funds promised to them to meet the goals of the law.

For what we spend in less than 2 months in Iraq, we could make up the shortfall in the SCHIP program to help cover children who would otherwise be uninsured.

For what we spend in 4 days in Iraq, we could substantially improve secu-

rity at our Nation's ports with an additional billion dollars, including increased scanning of cargo containers.

For what we spend in 2½ months in Iraq, we could pay the \$21 billion cost of implementing all of the remaining 9/11 Commission recommendations to secure our homeland.

Yet we need to look beyond the economic costs of this war at its true cost: 3,099 American lives, to date. That is invaluable. It is priceless. More will die in the days ahead if we do not change the course in Iraq. We now have more than 23,000 sons and daughters of America who are wounded in ways that will affect their lives forever. We have a real obligation to all of those who are wounded and their families, and to the survivors of those who suffered the ultimate sacrifice. Yet we look at a budget that does not meet that responsibility.

Today, we should be debating the President's escalation plan, particularly since we recently learned from the CBO that the escalation proposed by President Bush would easily cost more than triple what the administration has told us.

Let me be clear for those who may have not heard about the Congressional Budget Office report. That report says the President's escalation plan of 21,000 troops actually only includes combat troops and not all of the other troops necessary for force operations. The Congressional Budget Office estimates this could mean an additional 28,000 support personnel, and that the cost could go as high as \$29 billion. Now, to deviate from that would be to deviate from every standard operating procedure the Defense Department has had to support the men and women in the theater; it would be to deviate from every historical perspective. Yet that is not what they included in the budget sent to the Congress.

I am also deeply concerned that the administration has left open the possibility of yet another emergency supplemental to fund this war in fiscal year 2008. All that means is we are putting it upon the next generation of Americans, which is how most of the costs of this war have taken place—we are putting it on the backs of the next generation of Americans and not even being responsible for paying for it. We do all of this while we have the greatest tax cuts for some of the wealthiest people in the Nation, and at a time when the Nation is at war. That has never been seen before in the Nation's history.

The administration has never been honest with the American people about the cost of the war. It is time for that to end. This Senate must demand an honest accounting before we hand this administration any more money or, even more importantly, any more troops.

In the end, it is in honor of those men and women who have given the greatest sacrifice in the line of duty that we must change the course in Iraq. It is in honor of their courage we

EXECUTIVE SESSION

must ensure their comrades are not sent off to carry out a failing plan designed by their civilian leadership.

I ask each of my colleagues: Are you willing to look a young soldier in the eye and tell them you are sending them off to Iraq based upon a failed policy and a recycled plan and based upon the hope that Prime Minister Maliki will get it right? How many more American lives will we lose before we realize this plan will not work? And if it were your son or daughter, how long would you be willing to wait? How long would you be willing to listen to the counsel of patience, of delay, of only one more chance, of stay the course?

I know I certainly am not willing to wait any longer.

I believe there is a difference between deference to the Commander in Chief and blind loyalty. I cannot support blind loyalty that sends more of America's sons and daughters to die for a war of choice, to die for a continuing failed policy. In my mind, that is irresponsible and I believe the very essence of the constitutional framework this country was founded on requires us to act. That is what the majority leader wants to do. It is time for some real profiles in courage. I urge my colleagues to allow us to have an up-or-down vote on the President's escalation, and to support the Warner-Levin resolution. I hope, beyond that, at a later time, to support future binding actions to stop the failed policy in Iraq.

I started today by reminding all of us of the words of John F. Kennedy and the profiles in courage he detailed in this Senate. He said:

In whatever arena of life one may meet the challenge of courage, whatever may be the sacrifices he faces if he follows his conscience—the loss of his friends, his fortune, his contentment, even the esteem of his fellow man—each man [and I add each woman] must decide for himself the course he will follow. The stories of past courage can define that ingredient—they can teach, they can offer hope, they can provide inspiration. But they cannot supply courage itself. For this, each man must look into his own soul.

I ask each Member of the Senate to look into your own soul and your own conscience, allow us to move to the Warner-Levin resolution, allow us to have a vote against the escalation of troops in Iraq. The Nation is waiting and they are watching, and there is accountability to be had.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NOMINATION OF GENERAL GEORGE W. CASEY, JR., TO BE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of General George W. Casey, Jr., to be Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I support GEN George Casey's confirmation to be the next Chief of Staff of the United States Army. His nomination was approved by the Armed Services Committee by a vote of 19 to 6.

Through a long and distinguished career, he has held positions of increasing responsibility, culminating in that of Commanding General of multinational forces in Iraq, in which capacity he served for over 2½ years.

Prior to that command, he was Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, which was preceded by an assignment as Director of the Joint Staff, and before that as Director of Strategy, Plans, and Policy, J-5, on the Joint Staff.

General Casey is an infantryman, having commanded at all levels up to and including division command. As an assistant division commander, he served in Bosnia, and earlier in his career he served in Cairo as a U.N. military observer with the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization. He also served a tour of duty as a congressional liaison officer.

General Casey knows Iraq and the challenges the Army faces there. He also knows the Pentagon and the challenges he will face there. General Casey has the knowledge to perform his primary responsibilities as Chief of Staff, which is the training and equipping of soldiers and caring for them and their families.

There is some opposition to General Casey's nomination because he is identified with the administration's failed Iraq strategy, and I agree that strategy has not been successful. As a matter of fact, I have argued as forcefully as I know how that strategy has not been successful and that we need to change course in Iraq.

It is appropriate to hold military leaders responsible for their own failures, but the principal failures that have led to the chaos in Iraq were decisions of the civilian leaders. General Casey had to deal with the consequences of a myriad of flawed policies, including having insufficient forces at the outset of the operation, failing to properly plan for postwar stability operations, disbanding the Iraqi Army, then trying to build a new army, initially using civilian contractors, and an overly extensive

debaathification program, to name but a few.

All of these critical mistakes, which fueled the insurgency and civil disorder, are attributed to the civilian leadership in the White House, in the Department of Defense, and in the Coalition Provisional Authority. Compounding those mistakes was the effect of detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib attributed, in part, to ambiguities in what was considered permissible in the interrogation of prisoners fostered by that very same civilian leadership in the administration, the White House, and the Pentagon, where the advice of uniformed military lawyers was overruled. Those critical mistakes were made in the year before General Casey took command and had severe adverse consequences which he inherited.

General Casey's focus in Iraq was on training and equipping Iraqi security forces to bring them as quickly as possible to a level where they could relieve American forces from the burden of providing the security that Iraqis should be providing for themselves. He was not alone in seeing this was a priority. It was also the focus of his boss, the Central Command commander, General Abizaid, and his subordinates, the Corps commander, Lieutenant General Chiarelli, and the commanders of that training effort, Generals Petraeus and later Dempsey. General Casey put it this way:

The longer we in the United States forces continue to bear the main burden of Iraq's security, it lengthens the time that the Government of Iraq has to take the hard decisions about reconciliation and dealing with the militias. And the other thing is that they can continue to blame us for all of Iraq's problems, which are at base their problems.

Those are wise words. General Casey recognized there is no military solution to the situation in Iraq, that only a political solution enabled by Iraqi politicians making the essential political compromises can save the Iraqis from themselves. General Casey is not alone. There actually seems to be an agreement among most observers that an Iraqi political settlement is a key to ending the violence in Iraq. The difference of opinion exists on whether Iraqi politicians need breathing space, as President Bush has said, to reach required political compromises or whether, as many of us believe, Iraqi politicians need to be pressured to make those compromises and that the addition of 21,000 more troops doesn't make a political compromise more likely, it just gets us in deeper into a civil conflict.

It has been said that General Casey was too optimistic about the possibility of troops being reduced, having predicted in the spring and summer of 2006 and then subsequently predicting that reduction toward the end of 2006 and into 2007 was possible. He did make those predictions, and I think he was clearly overly optimistic. He has made a number of mistakes, but the key fundamental flaws were the mistakes

made, the wrong judgments of the civilian leadership of this country, not the uniformed military leaders of this country.

Was he too optimistic? Yes. Is he still too optimistic? I believe he is. When asked about whether he agreed with what the President finally said the other day, that we are on a road to slow failure—the President finally stepping up to acknowledging the reality in Iraq—General Casey said he believed we are still on a road to slow success. That is how optimistic he is.

I am not going to hold that against him. I think he is wrong in that excessive optimism, but we expect our military leaders to be enthusiastic and positive about the missions they are assigned—the missions that they are assigned—by their civilian leaders. We expect them to be confident and to inspire their soldiers with the importance of those missions, to keep their morale high, and General Casey did that.

He has also increased and decreased troops—both—depending on the missions assigned to him by the civilian leaders.

As he testified, he requested additional troops on six occasions for specific missions, such as to provide security for the elections or otherwise deal with spikes of violence. However, mindful of the stress on soldiers and their families and on the deteriorating readiness of the nondeployed units in the Army and the Marine Corps, he also sought opportunities for reductions—both directions.

One of the real questions I had to face in addressing this nomination was whether General Casey changed his tune when it came to this surge of additional troops that is being requested or being sent by the President. I pressed him on this issue at his nomination hearing before the Armed Services Committee.

I want to read the exchange between General Casey and myself at his hearing within the last week.

I asked General Casey the following:

We asked General Abizaid back in November when he appeared before this committee whether he needed more troops or whether he supported more troops going to Iraq. And this is just last November. And this is what he said. He said that he met with every divisional commander, General Casey, the Corps commander, General Dempsey. “We all talked together. And I said, in your professional opinion, if you were to bring in more American troops now, does it add considerably to our ability to achieve success in Iraq? And they all said no. And the reason is because we want Iraqis to do more. It’s easy for the Iraqis to rely upon us to do this work. I believe—

This is General Abizaid speaking—that more American forces prevent the Iraqis from doing more, from taking more responsibility for their own future.”

I continued in my questioning of General Casey:

Now, General Abizaid said that he spoke to you and that his opinion reflected your opinion and all the other commanders. Was that true when he said it?

General Casey:

I’m not exactly sure when in November it was, but it was.

Senator LEVIN:

So you’ve changed your view since November?

General Casey:

As I described in my opening testimony, Senator, in mid November was when the reevaluation of the plan was taking place. So I suspect John and I talked before that. And that does reflect my general view on additional U.S. forces in Iraq.

Senator LEVIN:

It reflects a general view, but then there was some kind of a reevaluation which took place in mid November.

General Casey:

That’s right, Senator. We’re constantly reevaluating how we’re doing and what we need.

Senator LEVIN:

But that position that General Abizaid stated was your position when you spoke to him in early November presumably still remains your general view.

General Casey:

That’s correct.

Senator LEVIN:

Well, if that’s your general view, what is the change? Why are you modifying your general view for this surge?

General Casey:

What has changed, Senator, are several things: One, the development of a plan, a new plan that was conceived by the Iraqis and worked in concert with us; so there is a plan that laid out requirement for those forces. So just to say do you need more forces is one thing; to say do you need more forces to execute this plan is quite another. And we do need an additional two brigades to implement that plan.

I think he is giving us a straightforward answer to that question. His general view is, and was before the new plan was adopted, that we did not need more forces in Iraq; that it took the Iraqis off the hook. There was a new plan which was adopted by the administration, by the Commander in Chief, by the civilian leadership of this country. That plan requires that we not just clear neighborhoods but that we then remain in neighborhoods in Baghdad.

Do I think that is a wise plan? I do not. I am going to vote against the surge. I think it gets us in deeper militarily. This is a military officer who has been given a new plan and has been asked what are the requirements for that new plan which has been adopted by the civilian leaders of this country. And when given a new plan by the Commander in Chief, he very properly said that is going to require some additional troops.

Again, we are going to debate the plan, the wisdom of it, I hope one of these days. We are going to debate the wisdom of whether this surge makes sense. But given a new plan, given that decision, what General Casey is saying is that his general view about the lack of the wisdom of increasing the military presence in Iraq has to be modified when there is a new requirement, a new plan which requires us to be

present in the neighborhoods of Baghdad.

Once again, although I disagree with the plan, I view that as a satisfactory explanation for why he now supports the additional troops. Not to the same extent that the President has proposed or decided upon, but to the extent of two brigades. He said the additional brigades will give additional flexibility. He doesn’t have any problem with that, but he testified that was not what his recommendation was.

So his emphasis on building up Iraqi security forces to relieve Americans of the tasks that Iraqis should be doing for themselves is a critical part of any strategy in Iraq that has a chance of success, and it is key to the ultimate U.S. military disengagement. The real key to a stable and secure Iraq and a viable Iraq is a political solution that can only be reached by the leaders in Iraq, the politicians. And what American political leaders need to do, in my judgment, is to pressure those politicians to make that happen.

That was never General Casey’s responsibility. General Casey never had the responsibility of doing what is critically essential politically, which is to put pressure on the Iraqi politicians to reach a political settlement. He is a military man. He is a military man who, by his own acknowledgment, has made a number of mistakes. Indeed, he listed a number of mistakes for us that he has made and that he takes responsibility for. But the fundamental mistakes which have led to the chaos in Iraq, which did not allow us to help to create in Iraq a stable and viable country, which is the goal of all of us, those fundamental mistakes were the mistakes made by the civilian leaders of this country. To hold him accountable or responsible, and to vote against him because of the major mistakes which led to this chaos through not the uniformed leaders’ mistakes but through our civilian leaders’ mistakes, it seems to me, is inappropriate and unfair, and I will vote for his confirmation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to express opposition to the nomination of General George Casey to be the next Chief of Staff of the Army.

I admire General Casey’s patriotism and his long service to our country. I have concluded, based on his role as commander of the multinational forces in Iraq, that I cannot support his nomination.

Let me first make clear that General Casey has had a long and distinguished career in the U.S. Army and is deserving of the utmost respect and gratitude for the contributions he has made to this Nation’s defense over his long career. At his nomination hearing on February 1, I stated my appreciation to him and his family for their extraordinary service and personal sacrifice, as well as the support they have provided to the men and women in uniform and their families. I emphasized

then, and I reiterate today, I do not in any way question General Casey's honor, patriotism or service to America, nor do I question his sincere desire to continue serving the Army.

At this critical moment in our history, however, with the obvious—obvious—lack of success in achieving our goals in Iraq, this nomination should bear unusual weight in our deliberations. All of the Armed Services, and particularly our ground forces, are undergoing difficult changes to adjust to the global war on terror. The next Chief of Staff of the Army will be faced with enormous challenges in matters relating to recruiting, training, and retention of soldiers, the continuing organizing of the Army, and requirements for the procurement of weapon systems. The next Chief of Staff must be able to evaluate ongoing strategy and be able to react with sound advice when unforeseen challenges are encountered. Perhaps most importantly, the next Chief of Staff must be unconstrained in evaluating the past while giving advice for the future.

I have questioned in the past, and question today, a number of the decisions and judgments that General Casey has made over the past 2½ years. During that time, conditions in Iraq have grown remarkably and progressively worse, and the situation now can best be described as dire and deteriorating. I regret that our window of opportunity to reverse momentum may be closing.

The bombing at the Golden Mosque in Samarra last February sparked sectarian violence throughout Iraq and in Baghdad, in particular. Yet in the face of this dramatic change in the Iraqi security environment, our military strategy—and I emphasize military strategy—remained essentially unchanged. Instead of conducting a traditional insurgency campaign, our troops focused on training and equipping Iraqis, hoping, in vain, that they could do the job. After repeated elections and political events demonstrated that the democratic process would not, on its own, bring down the level of violence, our troops did not begin focusing on protecting the population. Instead, the coalition and Iraqi forces launched Operation Together Forward in June 2006. This operation, aimed at securing Baghdad, failed. Yet the coalition launched Operation Together Forward II in August in a very similar fashion. The result, predictably, was a similar failure.

I am not going to go over the many times I complained about a failed strategy. A number of times I asked our leaders, both civilian and military, why they were continuing to pursue this failed strategy. I continued to give speeches denouncing this strategy and predicted we would end up in the dire circumstances we are in today. It is all a matter of responsibility—a matter of responsibility.

General Casey, more than any other individual, has been the architect of

U.S. military strategy in Iraq over the last 2 years. During this time, I fear he consistently presented unrealistically rosy, optimistic assessments of the situation in Iraq. For example, in December 2004, General Casey stated at a Pentagon press conference:

My view of winning is that we are broadly on track to accomplishing our objectives, with Iraqi security forces that are capable of maintaining domestic order and denying Iraq as a safe haven for terrorists. And I believe we are on track to get there by December of 2005.

I repeat that:

I believe we are on track to get there by December of 2005.

Almost a year later, in September of 2005, General Casey repeated:

We have a strategy and a plan for success in Iraq, and we are broadly on track in achieving our goals.

Last October of 2006, he stated, before the Armed Services Committee, I believe:

The idea that the country is aflame in sectarian violence is just not right. General Casey said: I do not subscribe to the civil war idea.

Mr. President, we have hearings to try to get an honest, unvarnished opinion of how our Armed Forces are doing, what their needs are, what their missions are, and of course because we are in a war, what is happening in Iraq. We are not on the ground there. We visit frequently, but we rely to a large degree, obviously, on the judgment and the recommendations and the evaluations of our military leaders. This is the opening statement of GEN George W. Casey before the Armed Services Committee on 23 June of 2005:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman . . .

Remember, this is 23 June 2005.

. . . In the past year, the Iraqis, supported by the coalition, have established an interim government, neutralized the Shia insurgency, eliminated terrorist and insurgent safe havens across Iraq, mobilized their security forces to confront the insurgency . . .

How could he possibly give that kind of assessment? Senator LEVIN says, well, we should have put pressure on the Iraqis. Well, maybe we should have put pressure on the Iraqis, but it was pretty obvious to even the most uninitiated that the Iraqis weren't performing. They weren't performing.

In his nomination hearing last Thursday, I asked General Casey about these and other statements he has made, both publicly and privately, that seem entirely at odds with the situation as most observers find it. I noted, for example, that in recent days, the Secretary of Defense, General Pace, and Admiral Fallon, the new head of Central Command, have all stated that the United States is not winning in Iraq and that we have had a failed strategy. These were clear-cut, realistic statements. But General Casey disagreed, saying I do not agree that we have a failed policy. I do not believe that the current policy has failed.

He may be the only person in America who believes that. This is a judg-

ment issue, not an honor issue. Of course, the civilian leadership is responsible. I believe that the former Secretary of Defense will go down in history with Robert Strange McNamara. But military leaders are also responsible. That is why we give them positions of responsibility because we place in their trust our most precious asset: American blood.

During his own nomination hearing on January 23, Lieutenant General Petraeus stated that five additional brigades were required to implement the President's new military strategy and that he could not accomplish his mission if he didn't have these additional troops. I, for one, worry that five brigades may still be insufficient to accomplish all we are asking our troops to do in Iraq and would prefer that we are on the side of too many troops rather than too few, as has been the case in the past.

General Casey, however, confounding the experts, said in his hearing:

We do need an additional two brigades to implement that plan.

Not five, not more than five, but just two.

General Casey said the additional three brigades the Department will send "merely gives General Petraeus great flexibility."

Remember, we are putting this person, who still doesn't believe we need five brigades, in the position to be the one who is implementing the policy. Given this and other judgments, I don't see in this nominee an accurate assessment of the situation in Iraq or what is required to avoid catastrophe there.

My colleague from Michigan says, well, it is all the civilian commanders' fault. I will put plenty of blame on the civilian commanders and I have for many years, but somehow to absolve the military commander on the ground there, conducting the operations, of any responsibility flies in the face of everything I ever learned in my lifetime of involvement with the military.

Recently, I noticed in the paper there was a submarine with four sailors who were washed overboard. I believe they were later rescued. The commander of the submarine was relieved. I still remember in my earliest youth, when the captain was asleep in the cabin and the USS *Missouri* ran aground in the mudflats someplace south of here, he was relieved that day of his command.

We put people in positions of responsibility and hold them responsible and we try to reward them as much as we can when they succeed, with the approval of a grateful nation. But we also hold them responsible for failure.

My friend from Michigan and I have a very different view of the responsibilities of commanders in the field, which is why, during World War II and other wars, we have relieved commanders in the field because they were not accomplishing the mission and, if they didn't like the mission, they didn't speak up to get the mission changed, and if they embraced a failed mission, then they were held even more responsible.

I would go on. I want to emphasize, again, what General Casey said in the hearings the other day. Senator LEVIN said:

... even he came to the point, after all these years, of not having what everybody wanted, which is success in Iraq. He finally described that mistakes were made. And then he said, "Yes, one could define that, doing what we're doing, as maybe a slow failure."

In other words, Senator LEVIN was asking General Casey if what has happened in Iraq was a "slow failure," as stated by the President of the United States. General Casey:

I didn't—I actually don't see it as slow failure. I actually see it as slow progress.

In the last 4 weeks I believe we have had five helicopters shot down. Casualties have spiked to a very high level. I saw in one of the newspapers this morning that over the past 3-month period they have been perhaps as high or the highest of any time in the war. And we are in a situation of slow progress?

Judgment. Judgment. Judgment. We expect people who are placed in positions of responsibility to exercise good judgment.

There is a lot I could say in response to the statement of my friend from Michigan concerning no responsibility whatsoever for the failures in the hands of the commander on the ground in Iraq. I mean, on its face it is a rather unusual interpretation of the responsibility we give to our commanders on the ground. Of course the ultimate responsibility rests with civilian leadership. Of course it does. That is how our democracy is shaped. But we don't absolve anybody in the chain of command, civilian or military, for the responsibility for failure and it is widely believed by everyone, perhaps with the exception of General Casey, that the policy in Iraq is a failure and that is why we are trying a new strategy in hopes that we prevail in very difficult conditions. There is an old saw about those who ignore the lessons of history are doomed to repeat them. During the Vietnam war there was failure. General Westmoreland, then head of forces in Vietnam, was brought back and made Chief of Staff of the Army even though our policy and strategy in Vietnam had failed. Ask anyone who was a young officer in those days in the United States Army or Marine Corps. It was a blow to their morale because they were held responsible for their performance on the field of battle. We are holding our men and women, both officer and enlisted, responsible for their behavior on the field of battle, as to whether they succeed or fail. But now, in this particular instance, a failed commander is now, again, unfortunately, being promoted to a greater position of responsibility. We are, again, repeating the lessons of history because we ignore them.

I intend to vote against the nomination of General Casey and I hope my colleagues will as well. I say that with all due respect to the honorable service

of him and his family to this Nation. It has nothing to do with honorable service. It has everything to do with judgment and positions of responsibility. Just as Abraham Lincoln held generals responsible for performance on the battlefield, so today we should hold commanders responsible for performance on the battlefield.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, a couple of quick comments on my good friend's statement. First, no one suggests that the commanders be absolved from any responsibility. In fact, when we asked General Casey what mistakes had been made, he listed a number of mistakes in his own answers, including:

We underestimated the ability of al-Qaida, the Sunni insurgents, to provoke sectarian conflict and failed to preempt the attack against the Golden Mosque in Samarra; we thought that as more security forces were trained and equipped we would be able to gradually shift ever increasing security responsibilities to them and thus reduce our forces proportionately. This is occurring slower than we originally projected. We were slow to anticipate the extent of the radical Shia death squads.

He has acknowledged mistakes have been made. But the fundamental mistakes which have been made which caused us to be in the situation we are in were not George Casey's. Every commander makes mistakes. There is no commander I know of who would say he or she did not make mistakes. No one is absolving General Casey of the mistakes, which he is the first to acknowledge. The question is whether he is going to be held accountable—not for his mistakes but for the fundamental mistakes which were made by the civilian leadership of this Nation. That is the question.

When my friend says General Casey must be the only one in America who doesn't think this policy is a failure, let me give you a couple of other Americans who seem to think the same way. Let's start with the President of the United States, last October, when he said: "We are absolutely winning in Iraq."

That is the Commander in Chief. "We are absolutely winning in Iraq."

How about another person, the Vice President of the United States, within the last year? "The insurgency is in its last throes."

To say that General Casey is the only person in America who has made statements that are overly optimistic, to put it mildly, in terms of what is going on in Iraq, when he is trying to carry out the policies of the administration, keep the morale of his troops, and now, after November the President now says we are on a road to slow failure, after the American public told the President of the United States that we are on a road to slow failure, now what we are saying is: OK, the President acknowledges we are on a road to slow failure unless we adopt his policy of a surge. What General Casey is saying, hon-

estly, when I pressed him—he doesn't frame it that way. He believes we are on a slow progress road. Are we going to say he is not qualified to be Chief of Staff of the United States Army, when he has been Vice Chief, he has been a Commander, he has been a three star general—because he believes it is slow progress instead of slow failure, when we have a Commander in Chief who just a few months ago said we are absolutely winning in Iraq, absolutely winning?

And George Casey, now it is all piled on him. He is the only one in America who seems to think we are winning in Iraq. Well, he doesn't think we are winning in Iraq; he thinks we are slowly making progress in Iraq, to use his words. Do I agree with him? No. I think this policy has been a failure right from the beginning. Going in was a mistake. It was a mistake that was based on arrogance, it was based on a misunderstanding of history, it was based on a misreading of what the threat was, it was based on a lot of mistakes. Disbanding the Iraqi Army? Look what it has led to. Not having a plan for the aftermath? Look what it has led to. These are the fundamentals. These are the transcendent mistakes which have created the chaos in Iraq, and George Casey inherits that.

He makes his own mistakes at a totally different level, degree, than these fundamental mistakes. Suddenly we say he is not qualified to be a chief of staff of the Army because he was a commander who inherited that mess and made his own mistakes of a much lower degree, obviously. Much too optimistic. He is a commander of troops, trying to keep morale up. So he is optimistic, I believe he is overly optimistic, history has proven he is overly optimistic. But to say we are trying to absolve him of mistakes when he acknowledges his own mistakes as any good commander will, learning from mistakes—he listed his mistakes; it is his list—no one is absolving him. We are simply saying he should not be carrying the load of the mistakes the civilian leadership of this country has made, which has helped to create such chaos in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I repeat, in case Senator LEVIN didn't hear me, I have criticized the policies and, placed responsibilities on the President, the Vice President and the former Secretary of Defense for the last 3 years over a failed policy in Iraq. The difference Senator LEVIN and I seem to have is I also hold responsible the commanders in the field for giving accurate information, for providing recommendations that will help to win a conflict rather than subscribing and continuing to this day, to this very day to support a policy everyone acknowledges has failed.

By the way, I said today says are failed—not quotes from a month ago or

6 months ago or a year ago, I say to my friend from Michigan. No one decried those comments, such as "last throes" and "stuff happens" and "dead enders" more than I did at the time. But I hold the entire chain of command responsible down to the commanders in the field.

He says just a few days ago:

I don't see it as slow failure. I actually see it as slow progress.

The unclassified NIE we have read, the National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq says, "We are not making progress." It says, "We are losing."

We are going to make the chief of staff of the Army the guy who thinks that "We are making slow progress" as opposed to the National Intelligence Estimate, which is agreed on by our entire intelligence establishment, that we are losing. So, of course, we hold people responsible. Of course we do. Do I hold our former Secretary of Defense responsible? Absolutely. Absolutely. If he were up for another job, I would be standing here on the floor objecting to it.

Do I hold others in the administration responsible? Absolutely. But this is a leader who is up for an increased responsibility and he has failed in his mission, and that is what it is all about. An honorable and decent man who has served his country, but the message throughout the military now is, unfortunately, as it was with General Westmoreland, "Even though you fail, you are going to be promoted."

To somehow say the commander in the field is in some way not responsible in any way for the "mistakes" I think flies in the face not only of the record but the tradition we have in the United States of America, of placing the commanders in the field in positions of responsibility and making them accountable for their performance and how they carry out those responsibilities.

I am sure the Senator from Michigan and I will continue to disagree for some period of time because we have a philosophical difference, a fundamental difference of opinion. If you want to blame everything on the civilian leadership, who are of course responsible, who of course history will judge very harshly, that is one way of looking at it. If you say that responsibility is shared down to the commanders in the field, as I do, then you probably have a different view.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I have no objection at all. I am just curious as to about how long. I am not in any way trying to influence the length of time.

Mr. ALLARD. Let me just say I am anticipating somewhere around 12 or 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ALLARD. In October 2002, this body saw fit to authorize, by a large majority, the use of force against Iraq. Specifically the resolution authorizes the President: to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.

I remind my colleagues that we did so because of two important reasons—the same two reasons offered by the President to the American public.

First, Saddam Hussein was in breach of more than a dozen United Nations Security Council resolutions. He refused to cooperate with U.N. weapons inspectors even after a decade of sanctions, and rejected proposal after proposal to verify that he did not have such weapons.

Second, after September 11, it was clear that America could not afford to allow imminent threats to our Nation go unopposed. At the time, Iraq represented a dangerous crossroad between terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. In the context of Saddam's hostile intentions, it was a nexus that we could not ignore.

When critics attempt to cover up their support for the use of force against Iraq, they damage U.S. credibility overseas and send mixed messages to our servicemembers. Even more dangerously, they encourage an enemy who believes America will give up when the fighting gets tough.

Of course, there is no doubt that the strategic imperatives in Iraq have changed since 2002. I will readily admit that this fight is one that we fully recognize. But that in no way diminishes the importance of our mission there now. We have a vital national interest to remain in Iraq and help maintain a secure and stable nation.

The terrorists have made it abundantly clear that Iraq is central in their war against the civilized world. They are committed to fighting there and will not stop unless we defeat them. If we have to fight, it is preferable to fight on their own soil.

They have also made it clear that they will not stop with Iraq. They will strike Iraq's neighbors as they did in Jordan and Lebanon. They will strike Europe as they did in the Madrid bombings. And, they will not hesitate to strike America again as they did on September 11.

And yet now, in this body, we are debating another resolution, but one that does not hold any legal weight; a resolution that would tie the hands of our soldiers in the field by limiting their options, lower their morale, and harm their efforts in Iraq. I am convinced that a long-term stable Iraq is in the best interest of our national security, and as I have said many times before, the price of failure in Iraq is too great to walk away now.

We should not forfeit our progress in Iraq to meet arbitrary deadlines whether they are in the short or in the

long term. We should not think about giving up when our men and women in uniform who have achieved so much. Such defeatism encourages the terrorists, undermines our efforts to persuade other nations to join us, and opens the door to attacks here at home. We must stand firm. We must stand strong.

Thus, I support the President's plan to move forward in trying to secure Baghdad.

One of the keys to success in Iraq, I believe, is obtaining a sincere commitment from the Iraqi Prime Minister to get the Iraqi government to play a much stronger role in the destiny of Iraq.

President Bush is confident that we now have that commitment and I think that this will have a major impact on our new efforts to bring stability to Baghdad.

I am supportive of this new strategy because it contains a much stronger commitment from Iraqis, in terms of their share of force strength and their financial share of the costs of the war, and includes new thresholds for the Iraqis to meet. To date, the Iraqis have become too reliant on U.S. troops and U.S. dollars. This plan shows a new commitment from the Iraqis to step up to the plate and fight for their country's future.

I am optimistic that the President's shift in direction was needed, and may have already resulted in two positive results:

No. 1, Iraq's prime minister dropped his protection of an anti-American cleric's Shiite militia after U.S. intelligence convinced him the group was infiltrated by death squads; and

No. 2, recently, U.S. forces arrested the top aide to radical cleric al-Sadr in a raid. I think this signals that the important change in our strategy shows hope for success and that Iraq is ready to come forward with a renewed commitment to solving its problems.

Mr. President, I enter in the RECORD the following newspaper articles describing these accounts.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 2007]

KEY AIDE TO SADR ARRESTED IN BAGHDAD—IRAQI-LED OPERATION PART OF BROADER PUSH
(By Ernesto Londono)

U.S.-backed Iraqi forces arrested a top aide to anti-American Shiite cleric Moqtada al-Sadr in eastern Baghdad on Friday, amid growing signs of stepped-up efforts to quell Sadr and his supporters.

U.S. military officials said in November that Sadr's Mahdi Army militia represents the greatest threat to Iraq's security. U.S. and Iraqi forces are preparing a renewed effort to pacify Baghdad, including the deployment of additional U.S. troops.

Abdul Hadi al-Daraji, Sadr's media director in Baghdad, was arrested at his house in the neighborhood of Baladiyah, near the Mahdi Army stronghold of Sadr City, shortly after midnight, said Sadr spokesman Abdul Razak al-Nadawi.

The spokesman said a guard was killed during the operation. At least two other aides were taken into custody, according to a statement released by the U.S. military.

The statement did not identify Daraji by name, but said the main suspect was involved in the assassination of numerous

members of Iraq's security forces and is "affiliated with illegal armed group cells targeting Iraqi civilians for sectarian attacks." The military said the arrest was the result of an "Iraqi-led" operation.

Nadawi said "the occupation forces are provoking Sadr . . . by these daily operations or every-other-day operations." The spokesman added that the cleric's followers "are the only ones demanding and putting a timetable for the occupation withdrawal."

Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, who has been pressured by the Bush administration to bring the Mahdi Army and other Shiite militias under control, was not forewarned about the arrest, said Ali Dabbagh, a spokesman for Maliki. Dabbagh said the prime minister was not notified about every impending high-profile arrest.

"No one is untouchable for the security forces," Dabbagh said. "At the same time, no one was interested to go into a fight with the Sadr movement." Sadr, whose supporters hold 30 seats in parliament, is a key supporter of Maliki, who is a Shiite, but the cleric is also widely seen as an instigator of the country's sectarian violence.

Neither Dabbagh nor the U.S. military said whether Daraji had been charged with a crime. "Definitely, if he's not charged, he will be released in a respectful way," Dabbagh said.

Sadr said in an interview with an Italian newspaper published Friday that a crack-down had begun and that 400 of his men had been arrested, according to the Associated Press.

Maliki told reporters this week that 430 Mahdi Army members had been arrested in recent days, but Nadawi said Thursday that the arrests stretched back to August 2004.

In the interview, Sadr said his militiamen would not fight back during the Muslim holy month of Muharram, which started Friday for Sunnis and begins Saturday for Shiites, saying it was against the faith to kill at that time.

"Let them kill us. For a true believer there is no better moment than this to die: Heaven is ensured," he was quoted as saying. "After Muharram, we'll see."

Also on Friday, the U.S. military reported the death of an American soldier killed Thursday by an improvised explosive device.

The soldier, who was not identified pending notification of relatives, was traveling in a convoy conducting an escort mission in a neighborhood in northwest Baghdad when the blast occurred. Three other soldiers were injured.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 18, 2007]

MALIKI PLEDGES TO TREAT MILITANTS WITH AN IRON FIST

(By Louise Roug)

Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri Maliki promised Wednesday to crack down on Shiite Muslim militias and Sunni Arab insurgents, warning that no one—not even political ally Muqtada Sadr—would be above the law.

"We will not allow any politicians to interfere with this Baghdad security plan . . . whether they are Sunnis or Shiites, Arabs or Kurds, militias or parties, insurgents or terrorists," Maliki said in a rare interview.

The prime minister's comments appeared to align his government's security plan with the Bush administration's call to confront Shiite militias. But in other remarks, Maliki underscored his differences with the U.S., suggesting that American miscalculations had worsened the bloodshed in Iraq, and warning that his patience for political negotiation with warring factions was wearing thin.

"When military operations start in Baghdad, all other tracks will stop," Maliki said.

"We gave the political side a great chance, and we have now to use the authority of the state to impose the law and tackle or confront people who break it."

U.S. officials have said that renewed military operations should go hand in hand with efforts at political reconciliation between warring Shiites and Sunnis.

Maliki said if Iraqi security forces were given sufficient training and equipment, they could stabilize the country enough to allow the withdrawal of U.S. troops starting in three to six months—a period in which President Bush's proposed troop buildup would still be underway.

He said if better U.S. training and supplies had come earlier, lives could have been saved.

"I think that within three to six months our need for the American troops will dramatically go down," Maliki said. "That's on the condition that there are real strong efforts to support our military forces."

The U.S.-Iraq security plan involves sending 21,500 more American troops to Iraq and 8,000 to 10,000 Iraqi forces to Baghdad in an effort to quell the civil war between Sunnis and Shiites that on average kills more than 100 people a day.

Maliki said Iraqi security forces this week had detained 400 Shiite militiamen affiliated with Sadr, a radical Shiite cleric whose followers constitute part of Maliki's political base. He offered no further details.

RETURN TO POLITICAL FORM

The interview, which took place in a pavilion inside the heavily fortified Green Zone, was a return to the freewheeling style that characterized Maliki's political manner before he became prime minister last year.

When asked whether the Bush administration needed him now more than he needed the administration, Maliki laughed uproariously, calling it an "evil question."

Throughout, Maliki appeared confident and seemed to relish the chance to respond to statements by Bush and U.S. officials, including allegations that his government had botched the hanging of deposed leader Saddam Hussein and had not done enough to stop the sectarian violence.

Commenting on a recent statement by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, he said, "Rice is expressing her own point of view if she thinks that the [Iraqi] government is on borrowed time," humorously suggesting that it might be the Bush administration that is on borrowed time.

"I understand and realize that inside the American administration there is some kind of a crisis situation, especially after the results of the last election," he said.

Maliki said suggestions by Bush officials that the U.S. did not fully support his government played into the hands of insurgents.

"I believe such statements give a morale boost to the terrorists and push them toward making an extra effort, making them believe they have defeated the American administration," Maliki said. "But I can tell you, they haven't defeated the Iraqi government."

CONCERN ALL AROUND

The widening split between the U.S. and Iraqi governments comes at an inopportune time.

Maliki has promised to carry out a security plan to halt the civil war, but his government has been riddled with sectarian fighting and corruption.

The Bush administration is under fire in the U.S. over the Iraq security plan. The strategy to send more American troops is being resisted by many Democrats, who control the House and the Senate.

In Washington on Wednesday, a group of senators introduced a nonbinding resolution opposing the troop buildup.

In the Middle East, there is great concern that Iraq's civil war could spill over into neighboring countries.

When Rice visited Kuwait this week, officials told her that the U.S. needed to start talks with Syria and Iran in order to ease the violence in Iraq. But the White House has resisted the suggestion, also put forward by the bipartisan Iraq Study Group.

U.S. rhetoric directed at Iran has become more aggressive even as Iraq is working to strengthen its ties with its eastern neighbor and largest trade partner.

When American forces detained five Iraqis in northern Iraq last week, some Iraqi officials were angered by what they saw as U.S. interference in their foreign affairs.

In the interview, Maliki asserted his government's independence from U.S. interests in the region. But he underscored that the U.S. and Iraqi governments shared basic goals for his country: stability and prosperity.

"The success that can be achieved in Iraq will be a success for President Bush and the United States, and vice versa," Maliki said. "A failure here would be a failure for President Bush and the United States."

He took issue with Bush's contentions during a PBS interview Tuesday that Maliki's government "has still got some maturation to do," and that it had botched Hussein's execution by allowing Shiite guards to taunt the former leader and videotape his hanging.

Maliki said that Hussein and his codefendants were given a fair trial, and that it was his government's constitutional prerogative to carry out the death penalty. He said Hussein was shown greater respect than the former president gave to his rivals.

Maliki appeared to bristle at Bush's criticism, but he acknowledged that "mistakes had happened." He said he had personally given orders to his deputies to treat Hussein with respect before and after he was hanged.

He said the pressure Bush was feeling might have prompted the critical remarks.

"Maybe this has led to President Bush saying that he's sorry, or he's not happy, about the way the execution happened."

Significant developments like these are exactly the type of results the President is working toward. Iraqi officials must do more to defend their country and President Bush is making that clear. In turn, we must remain steadfast in our resolve to show the Iraqis that we will honor this renewed commitment by allowing the plan to proceed without trying to weaken it before it has a chance to work.

Our new Commander in Iraq, General David H. Petraeus, has testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that he would not be able to get his job done without an increase in troops.

Think about that Mr. President. Just two weeks ago, the Senate unanimously approved General Petraeus to head our efforts in Iraq, but some in this body would now restrict his efforts by scuttling the new strategy before the General has been given opportunity to perform.

Why would we support him and recognize his stellar career with a unanimous nomination vote, but say we would rather not give him the troops to get the job done we have sent him over there for?

General Petraeus also testified that the adoption of a Congressional resolution of disapproval of our efforts in

Iraq would not have a beneficial effect on our troops. I've felt all along that the field commanders should be given the opportunity to try the new plan of action.

Mr. President, I enter in the RECORD the following media report regarding General Petraeus' Senate confirmation hearing.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 2007]

GENERAL SAYS NEW STRATEGY IN IRAQ CAN
WORK OVER TIME

(By Michael R. Gordon)

Lt. Gen. David H. Petraeus, President Bush's new choice as the top commander in Iraq, told senators on Tuesday that the new military strategy to secure Baghdad can work, and that he had asked that the additional troops the administration promised be deployed as quickly as possible.

In his first public comments about Mr. Bush's plan to send some 21,500 troops, the general described the situation in Iraq as "dire" but not hopeless. He asserted that the "persistent presence" of American and Iraqi forces in strife-ridden Baghdad neighborhoods was a necessary step, but also cautioned that the mission would not succeed if the Iraqi government did not carry out its program of political reconciliation.

"The way ahead will be neither quick nor easy, and undoubtedly there will be tough days," he told the Senate Armed Services Committee. "We face a determined, adaptable, barbaric enemy. He will try to wait us out. In fact any such endeavor is a test of wills, and there are no guarantees."

But much of the hearing focused not on details of the strategy about to unfold in Iraq, but rather on the political debate within the Senate over resolutions that would signal disapproval of the new strategy.

When Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Republican of Arizona, who has long favored sending more troops to Iraq, asked if approval of a Senate resolution assailing Mr. Bush's new strategy could hurt the morale of American troops, the general replied, "It would not be a beneficial effect, sir."

Asked by Senator JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, who also backs the plan, if a resolution would also "give the enemy some encouragement" by suggesting that the American people are divided, General Petraeus replied, "That's correct, sir."

That answer sparked admonishments by critics of Mr. Bush's strategy, who insisted that the point of the Senate resolutions is to put pressure on the government of Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki of Iraq to follow through on its political program and take more responsibility for its own security.

"We know this policy is going forward," said Senator HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, Democrat of New York. "We know the troops are moving. We know that we're not likely to stop this escalation. But we are going to do everything we can to send a message to our government and the Iraqi government that they had better change, because the enemy we are confronting is adaptable."

Senator JOHN W. WARNER, the Virginia Republican who is promoting a resolution opposing Mr. Bush's troop reinforcement plan, cautioned General Petraeus to be sure that "this colloquy has not entrapped you into some responses that you might later regret."

By the end of the hearing, General Petraeus sought to extricate himself from the political tussle by insisting that as a military man he did not want to take a position on the Senate debate. "There are a number of resolutions out there," he said.

"Learning that minefields are best avoided and gone around rather than walked through

on some occasions, I'd like to leave that one there."

Senator Carl Levin of Michigan, the Democratic chairman of the panel, said later that he was satisfied that the general had not intended to involve himself in the debate. The exchanges at the hearing did not appear to have any ill effect on the prospects for the confirmation of General Petraeus, and Mr. McCain said he hoped the commander would "catch the next flight" to Iraq after winning Senate confirmation.

When their questions focused on the military plan, senators elicited several new details. General Petraeus said Lt. Gen. Raymond T. Odierno, the day-to-day commander of American troops in Iraq, advised that in order to carry out the new strategy, five additional brigades were needed in Baghdad and two additional battalions were needed in Anbar Province in western Iraq.

Under the current deployment schedule, it will be May before all five of the brigades are in Iraq, but General Petraeus hinted that he would like them sooner, saying that he had asked the Pentagon to dispatch them "as rapidly as possible."

General Petraeus acknowledged that the guidelines in the military's counterinsurgency manual implied that 120,000 troops would be needed to secure Baghdad. But he reasoned that the roughly 32,000 American troops that would be deployed in the capital under the plan would be enough, because the total number of American and Iraqi security personnel would be about 85,000, while the use of civilian contractors to guard government buildings would reduce troop requirements.

If the troops are sent according to the current schedule, General Petraeus said the United States would know by late summer if the plan to clear contested neighborhoods of insurgents and militias, hold them with American and Iraqi security forces and win public support through reconstruction was working.

He said he would raise the issue of suspending troop reinforcements with his military superiors if the Iraqi government appeared to have not lived up to its commitments. But he suggested that withholding assistance from specific Iraqi institutions that fall short would have a greater influence. The general also said that a decision to withdraw American troops within six months would lead to more sectarian attacks and increased "ethnic cleansing."

General Petraeus acknowledged that he had concerns about the absence of a unified command structure. Under the new plan, the Iraqi Army and police units will be under direct Iraqi command. The American Army units that work with them will be under a parallel American command. To ensure proper coordination, American officers are trying to establish joint command posts.

Senator Levin said his committee had repeatedly asked the administration to make available a list of the security and political "benchmarks" the Iraqi had agreed to meet. He warned that the committee would use its subpoena power or hold up military nominations if benchmarks were not provided.

By insisting on that the benchmarks be provided, Mr. Levin seemed to be trying to position himself to argue that the "surge" of reinforcements be suspended if the Iraqis fell short of meeting commitments.

There is no doubt that we face extremely difficult challenges in Iraq and we have not made enough progress. The citizens of Iraq must be willing to fight for their own freedom. The President recognizes this and his new plan is the result of increased commitments from the Iraqi Prime Minister.

Again, the cost of failure in Iraq is too great as far as our future long-term national security. It's in America's security interests to have an Iraq that can sustain, govern and defend itself. Too much is at stake to simply abandon Iraq at this point; the price of failure is too great.

I wish we could move forward and have legitimate votes on when we should leave or if we should reduce funding for the effort. But unfortunately we won't proceed to those votes due to a decision of the Democratic leadership.

Let me remind the American people, it is the majority leadership which determines the schedule here in the Senate. It is the Democratic leadership that does not want to have a real debate on Iraq. I would welcome an open and fair debate over our future involvement in Iraq and the Middle East.

Personally, I cannot and will not support a proposal that would at this time condemn the new strategy our Commander in Chief has advocated for—a strategy that requires our full support in order for it to succeed. I would rather have an opportunity to vote on Senator GREGG's amendment in support of what our troops are trying to accomplish rather than a resolution that does nothing but diminish morale, sow confusion and discord without achieving anything but short term political pandering. If we are going to debate, let's have a real debate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on the nomination of George Casey to be Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. I have had the occasion, as so many others have had, to visit Iraq on numerous occasions to talk to General Casey. I knew of him before his appointment to Iraq. I think you have to first begin assessing his tenure in Iraq by understanding the situation as he arrived. He arrived after the CPA—the Coalition Provisional Authority—under Mr. Bremer had made systematic and fundamental mistakes with respect to the occupation. He arrived, in fact, after our national command authority entered a country and attempted an occupation without a plan. That, I think, can be attributed to many people but not to George Casey. Without this plan, they were improvising constantly, both on the military side and on the civilian side.

The chief master of improvisation was Ambassador Jerry Bremer. He and his colleagues decided to disband the Iraqi Army without any alternative approach to retaining individuals, paying

them, or directing them into useful services. He also embarked on a very elaborate debaathification program.

In this time it became increasingly more obvious that our forces, because of the misguided and poor decisions by the President and the Secretary of Defense, were engaging in an occupation without sufficient resources. This became most obvious in Abu Ghraib, an incident that shocked the conscience of the world, shocked America particularly. Again, this all preceded George Casey.

When he arrived on the ground he had a situation of chaos, both administratively and also a situation in which the leadership of this Nation—not the officers but the civilian leadership—had grossly miscalculated in terms of successfully stabilizing this country.

Over the intervening months, General Casey established some degree of administrative routine, some degree of planning. He, along with colleagues such as General Petraeus, started an Iraqi training program. Once again, to understand what he saw when he came in, I can recall, as can many of my colleagues, going up and being briefed by Secretary Rumsfeld and others about the 200,000 Iraqi security forces. In fact, they usually pulled out a big pie chart which each week was designed to show the slice of American forces as growing smaller and smaller. That was a total fiction. These people could not be found. When they were found, they were not trained. Again, that is what George Casey inherited.

If people are trying to lay blame and accountability on someone, George Casey is somewhere in the middle or the end of the line. It begins at the top, with the President of the United States whose policies were flawed, with implementation that was incompetent. A large part of the burden should be shared by Secretary Rumsfeld whose personality, whose temperament added further to the chaos that we saw in Iraq. I think we could also include Secretary Wolfowitz and other civilians—Doug Feith, Steve Cambone all of them misguided and impervious to the reality of the ground in Iraq.

Yet just a few weeks ago, as Secretary Rumsfeld left, he was lauded by the President of the United States and the Vice President as the greatest Secretary of Defense we have ever had. That is really accountability.

This nomination is difficult in some respects because in that chaotic and difficult and challenging assignment, General Casey would be the first to admit that his performance was not without flaws. That is one of the appealing aspects of General Casey. He has a certain candor and honesty that he has generated throughout his entire career.

Today, we are debating his nomination. I will support that nomination. I will support it not because he succeeded in every endeavor but because he gave his last ounce of effort and energy to a very difficult and challenging

role. He made progress, but that progress today is hampered—but hampered not by his role, certainly, alone—but by strategic decisions that were made by the President, by the Secretary of Defense, and by many others.

Interestingly enough, too, this nomination is not strictly the result of the President's work, but it is also that of Bob Gates who, I think, is an individual of competence and character who has already created a new tone and a good tone in the Department of Defense. Secretary Gates thought long and hard about this, and in some respects to suggest that Casey is the wrong person for this job is to question the judgment of Bob Gates. At this point, I am not quite ready to do that.

I will support General Casey's nomination. He has an important role to play in the Army, an Army that because of this administration has been severely strained. All of the non-deployed units in the United States are not combat ready. There is a huge personnel turmoil caused by extended deployments overseas. The ability of the Army to modernize is sincerely compromised by operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. He has to face all these problems.

There is something else he has to face, too—and, again, it goes right back to the top. It is the selective realism of this President and his Cabinet and his civilian leadership. I was amazed to look at the budget released yesterday, the budget that General Casey will have to operate with, to find out that this administration is estimating the cost of operations in Iraq—not in this fiscal year but the following one, starting October 1, 2008—at a mere \$50 billion. Yes, I say a mere \$50 billion because this year we will spend about \$240 billion; yet next year it will remarkably be brought to \$50 billion, although General Pace told me in my questioning that they operate with the assumption at the Pentagon they will spend at least \$84 billion.

Where is this \$200 billion, or \$34 billion, disappearing? It is disappearing into the fiction that this administration is trying to project, not just about Iraq but the deficit reduction, their tax cut plans—all of these things. And General Casey will have to work with that budget.

And there are those in the Senate demanding we vote not to cut off funds for troops. We are not going to cut off funds. But I tell you what. If the President's budget is to be believed, come October 1 of 2008 there will be a huge reduction in funds for those troops in Iraq—but, then again, do we believe the President on this or many other issues?

I will vote for General Casey. I think he should be criticized for shortcomings that he admits readily, but he should not be condemned because he was carrying out a strategy and a policy that was seriously flawed when he arrived on the ground in Iraq. He has done his best to do the job he was given.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak 10 minutes in morning business.

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, of course, I will not—did I understand the Senator to say 10 minutes? We don't have any shortage of time, so I am not trying to restrict the Senator in any way. I just want to plan.

Mr. DEMINT. Ten minutes.

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

Mr. DEMINT. Madam President, I take a few minutes today, despite my hoarse voice, to discuss the fiscal year 2007 spending resolution that we will be debating next week.

The operations of the Federal Government are currently being funded by a temporary spending measure that expires on February 15, and the proposed resolution will fund the Government for the rest of the year.

It is important we understand how we got to this point. Last year, we did not debate and pass all of our annual spending bills before the November elections. When we came back after the election for the lameduck session, a few Members worked successfully to stop Congress from passing a last-minute, foot-tall omnibus spending bill—like this one—that would have been filled with thousands of wasteful earmarks. As a result, we passed an earmark-free stopgap spending measure that, if continued, would have saved the American taxpayer some \$17 billion.

There were several media reports last year that said Republicans were trying to push this debate into the future so Democrats would have to clean up this mess. That may have been true for some, but it was never true for me. My goal has always been to stop wasteful earmarks. I am happy to work with Members in either party to get that done. That is why I offered to work with the Democratic leader to pass a clean resolution this year that would not contain any new earmarks and that would keep spending at last year's levels.

While the Democratic leader did not work with me on this measure, I am pleased to say that it does not contain any new earmarks. Let me say that again so that there won't be any confusion. There are no new earmarks in this spending resolution. I applaud the Democrats for continuing the progress we started last year.

As my colleagues can see, this resolution is only 137 pages. That can be compared to where we were headed before we were able to stop the earmarks. It is a major improvement over the last omnibus spending bill we passed that has over 1,600 pages.

Let me make another point clear if I could. This resolution does not stop the administration from enacting the hundreds and even thousands of earmarks

that are not written into this bill. As my colleagues know, over 95 percent of all earmarks never show up in our bills but are buried in hidden committee reports that do not carry the force of law. This resolution says—the one we are considering next week—that the earmarks contained in fiscal year 2006, in the committee reports in 2006, shall have no legal effect. That is a good thing, but those earmarks had no legal effect anyway. The administration was not bound by them last year and is not bound by them now.

Also, this resolution is completely silent with respect to the earmarks in fiscal year 2007 in those committee reports. I am not sure why these reports were left out of this measure, but it appears to be a glaring mistake.

The supporters of this resolution say it is earmark-free. While that is technically true, earmarks can still sneak in the back door. I praise Democrats when they call for a moratorium on earmarks, but this resolution does not actually achieve that goal. That is why I am sending a letter to the President today asking him to do his part by prohibiting anyone in his administration from giving preference to any earmark request that is not legally binding. We need to put a stop to committee report earmarks. We need to end the practice where a Member calls up a Federal agency and threatens its funding if it does not fund that Member's pet project.

Our Federal agencies need to be free to use American tax dollars in ways that meet true national priorities rather than serving one special interest or another. The President has the power to stop secret earmarks. He said in his State of the Union that he wants to stop them. I hope he will do so.

This spending resolution has several other flaws. For example, it uses budget gimmicks to hide its true cost. The proponents say it does not exceed the budget, but that is less than honest. First, it cuts spending on national defense programs with the expectation that funds will be added as emergency spending later this year. This is not the time to cut defense and security spending while adding social programs. It is not honest to hide spending this way. Second, the resolution also pays for new spending by cutting funding in budget accounts that are already empty. These are phony offsets, and they should not be used.

This resolution not only pretends to reduce spending in places where it does not, it also fails to reduce spending where it should. First, the resolution leaves out thousands of congressional earmarks worth billions of dollars. Rather than passing those savings along to American taxpayers, it spends them on other programs. Second, this resolution fails to eliminate a number of programs which were proposed for termination by the President and agreed to last year by the House and the Senate Committee on Appropriations. These programs should be terminated, but this resolution fails to do so.

There are a number of problems with this resolution. I hope we can fully debate this measure and offer amendments to make it stronger.

I understand the Democratic leader does not intend to allow amendments, which is very unfortunate since we have plenty of time to consider and debate them. The current stopgap spending measure lasts for another week, and the House can easily take up our final bill and pass it in a matter of hours. I am glad there are no new earmarks written into the text of this resolution, and I thank my colleagues for that, but if we are not allowed to fix other problems in this resolution, I will not be able to support it.

As I am sure many of my colleagues remember, I came to the floor a few weeks ago and had a spirited and important debate with the Democratic leader on how the Senate will disclose earmarks. We worked through that issue and came to a bipartisan agreement that resulted in earmark disclosure rules that were unanimously approved. It was a clear example of how this body can and should work together. I believe we can do that again on this resolution. I hope the Democratic leader will reconsider his position and work with us to allow a limited number of amendments.

Madam President, I yield the floor and the remainder of my time.

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

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. No objection.

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

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I wish to address the body and my colleagues about Iraq, the complex situation that exists there today, the resolution we were not able to address on the floor this week. My hope is we will be able to address this resolution in the very near future.

Iraq is one of the most important and, certainly, complex subjects we will ever debate on this floor. For example, there are some Members of this body who want to reduce this to an either/or decision: surge into Iraq or withdraw from it. But the issue cannot be discussed in such oversimplified terms, I do not believe. Our decisions, whatever they end up being, carry consequences far beyond the number of troops who are deployed within Iraq's borders. Those who favor a withdrawal or a phased withdrawal from Iraq must wholly appreciate those consequences.

We have heard that withdrawal from Iraq would leave a safe haven for ter-

rorists. That is almost certainly assured. We have heard that withdrawal would destabilize the region. That is certainly true as well. But a withdrawal is even worse than that. A cut-and-run strategy would set the stage for a regionwide conflict between gulf states, Arab countries, and Iran and its sphere of influence, and not just a regional war but a bigger one. Such a war would have enormous implications for the war on terrorism and stability around the world. We cannot withdraw from the Middle East and leave behind the kind of chaos in which al-Qaida thrives. If Arabs feel compelled to counter an Iranian threat, the governments are likely to become more radical, not more moderate. We recognized in the aftermath of September 11 that winning the war on terror requires the emergence of moderate governments across the Middle East. Withdrawing from Iraq would amount to pushing the governments of the region toward the arms of Islamist radicals and undermine the core of our counterterrorism strategy since 9/11. This is not the way to go.

We must acknowledge that we cannot afford to lose in Iraq because such a loss would reverse the gains we have made in the war on terror and extend the war on terror for years to come. On the other hand, I am not convinced that a troop surge into Iraq will usher in the sort of peace we need to take the place of the consequences I have just discussed.

I have no doubt our forces are capable of winning any and every individual battle in which they engage. I have been with the troops. I have been with the troops within the past month. They are strong. They are determined. They are courageous. And they are doing a fabulous job. I believe strongly they are capable of defeating the al-Qaida insurgency in Iraq and, as they have demonstrated recently, they are quite capable of defeating Iranian agents seeking to foment violence and instability inside of Iraq. What they cannot do, what our troops cannot do, is achieve a political solution between Iraq's sectarian groups. That is a political problem which requires a political solution. As I found out during my recent travels to Iraq, the sectarian violence is the overwhelming cause of Iraq's difficulties. Additional troops on the streets simply will not make Sunni and Shia trust each other.

I say this with great respect to General Petraeus, who is a friend, whom we have confirmed to be the commander of the multinational forces in Iraq. I met with General Petraeus several times during his tenure when he was commander at Fort Leavenworth in my home State of Kansas. He is a bright, articulate, and outstanding officer. I believe he is well qualified to take on this extraordinarily difficult assignment. I voted to confirm him because he is the right man for such a difficult position, and I wish him Godspeed.

I understand there are different constitutional roles that must be played in the debate over our strategy in Iraq. The President has the responsibility as Commander in Chief to direct the Armed Forces. As part of that responsibility, he sent us a commander he believes will serve well under his overall direction, and I could not agree more.

The Senate has the right, if it chooses, to express its opinion of the President's actions. And we do so. It is entirely possible for the Senate to express its disapproval of the President's strategy without taking steps to undermine the commander or the troops. I have indicated that I do not support the President's surge plan, but I did not attempt to undermine the Commander in Chief or our soldiers in the field by voting against General Petraeus, who is very well qualified for command, nor will I attempt or support efforts to undermine our troops by withdrawing their funding. This is the essence of disagreeing at home while being united overseas.

A Senate debate over strategy is consistent with our constitutional roles to voice opinion and oversee the executive branch. Denying promotions of qualified leaders or cutting funding to the troops in the field would not only be inappropriate but irresponsible.

Let me now turn to those things which I endorse wholeheartedly.

First, I support our troops. They are brave, as I have stated, dedicated, and talented. They deserve not only our admiration and gratitude but our very best efforts to help them achieve their mission. And I support that mission. Our troops are vital to prevent the kind of regional instability I spoke of earlier. They are crucial to denying radical Islamic extremists a safe haven from which they can launch further attacks. They are essential to providing the training necessary for the Iraqi security forces to take charge of their own country's security.

As I have said, we cannot afford to lose this fight. Iraq is the key front in the war on terrorism. We must remain in Iraq as long as it takes to ensure that Iraq can fend off external threats in a tough neighborhood as well as take full responsibility for its own internal security and prevent the establishment of terrorist safe havens within its territory. But I fully understand we cannot sustain this kind of long-term commitment in Iraq that will likely be necessary unless we have bipartisan support here at home. We must be united here if we are to achieve victory over there.

This principle was at the foundation of the efforts of the Baker-Hamilton commission, which sought to bring people together on a way forward that could have broad support. I supported the commission's report as something we could rally around together. I do not agree with every part of that report. Some recommendations, such as those linking the Arab-Israeli conflict with the problems in Iraq, just do not

seem to make sense to me. Neither a peace accord between Israel and Palestinians nor new arrangements in the Golan Heights will convince Iran or al-Qaida to get out of Iraq or end the sectarian violence. But I supported the overall report because it could have been something we could use to build bipartisan support for a new strategy in Iraq.

If we cannot rally around that report, perhaps we can rally around a Senate resolution that can gain strong bipartisan support, uniting us here to win over there. Many of us have been working toward this goal. Many of us support a resolution or resolutions that provide responsible opposition to the surge. We do not want to see funds withdrawn from our troops, nor do we believe in withdrawing from Iraq. I hope the party now in the majority in this Chamber will articulate exactly what it can support.

There has been a lot of discussion in the last several days about funding for our troops. I am concerned that already there are plans to use the supplemental and the regular appropriations process to restrict funding for operations in Iraq. Our troops face the threat of real casualties daily. They ought not be casualties of our debates on Iraq.

I have indicated my support for the Warner resolution because it responsibly articulates an opposition to the surge while guaranteeing our troops in the field have the support they deserve from this body and from the American public. This is a responsible approach. I hope that whatever resolution reaches the floor includes a promise of support for our troops. I will not support proposals that do not include such provisions. We need this debate, and we need to vote on this.

I believe there is a way we can come together across the aisle. I think we can be clear about our priorities. The first priority I think we can agree on is getting the Iraqis to work and agree on a political solution to the sectarian violence occurring between Sunnis and Shias. We must encourage the Iraqis to reach a political equilibrium, eliminating the motivation for sectarian strife. We should make sure Iraq's borders are secure. We should chase the foreign fighters out of Iraq and deny the terrorists safe haven. And we should limit the influence of Iran.

I believe we can sustain this kind of military strategy for the necessary time to come, preserving our interests while we put pressure on Iraq's various groups to reach a political settlement. For this reason, I have indicated support for the resolution, as I stated, put forward by Senator WARNER. I believe it is the most constrictive resolution we will consider. It outlines the importance of winning in Iraq, opposes the surge, offers reasonable political and military goals, and praises the efforts of our men and women in uniform. This resolution moves us toward the kind of consensus needed for success.

Other proposals that fail to recognize the consequences of failure, that advocate a precipitous withdrawal, or that provide less than full support for our men and women in uniform, polarize, move us away from consensus and further from victory.

Madam President, the Senate needs to express itself on the subject of Iraq. I hope we can get to a vote on a resolution that will have strong bipartisan support that achieves the goals I have outlined and sustains our commitments for as long as it takes to win in Iraq. We need to have an open process. We need to be able to vote on various resolutions. This is the most important issue facing our country. We should have a full, open debate and debate about it a long time and vote on several resolutions that people see as key. We need to address this, and we need to do it now. We can win. We must pull together.

Madam President, I thank the Chair and 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. COCHRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, there has been much debate and discussion about President Bush's plan for a new way forward in Iraq. In fact, there was much discussion between the President and his team of military and civilian advisers prior to his making the decision to change course and outline a new strategy to help bring stability to the country and to hasten the day when our troops could come home.

There is no easy answer and no easy solution to the situation in Iraq and the Middle East. The President's decision was informed by input from many sources, including his national security advisers, civilian and military, members of his Cabinet, his intelligence experts, as well as Members of Congress, foreign leaders, and others with foreign policy experience. In the end, it was the President who decided this new strategy and that this new strategy had the best chance of success.

He acknowledged, and we all know, there is no guarantee of success. But the dangers are too great to not try to create an opportunity to provide an increased level of stability in Iraq. A temporary deployment of additional U.S. troops in Iraq to support the Iraqi security forces will provide a new window of opportunity for Iraqi political and economic initiatives to take hold and reduce sectarian violence.

The President and his military and civilian advisers reviewed last year's

efforts and determined there were not enough troops to secure the cleared neighborhoods. They also determined that unnecessarily burdensome operational restrictions were placed on the military. The President and our military leaders have assured us that these mistakes will not be repeated.

Prime Minister Maliki has assured us that more Iraqi troops will be engaged in the fight and that political restrictions will be removed. In addition, the Prime Minister of Iraq has committed to take responsibility for security for all Iraq provinces by November, to work to pass legislation to share oil revenues equitably among Iraqi citizens, and to spend \$10 billion of Iraqi reserve funds for reconstruction and initiatives that will create jobs. He will also work toward demobilizing militias, holding provincial elections, and reforming deBaathification laws, which should help improve the civil structure so the Government can meet the needs of its people and help promote economic growth.

Last week the National Intelligence Estimate, entitled "Prospects for Iraq's Stability: A Challenging Road Ahead," was delivered to Congress. I will not speak to the 90-page classified report. But there were some unclassified judgments provided to us that I can mention. Within this National Intelligence Estimate, this information is provided to support these conclusions:

If strengthened Iraqi security forces, more loyal to the government and supported by Coalition forces, are able to reduce levels of violence and establish more effective security for Iraq's population, Iraqi leaders could have an opportunity to begin the process of political compromise necessary for longer-term stability, political progress, and economic recovery.

Nevertheless, even if violence is diminished, given the current winner-take-all attitude and sectarian animosities infecting the political scene, Iraqi leaders will be hard pressed to achieve sustained political reconciliation in the timeframe of this Estimate.

Coalition capabilities, including force levels, resources, and operations, remain an essential stabilizing element in Iraq. If Coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this Estimate, [that is 12 to 18 months] we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq, intensify Sunni resistance to the Iraqi government, and have adverse consequences for national reconciliation.

If such a rapid withdrawal were to take place, we judge that the ISF [Iraqi Security Forces] would be unlikely to survive as a nonsectarian national institution: neighboring countries—invited by Iraqi factions or unilaterally—might intervene openly in the conflict; massive civilian casualties and forced population displacement would be probable; AQI [al-Qaida in Iraq] would attempt to use parts of the country—particularly al-Anbar province—to plan increased attacks in and outside of Iraq; and spiraling violence and political disarray in Iraq, along with Kurdish moves to control Kirkuk and strengthen autonomy, could prompt Turkey to launch a military incursion.

Madam President, these statements remind me of prepared testimony pre-

sented by Dr. Henry Kissinger to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 31. He indicated that U.S. forces are indispensable and withdrawal would not only have dire consequences in Iraq but would also have a negative impact on the region. I will quote from Dr. Kissinger's testimony at that hearing in the Senate:

The disenchantment of the American public with the burdens it has borne largely alone for nearly four years has generated growing demands for some type of unilateral withdrawal, usually expressed as benchmarks to be put to the Baghdad government that, if not fulfilled in specific timeframes, would trigger American disengagement.

But under present conditions, withdrawal is not an option. American forces are indispensable. They are in Iraq not as a favor to its government or as a reward for its conduct. They are there as an expression of the American national interest to prevent the Iranian combination of imperialism and fundamentalist ideology from dominating a region on which the energy supplies of the industrial democracies depend. An abrupt American departure would greatly complicate efforts to stem the terrorist tide far beyond Iraq; fragile governments from Lebanon to the Persian Gulf would be tempted into preemptive concessions. It might drive the sectarian conflict in Iraq to genocidal dimensions beyond levels that impelled U.S. intervention in the Balkans. Graduated withdrawal would not ease these dangers until a different strategy was in place and showed progress. For now, it would be treated within Iraq and in the region as the forerunner of a total withdrawal, and all parties would make their dispositions on that basis.

President Bush's decision should, therefore, not be debated in terms of the "stay the course" strategy he has repeatedly disavowed in recent days. Rather, it should be seen as the first step toward a new grand strategy relating power to diplomacy for the entire region, ideally on a nonpartisan basis.

The purpose of the new strategy should be to demonstrate that the United States is determined to remain relevant to the outcome in the region; to adjust American military deployments and numbers to emerging realities; and to provide the maneuvering room for a major diplomatic effort to stabilize the Middle East. Of the current security threats in Iraq—the intervention of outside countries, the presence of al-Qaida fighters, an extraordinarily large criminal element, the sectarian conflict—the United States has a national interest in defeating the first two; it must not involve itself in the sectarian conflict for any extended period, much less let itself be used by one side for its sectarian goals.

Madam President, it is clear to me from Dr. Kissinger's comments that it is truly in our national interest to support the President's new strategy to help provide a new opportunity for political and economic solutions in Iraq and for more effective diplomatic efforts in the Middle East region. Of course, we know there are no guarantees of success. But according to the National Intelligence Estimate, the perspective of one of our most experienced foreign policy experts, Dr. Kissinger, included maintaining the current course or withdrawal without additional stability in Iraq will be harmful to our national interests and to the entire region.

Over the last few weeks, there have been a number of hearings in which the

situation in Iraq and the President's new plan have been debated. During the January 30, 2007, hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on his nomination to be Deputy Secretary of State, Ambassador John Negroponte stated:

... I believed, and still believe, that it is possible for Iraq to make a successful transition to democracy. What I would like to say is that my belief that success in Iraq remains possible is based on my experience in dealing with Iraq as U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. and Ambassador to Iraq, and as Director of National Intelligence.

We know there are challenges in Iraq and in the region. And the President has developed a new strategy for dealing with the problem, which I applaud. This includes involving the Government in Iraq and the military forces and the police in Iraq in a more aggressive way. Together they have worked with our military and diplomatic leadership to come up with a new plan that, if it is not undermined by the Congress, has a chance of succeeding.

During the January 23 hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the nomination of General David Petraeus to be Commander of the Multinational Forces-Iraq, General Petraeus said:

I believe this plan can succeed if, in fact, all of those enablers and all the rest of the assistance is, in fact, provided.

He, also, indicated this:

It will not be easy, but if we could get them to where they are shouting instead of shooting, that would be a very substantial improvement.

Madam President, it is obvious to me we need to do what we can to help stabilize this situation and bring our troops home. As a beginning point for this strategy, for it to work, we should show a commitment by our country to success. I support this new initiative, and I think we should give it a chance to work.

This does not mean we should not monitor the situation or that the plan should not be adjusted as new developments occur. But we need to move forward in hopes of stabilizing Iraq, stabilizing the region, and in hopes of bringing our troops home at an early date. The President deserves our support in this effort, and I intend to support him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OBAMA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business on Iraq.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this whole debate regarding what the Senate should do and how to send the right

messages regarding Iraq war policy is important, but the most important message the Senate can send, to me, would be to our troops and to our potential enemies.

Everybody in America understands the war is not going well. Those who don't understand it are in denial because it clearly has not been the success we were hoping for.

The new strategy we are about to embark on, the Petraeus doctrine, for lack of a better word, I do believe has the best chance left for us to succeed, and additional troops in Iraq can make a huge difference. We have been able to clear in the past but never hold. We don't need any more combat power to clear. We have won every battle we have ever been in with the insurgents. But we have been unable to hold the territory. Mr. President, 17,500 more troops in Baghdad would allow us to hold territory for the purpose of political reconciliation.

The ultimate question for the body is how to bring out the best in the Iraqi political leadership. Some say we need to send a strong message that we are going to leave at a date certain, threaten to cut off funding for the Iraqi military, quit providing security to political leaders in Iraq.

My answer is that democracy is hard without being shot at. The reason we don't solve immigration, Social Security, and other emotional problems is because in our own country we get locked down by pretty extreme voices who have political action committees and run 527 ads.

The problem the Iraqi political leadership has to deal with is a violent country, to the point where it is hard to get political compromise. It is tough to go to Baghdad and do an oil-sharing revenue agreement among Sunnis, Kurds, and Shias when 100 of your constituents have been shot in the head and left out in the street that day.

So I believe precondition to political reconciliation is better security and the better security can only be achieved by going into militia strongholds that were previously off limits, by more combat capability on the ground to hold territory cleared, and by putting the Iraqi troops out front with a sufficient support network behind them and American hands to give them the capacity they are lacking today to deal with the insurgency.

The McCain-Graham-Lieberman resolution understands a million troops won't matter if the Iraqi political leadership doesn't reach political consensus on oil, rule of law, and on a million other problems they have. But the benchmarks in our resolution are an acknowledgment that it takes political compromise in Iraq to bring about stability, but we cannot have that political compromise with this level of violence.

The resolution also talks about a failed state in Iraq and the consequences to this country. They are long lasting and far reaching. A failed

state in Iraq is partitioned, where the civil war environment spreads to the region, as a disaster. So if you throw in the towel on Iraq, you don't stop the fight; you guarantee a larger fight.

The debate for the Senate is how many votes should we have to express the differences we have in this body? If the Warner-Levin resolution—I respect both authors, but I just disagree with the message it sends—if Warner-Levin is ever adopted by this body, the headlines throughout this world will be: Senate condemns surge. Baghdad lost.

The resolution disapproves of sending more troops. I believe we need more troops in the short term to bring about political reconciliation. But it is not only me saying it. It is General Petraeus, the commander. I think the message from the resolution considers his efforts lost before they have had a chance to be implemented. It is a lack of resolve in terms of the enemy. The enemy will see this as a lack of resolve on our part, and no good comes from it because it doesn't stop the troops.

Secondly, it says you can continue operations in Anbar, the Sunni area where al-Qaida is operating, but you can't go into Baghdad. Baghdad is a mess. Baghdad is a very violent place where they have sectarian violence occurring. The question is: Do we stop it now or let it grow bigger? There are 6 million people in Baghdad. The nightmare I worry about is an open civil war, where we have a bloodletting that will bring in Sunni Arab nations to come to the aid of their Sunni brothers, Iran will get involved in the south of Iraq, and nothing good will come of that.

The reason we are having this sectarian violence is because al-Qaida struck the mother lode when it bombed the Golden Mosque in Samarra, the third most holy religious site in the Shia religion. That has created sectarian fighting that has gotten out of control.

For decades, Sunnis and Shias married and lived together in Baghdad and other places. The Shia population was terribly oppressed during the Saddam Hussein regime, but the Shia majority had remarkable restraint up until the bombing of the mosque, which was al-Qaida inspired. I don't want to give in to acts of terrorism that bring out the worst in people.

Our goal is not to get the oil from Iraq; it is not to create a puppet state for the United States in Iraq. It is to bring out the best in the Iraqi people, to allow the moderates in the region a chance to conquer and defeat the extremists who have no place for anybody other than only their way of doing business, including us.

We can't kill enough of the terrorists to win, but we surely can empower the moderates so they have a chance of winning.

I am glad we did not take a vote in isolation on Warner-Levin. It would have been 50-something votes, less than 60, and the headlines throughout the

world would read: Surge condemned. Baghdad lost. It would have been embarrassing to the President. This is not about President Bush being embarrassed. It is about the message we send to our troops and our enemies.

The reason the Senate is not the House is because we have a chance for the minority; we have a chance to have a healthy, full debate. We were asking for two votes, not one. If you are going to vote on Warner-Levin, fine, I will come to the floor and take the responsibility for opposing it, vote against it, and argue vehemently that it undercuts our efforts in Iraq. But there was another vote being proposed on the Judd Gregg amendment that simply said we will not cut off funding, we will not cap troops as a statement of this body. It would have gotten 70 votes. And the reason we couldn't have those two votes, in my opinion, is because the Democratic left—and we have them on the right—would have ginned up and gone nuts over the idea that the Democratic caucus would not cut off funding for a war that the Democratic left thought should have ended last week.

I know what it is like. I have been through this on immigration. Once your base gets mad at you, it is not pleasant, but you can't build policies around bloggers.

So I am glad the Senate did not take a single vote that was designed to embarrass a single political element in the country. If we are going to debate Iraq on the floor of the Senate, we should be willing to take more than one vote. Two votes is not too much to ask.

Where we go from here, I don't know. I can't promise success from this new strategy, but I can promise the consequences of failure, and these young men and women who will leave to go off as part of this new strategy, I know every Member of the Senate wishes them well and prays for their safety. But I do hope as they leave, we do not take any action to undercut their efforts because of 2008 politics. The war in Iraq is much bigger than the next election.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

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

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, during the course of the afternoon, a group of Republican Senators have been meeting, including our final meeting with our distinguished Republican leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, and our assistant Republican leader, Senator LOTT. We now have a letter signed by seven Senators: myself, Senator COLLINS, Senator SMITH, Senator VOINOVICH, Senator SNOWE, Senator HAGEL, and Senator COLEMAN. The letter is addressed

to our two Republican leaders and to the distinguished majority leader, Senator REID, and the assistant majority leader, Senator DURBIN.

I would like to now read the text of the letter to place it into the Record:

Dear Leaders: The war in Iraq is the most pressing issue of our time. It urgently deserves the attention of the full Senate and a full debate on the Senate floor without delay.

We respectfully advise you, our leaders, that we intend to take S. Con. Res. 7 and offer it, where possible, under the Standing Rules of the Senate, to bills coming before the Senate.

On January 10, 2007, the President stated, with respect to his Iraq strategy, "if Members have improvements that can be made, we will make them. If circumstances change, we will adjust." In a conscientious, respectful way, we offered our resolution consistent with the President's statement.

We strongly believe the Senate should be allowed to work its will on our resolution as well as on the concepts brought forward by other Senators. Monday's procedural vote should not be interpreted as any lessening of our resolve to go forward advocating the concepts of S. Con. Res. 7.

We will explore all of our options under the Senate procedures and practices to ensure a full and open debate on the Senate floor. The current stalemate is unacceptable to us and to the people of this country.

Mr. President, for reference purposes, a copy of S. Con. Res. 7 is printed in the RECORD of Monday, February 5, 2007 at page 51556.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the debate over whether we should be supporting or withdrawing our support from the President's plan to surge over 20,000 more troops into Iraq, I am acutely aware of one overriding irony. Those who are seeking to begin the withdrawal from Iraq are committing the same conceptual error that many of the same critics have accused the administration of committing when they made their flawed plans for the invasion of Iraq. They are not thinking about what will happen on the day after we begin our withdrawal.

Let me say that the situation in which we find ourselves today in Iraq is certainly in part due to the administration's failure to anticipate many variables in the Iraqi theater, in the region, and in Iraqi society. Those who prepared only for the military defeat of Saddam's forces committed such a profound error that it will be a lesson learned in the history books long after we are gone.

We did not prepare for the vehemence with which certain elements of the displaced Sunni elite would fight to retain their status quo.

We did not anticipate how fractured and weak the oppressed Shia society of

Iraq would be once the dictator was deposed, and we did not appreciate how unprepared the Shia would be to present true leadership.

And we did not anticipate, because we apparently did not plan for this, that a political and leadership vacuum created by the fall of Saddam would invite the influence of Iran, whose interests in Iraq are anything but charitable.

The mistakes that we have read so much about—the failure to secure massive ammunition dumps, the peremptory disbanding of the Iraqi army, the sweeping de-Baathification policies that alienated many Sunnis not directly responsible for the Saddam's tyranny—all of these mistakes derive from our failure to think about what would happen in Iraq the day after Saddam fell. It was a much more profound mistake than not sending enough troops; we simply did not imagine that we would be facing problems that would require more troops.

Thinking of what was the most fundamental criticisms of our failures to anticipate the terror of September 11, I am reminded of the 9/11 Commission's conclusion that we did not have the imagination to prepare for that attack.

In Iraq, where our imagination failed again, a thorough understanding of Iraqi history and society should have helped.

I am not talking about rehashing the history of imperialists, who would argue to justify their creation of the unnatural state of Iraq, or who would argue about the superiority of one sect over the other.

I am not talking about the history as told by anthropologists, who argue about ancient fights and long-simmering disputes.

A thorough study and understanding of Iraq would have required us—and the top policymakers of this administration—to understand the complexity of Iraqi society as it was in 2003. And if we had done so, we would have had the imagination to prepare for the many contingencies that quite naturally developed when we so boldly sought to change the status quo.

We know that we had next to no intelligence on Iraq—and if you have read the latest NIE on Iraq put out last Friday, you will be dismayed, as I am, to read that we have very little more intelligence today.

But how about open source knowledge on which we could have made more careful assessments of what to expect the day after the tyrant toppled?

It was a tragic mistake to underestimate the role of criminality underpinning Saddam's regime in its last decrepit days, a criminality that was unleashed immediately after we invaded and which has added great complexity to the conflict among the many armed groups in Iraq today.

But we should not have underestimated the reluctance with which the Sunnis would accept their new declassified position in Iraq.

We should not have overestimated the ability of the Shia, with no political experience, to assume political power. Had we properly assumed the difficulties that we would have faced, we should have been prepared for a period of instability, during which the neighbor to the east, Iran, would not sit idle.

I say this because I cannot support the administration today without honestly assessing what happened in the preparation and implementation of this war over 4 years ago.

And now, 4 years later, the Senate has determined to take up an increasingly partisan debate over what to do to prevent losing the Iraq war.

And we are now debating a variety of what I hope will be non-binding resolutions in response to the President's announcement to surge 21,500 troops into the Iraq conflict.

This is an extremely somber moment in the history of this nation. We find ourselves in the midst of a war that it appears some still do not fully understand. It is a war whose dynamics and politics are completely in flux, and with the consequences of both our actions in the field—as well as in our politics right here—being profound for the Iraqi people, the Middle East region and our national security.

Make no mistake: What we do communicate is America's political will, and our political will is directly related to the morale of our troops. Those who seek to, for rhetorical purposes only, assert their support of the troops while communicating their opposition to their mission cannot sever this natural connection between political will and morale.

While it is always good for the Senate to debate great matters of war and peace—and, indeed, there are no more important matters—the imbalance between partisan rhetoric and substantive direction on this question has been, to my mind, unsettling. A perilous state of war in Iraq is not improved by the partisan level of debate here.

I have watched the course of this conflict with increasing concern and dismay.

As I said, I have been profoundly disappointed in realizing the errors we have made in implementing this war.

I have been greatly dismayed in the failure of the Iraqi people to resist the descent into sectarian violence, and their failure to demand leadership from their elected leaders.

I have been horrified by the level of barbarism. I have not been surprised, I must say, by the Sunni jihadists, whose barbarism should be well known by now, but by Shia militias, who, operating under a government dominated by the Iraqi Shia for the first time in modern Iraq's history, seem to operate without restraint or morality by their authorities in their nihilistic persecution of their real and perceived enemies. I can understand the sense of revenge one must feel when one has been

released from decades of oppression; I can understand the anger and despair one feels when one's family is targeted for murder; I can appreciate the rage when one's shrines and mosques are bombed. I will never understand a revenge that takes as its victims other innocents and noncombatants.

The American people have been shocked by this level of brutality as well—but we shouldn't call it mindless, because in the diabolic minds of the Sunni al-Qaida and ex-Baathist perpetrators, it has a reason: to push Iraq into chaos. In the minds of the bloody Shia militia leaders like Moqtada al-Sadr, there is also a rationale: Their militias complete the cyclical logic of barbarism.

In this cycle is perpetuated a nihilistic violence that will so destabilize Iraq that the Sunni jihadists will be able to create a safe haven where they will expand their reach and refocus on their long-term goals. They are succeeding, and if they succeed they will focus on us.

In this cycle is perpetuated a nihilistic violence that will so destabilize Iraq that the Shia will be left so victimized and subject to militia rule that Iran will further assert its influence to undermine this fledgling nation. If post-Saddam Iraq succeeds, its success would provide the Shia world with an alternate model to the corrupt and failing regime in Tehran. If it fails, Tehran will have a field in which to meddle for years.

The Iraqi Shia, so traumatized by years of oppression under Saddam, and traumatized—let us be perfectly honest about this—by America misleading them and neglecting them in their hour of need immediately after the first gulf war—have failed to stand up and present political figures who can assert leadership instead of political impotence.

Iran is not a passive player here, no. It is not in Iran's interest for the Iraqi Shia to build a strong, independent, Shia Arab state.

It is not in Iran's interest to have the seminaries of Najaf and Karbala returned to their central position in the world of Shia scholarship, possibly eclipsing Qum. To have this occur would lessen the legitimacy Iran desperately needs as ideological cover for Persian supremacy. The Iraqi Shia, Arabs who were the rank-and-file cannon fodder in the 8-year war against Iran, are now left open to Iran's meddling by their own weak government.

The Sunnis, Iraqi and others throughout the region, are quick to tell us we have fallen into a preexisting and ancient conflict between the Arabs and the Persians, and the Iraqi Shia and their seemingly hapless leaders are caught in between. And that is where we find ourselves today.

Now the Senate is to respond to the policy advanced by the President before the Nation on January 10.

We are to express approval or disapproval to the President's initiative

in the middle of a war like this Nation has never faced. At a moment when the situation in Iraq is critical and the outcome is uncertain, some believe our exercise here will provide valuable clarity.

As I have said, it is fitting that the Senate debate this war.

From the day we passed a resolution authorizing the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein the fall of 2002, it has been fitting to debate this war, and we have, through many floor speeches and amendments to authorizing or appropriating legislation. Whether it is fitting that we respond to the President's latest change in military strategy with these resolutions is another matter.

I have paid a great deal of attention to the hearings held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. I thank and commend the chairmen and ranking minority members of both committees for the many opportunities for substantive review they have sought to present to us and to the American public.

Dozens of substantive testimonies have been submitted, and the questioning has been, in many cases, direct and detailed.

As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I have also had the opportunity to listen to the opinions of the leaders of the intelligence community, and I have read the reports coming from Iraq including, most recently, the National Intelligence Estimate released last Friday.

The public needs to be reminded: There are no silver bullets, no glowing assessments, no confident predictions.

Surrounding this debate, there is a level of political taunting amongst ourselves that I find troubling.

From the majority leader, I hear public pronouncements of 21 Republican seats to be defended in 2008—and I find it disturbing that anyone would question that a Senator of any party would hinge his or her voice on such momentous policy problems for the purpose of personal political survival.

Does anyone doubt that the November election in 2008 is a world away from the carnage of Iraq today?

Can anyone predict with certainty what the situation will be in Iraq almost 2 years from now?

I do not like the rhetoric of "cut and run" any more than I like the rhetoric accusing members of my party for "heading for the tall grass."

Lives are in balance and we should not be throwing around glib rhetoric.

In that sense, the exclamation of a member of my party 2 weeks ago that we should all be accountable on these resolutions or go be shoe salesmen has a certain urgency, although I do not condescend to the working man, a good many of whom are fighting in this war as we speak.

Nor do I believe that if I go and buy a pair of shoes from a good shoe salesman today that those shoes will not last longer and give better value than

some of the resolutions being bandied about today, to be forgotten months from now when the war will bring to us either the reality of some progress toward stability, more stalemate in strife or even greater chaos.

One should predict the future with caution and humility. But, I can make one prediction here, particularly to those on the other side of the aisle: Iraq will be a central issue before this Congress, and before the next administration, in 2009.

We cannot make it go away before then. There is no way that a withdrawal begun now will leave a new administration free from the policy problems presented by Iraq.

So we should liberate ourselves right now from seeking partisan advantage, because as much as some may wish to walk away from Iraq, its relevance to our security and standing is not going to diminish. Not for a long time.

I will support the President's plan for this surge, and I will support any resolution that articulates such support, provided I can agree with all of its language. In doing so, I am acutely aware that the situation we are addressing is at least in some part a function of policy failures committed by this administration.

Admitting this, I have to say that I am unaware, through my reading of American military and diplomatic history, of any conflict in the midst of which our leaders saw clearly the end. Rarely have outcomes been perceivable through the shifting tactics and circumstances that war presented in the moment of greatest chaos.

Many times, in hot wars and cold wars, we have reassessed and changed policy.

Retroactive analysis and accountability are important—sometimes it is critical to understand minor and major mistakes in order to correct flawed policy—but the challenge is to seek the policy amongst the realistic options that will best deliver us to our goals for the future, not to sink in self-satisfying denunciations of the past.

I have read each of these resolutions carefully. I oppose the original Biden amendment, because I fundamentally disagree with it.

Its first resolution clause states:

It is not in the national interest of the U.S. to deepen its military involvement in Iraq, particularly by escalating the United States military force presence in Iraq.

I deeply disagree.

Not only does this set up a potential constitutional conflict between the executive and legislature as to who runs foreign policy in a war, its intent is to inhibit the President from trying to improve the situation in Iraq at a perilous time. Further, to maintain the status quo in Iraq, as this clause implies, is to guarantee greater chaos in Iraq.

If the opponents of the President want to force a withdrawal, shouldn't they say so directly?

The second clause of the original Biden resolution stated:

The primary objective of U.S. strategy in Iraq should be to have the Iraqi political leaders make the political compromises necessary to end the violence in Iraq.

When I read this, I have to ask, where have the authors of this language been? That was our strategy, which we tried mightily, from 2004 until last year: to let politics lead the way to security. But the forces of insurgency and chaos overwhelmed the fledgling political process and now we clearly realize we have to implement and achieve security before we can regain political process.

Am I the only one here who finds it ironic that critics of the administration who support this resolution appear to be advocating a policy that has failed?

The next clause reads:

Greater concerted regional and international support would assist the Iraqis in achieving a political and national reconciliation.

This is not a policy option, but a dreamer's delusion. It is true, in the abstract, that international support would be greatly beneficial to the Iraqis. But if you look at the region, this dream of international cooperation is not based on reality. Aspirations should not substitute for harsh reality.

Then the resolution states:

Main elements of the mission of the U.S. forces in Iraq should transition to helping ensure the territorial integrity of Iraq, conduct counterterrorism activities, reduce regional interference in the internal affairs of Iraq, and accelerate training of Iraqi troops.

But, we are conducting counterterrorist activities, and the fight in al-Anbar for which the President has requested a small number of this surge is exactly for that. But this resolution disapproves of that, if you are to reread the first clause. We are accelerating training, but we have learned that, if you are going to do it right, you can't speed it up beyond a certain point.

To paraphrase my colleague, the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Senator BOND, who has said of rushed intelligence assessments:

If you want it bad, you're going to get it . . . bad.

If we rush the training, as we have seen, we're going to get ineffective results. If our training of the Iraqi security forces is to be effective and successful, we need to take the time to do it right.

I am all for reducing regional interference, but to do so might mean exercising power and influence, and critics of this President have a conviction if you suggest anything other than a diplomatic tea party with Syria or Iran.

And I do not consider it wise to commit to the territorial integrity of Iraq. We should be agnostic about this question, and recent history should keep us humble against knee-jerk commitments to territorial lines drawn by imperial powers. A previous Bush administration fumbled on the wrong side of

history in the last days of the Cold War when it argued against "suicidal nationalism" at a time when the Soviet Union was dissolving. A failure to recognize that Yugoslavia was a false state led the U.S. to delay for years an involvement that could have saved hundreds of thousands of civilian lives.

If a soft partition could be achieved without bloodshed, I would support that in Iraq, although no one has figured out how to do that, yet, and it remains unclear whether Iraqis themselves, particularly urbanized Iraqis, desire this or could survive a bloody partition.

But I repeat: If I could imagine a nonviolent partition implemented by an international organization that would have the support of the Iraqi people, I would rather find the billions to do that than the billions to fight a war. In the case of finding financial resources for soft partition, I would expect we would have a somewhat better response from the international community than we are having now.

The next resolution clause states:

The U.S. should transfer, under an appropriately expedited timeline, responsibility for internal security and halting sectarian violence in Iraq to the Government of Iraq and Iraqi security forces.

But just because we want to shed ourselves of this war does not mean we can immediately stand up Iraqi security forces. We have been trying to do that, and it is taking time. This clause is, in effect, purely aspirational. It makes us feel good, but it doesn't change the reality on the ground.

The final clause states:

The U.S. should engage nations in the Middle East to develop a regional, internationally-sponsored peace and reconciliation process for Iraq.

Mr. President, who are the players in the Middle East who are both: (a) sympathetic to the Iraqi cause, and (b) strong enough to be effective?

No country meets both of these simple conditions.

They aren't there. It is too typical of the critics of this administration to substitute the process of diplomacy for the substance of hard policy choices.

Now, I do not oppose diplomacy. It is a legitimate tool in the tool kit. But diplomacy must always be part of a broader policy. Before I would support this administration's diplomatic initiative toward Iran, I would want to see a comprehensive Iran policy. However late in the day, the administration appears to be forming such a policy, and it appears to include elements of confrontation and competition, as well as a clearly stated solicitation for more constructive relations, as any sound and sophisticated policy should.

If we are to sit down with Iran while Iran is continuing with a program for nuclear development, continues to be the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world, continues to undermine the stability in Lebanon, and is working against the coalition's forces in Iraq, I would want those Iranian diplomats

that we are sipping tea with to know that we are competing and challenging them on all of those fronts. It would be foolish to talk to Iran simply hoping we could convince the Iranians to see the world our way.

The nations of the region with whom we are close do support the peace and reconciliation in Iraq. And those nations want us to remain in Iraq until the situation is stabilized. Kuwait, Jordan, Turkey, Saudi Arabia—none of those governments want us to leave Iraq the way it is now. But Syria and Iran and al-Qaida, too—they want us to leave, and leave behind chaos they can exploit.

My colleague and good friend, Senator WARNER, has made an effort to write a resolution that smoothed away some of the aspects of the original Biden legislation which I find I cannot support.

In particular, the senior Senator from Virginia recognizes, in the first clause, the President's foreign policy prerogative, while somewhat ambiguously also stating that the resolution's intent is not "to question or contravene" the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

I say "ambiguously," because Senator WARNER's first resolution clause is remarkably similar to Senator BIDEN's:

The Senate disagrees with the plan to augment our forces and urges the President to consider all options and alternatives for achieving the strategic goals set forth below.

It seems to me, however, that adding troops to meet the goals the President has set—achieving a zone of security in Baghdad from which the Iraqi political leadership can assert its leadership and implement essential policies—is a major option that the Warner resolution precludes.

Further, Senator WARNER's resolution strongly supports our efforts against Sunni jihadists, including al-Qaida, in Anbar Province, as I do.

Senator WARNER and the cosponsors of his resolution, however, do not want to see us in between the various sects fighting in Baghdad.

I have to ask: If we are to encourage the anti-al-Qaida Sunni elements in Anbar to join us in a fight to eradicate al-Qaida, what credibility do we have to do so if we are standing by while Sunni jihadists target Shia in Baghdad, and Shia militias slaughter Sunnis in response?

Part of how we got here is by not imagining the way the perpetrators of sectarian strife calculate. We can't continue to fail to understand this dynamic, nor to believe that we can ignore it.

I will support the President's surge strategy because I believe there is a reasonable chance—reasonable, not guaranteed—that a strong military presence that has open rules of engagement to attack insurgents, militias and other criminal elements may create a zone of calm and security for Baghdad. This goal is to create the

space for political leaders to make effective decisions on oil resources, federalism, economic development and other critical issues to entice the majority of the Iraqis into believing there is an alternative to civil war.

Such a period of calm, if achieved, is essential not only for the political system to assert itself, but for us to complete the majority of our training of Iraqi security forces.

If we are to succeed, we won't be able to do it alone. The Iraqi Sunnis are going to have to lead in defeating the foreigners who are terrorizing them in their homes in western Iraq and leading the attacks against Shia in Baghdad.

The Sunnis will have to lead in ejecting al-Qaida, as they have begun to do so.

The Sunnis, not the Shia, are going to have to definitively expose and defeat the former Baathists who have not accepted that the Baath era is over.

The Sunni will have to address this challenge, not the Shia.

And the Shia, not the Sunni, are going to have to lead in ending the terror of the Shia militias.

The Shia are going to have to defeat those who claim to advance the Shia cause by revenge, by torture, by barbarism. If the Maliki government fails to muster the political will to do so, we cannot impose it from the outside.

Perhaps the Iraqi government can finally make progress toward building institutions that will sustain a unified Iraq, toward passing legislation that will divide Iraq's enormous natural resources equitably among the three ethnicities, that will open the civil society to Sunnis, instead of punishing them indiscriminately for their dominance during the Baath era.

Perhaps.

But if not, this Nation and this administration should not be irrationally wedded to the notion of a unitary state of Iraq. We need to imagine all options, rather than cling to ideas which may have departed from the realm of reasonable options.

I will support this surge because the option right now of withdrawing leaves three critical questions unanswered:

No. 1: How do we continue the fight against foreign Sunni extremists, including al-Qaida, in the west of Iraq?

No. 2: Are we to leave a fractured Shia substate unstable enough for Iran to exert expansionist influence, thereby strengthening Tehran?

No. 3: Are we prepared as a nation to see a bloodbath ensue, in Baghdad and elsewhere, that may make other American foreign policy failures—Budapest in 1956, Vietnam in 1975, the Shia slaughter after we ejected Saddam from Kuwait in 1991—pale in comparison?

As I said at the beginning of this speech, the critics' attempts to set the stage for withdrawal commits the same strategic blunder they legitimately accuse the Bush administration of making in its implementation of the Iraq

war. They didn't think of the day after Saddam fell. Today the critics are not thinking of the day after we withdraw.

Today, however, we need to recognize that worse than the vanity about easy victory committed in 2003 is the denial of calamitous defeat that would occur if we leave before we make every attempt to stabilize the country.

For this reason, I will support the administration, but I will do so under no casual assumptions or glib assurances.

I will also do so by demanding that the administration be much more forthcoming in its plans for the day after—the day after we complete our surge into Baghdad, the day after we can honestly assess that Baghdad has been pacified, and heaven forbid, the day after we assess that the chaos unleashed and manipulated by the forces of destruction are prohibiting a meaningful and comprehensive success.

I am not conceding defeat, nor preparing for withdrawal.

I am supporting a strategy for success. So far, President Bush—who has a lot to answer for the mistakes that have been made—is offering the only way to try to leave Iraq in better shape than it is now.

He has my support, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, we are all well aware in this Chamber that our country finds itself in a deepening crisis in Iraq, and we find ourselves at a moment of decision in the Senate. Nearly 4 years ago, our President rushed us into war in Iraq, a war now longer than American involvement in World War II, which next month will actually exceed the length of our own Civil War. For 4 years, Members on both sides of the aisle have watched with shock and dismay as our President has made mistake after misjudgment after miscalculation. Even before the invasion ended, the administration rejected the voluminous plans drawn up by the State Department to deal with the chaotic aftermath. The successful examples of the U.S. experience in Bosnia and Kosovo during the 1990s were summarily rejected. State Department and other American officials with experience in nation-building were blackballed in favor of inexperienced ideologues who were selected on the basis of political litmus tests, including answering questions about whether they were for or against Roe v. Wade and whether they had voted for George W. Bush.

Despite the urgent warnings of Army Chief of Staff Rick Shinseki and other senior military commanders, the necessary number of troops to ensure security and stability was not sent at the start of the conflict. Our men and women in uniform were ordered into harm's way without the necessary body armor or armored vehicles, a mortal error I have tried to correct time and

again since I first learned of it. The strategic blunders now fill an entire library shelf of books, and they are certainly too numerous for me to list in the time allotted here.

Through these 4 years, there has also been another abdication of responsibility. That was the failure of this Congress to engage in its Constitutional obligation of oversight and accountability. While our troops have stood valiantly on the frontlines, the Congress has stood on the sidelines. Defending a partisan position trumped U.S. national security interests and the welfare of our troops in the field. Many Members attempted to raise the debate, and we were unable to do so because of the majority's refusal to hold the administration accountable.

In the election last year, the American people decided the status quo was no longer acceptable. So we have a new Congress, and it is past time we in this Chamber do our duty to balance the President and provide a check against his failed policy in Iraq. As there is a majority in our country against the President's failed policy in Iraq, there is a bipartisan majority in this Senate against it, as well. The resolution before the Senate reflects that bipartisan consensus as it also reflects the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

But a partisan minority seeking to shield the administration's continuing failure in Iraq seeks to thwart the bipartisan majority and the will of the American people. This is not a debate about abstractions. I have seen the consequences of our involvement in Iraq, as have many of my fellow Senators. Three weeks ago, I visited Iraq to express gratitude to our soldiers, to meet with Iraqi leaders and U.S. commanders and our troops on the ground.

What I saw and what I did not see underscored my concerns. I saw American service men and women performing their duty admirably, but I did not see a strategy that, under the current circumstances, has much chance of success. The collective analysis of our intelligence community in the latest National Intelligence Estimate is that the term "civil war" does not adequately capture the complexity of the conflict in Iraq. The bipartisan Baker-Hamilton Commission said the situation in Iraq is grave and deteriorating. Yet the President's response to the bipartisan commission and the latest National Intelligence Estimate does not match the urgency that is described. The so-called surge is not a new strategy but a tactic that has been tried and failed.

The absence of leadership on the part of the President leaves Congress no choice but to demonstrate the leadership that the American people and the reality on the ground demand. The previous two Congresses abdicated their duty. We must not. Every single day our feet sink deeper into the sands. Every day the crisis worsens. To hide from this debate with our troops in such danger is wrong, plain and simple.

The crisis in Iraq has fostered a crisis of democracy at home. The American people expect a debate. Our troops are owed a debate. Our Constitution commands we debate. But a partisan minority acting at the behest of the administration is standing in the way. This amounts to a gag rule on our democracy, contrary to the national security interests of the United States.

Even though America voted for a new direction in Iraq, even though the majority of Senators opposes escalation in Iraq, we cannot get the Republicans to allow us to take a symbolic vote to condemn the escalation, much less a real vote to stop it. This resolution deserves a debate. It deserves a vote. It deserves passage.

There are those in the Senate who invoke our grave troops, suggesting that a debate on the most important issue facing our country and facing our troops would somehow undermine the mission and weaken our Nation. It is a pernicious, shameful argument and it is dead wrong. Our democracy is stronger than that and the American people and our troops deserve better than that.

Our troops understand we are debating this war. We are debating it not just in this Senate, we are debating it in kitchen table conversations, around water coolers, and standing in line at supermarkets. We are debating this war everywhere Americans gather. Indeed, our troops are debating this war.

The American people understand it is the policy that undermines our national security interests, not a vote disapproving the policy.

This debate and this resolution have merit and purpose and it will, if permitted to go forward, begin the process of changing the policy; otherwise, why would the administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle fight so hard to prevent us from having a debate and a vote? Because they understand this will be the first step to restore our strength and renew our leadership around the world, to begin redeploying our troops out of Iraq and start on the long road of undoing the damage brought by the President to America's leadership around the world.

If you believe the escalation is the right strategy, cast your vote for it. If you believe, as the majority in this Chamber believes, that escalation is not the right strategy, then cast your vote against it. But standing on the sidelines is no way to stand up for the troops.

Now, there are many—both in the Chamber and outside—who wish to go further than this resolution and look for ways to bind the actions of the President and to require him to change course. I understand and agree with the frustration that has afflicted many Members in dealing with the President's policy. However, if we can get a bipartisan vote against escalation, it will be the first time the Senate has exercised its constitutional responsibility to be a check and balance on the

President. The first step for the Senate will be a giant leap toward accountability and toward the right end to this war.

There is a big difference between calling for the end of this war and doing the difficult, painstaking work of building the political will within the Congress to take action. We, in the Senate, entrusted by our constituents to cast tough votes, should not have the luxury of standing outside the arena and lobbying criticism from within.

Once we pass this resolution, we should go further. Rather than an escalation of U.S. troops, which will not contribute to fundamentally changing the conditions on the ground, we should put pressure on the Iraqi Government in a way that they will understand there are consequences to their empty promises and their continued inaction.

Last week, the National Intelligence Counsel released the unclassified key judgments of the National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq. That presents the consensus views of the U.S. intelligence community. It underscores the need for a political solution. The NIE states that in the coming 12 to 18 months, the overall security situation will continue to deteriorate at rates comparable to the latter part of 2006. And it goes on further to say that even if violence is diminished, given the current winner-takes-all attitude and sectarian animosities infecting the political scene, Iraqi leaders will be hard-pressed to achieve sustained political reconciliation in the timeframe of the estimate, namely, a year to a year and a half. Even if the intelligence experts argue the escalation results in greater security, their best judgment is that the bloodshed and violence will continue to spiral out of control.

So what should we do? Many believe, and we have been arguing for this and voting for this for more than a year and a half, that we have to chart a new course that emphasizes greater Iraqi responsibility. I still believe that is the path we should be taking. Instead, the President has chosen a very narrow course that relies heavily on American military force.

I will be introducing legislation that I think offers a better alternative. First, my legislation will cap the number of troops in Iraq as of January 1st and will require the administration to seek congressional authorization for any additional troops. The President has finally said, this is not an open-ended commitment in Iraq, but he is providing the Iraqis with an open-ended presence of American troops.

Second, as a means to increase our leverage with the Iraqi Government and to clearly send a message that there are consequences to their inaction, I would impose conditions for continued funding of the Iraqi security forces and the private contractors working for the Iraqis.

My legislation would require certification that the security forces were

free of sectarian and militia influence and were actually assuming greater responsibility for Iraqi security, along with other conditions. We must not let U.S. funds, taxpayer funds, be used to train members of sectarian militias who are responsible for so much of the violence in Iraq. Unfortunately, it appears our funds to Iraqi security forces may be going to the people we are trying to restrain.

A news report last week in an article entitled "Mahdi Army Gains Strength through Unwitting Aid of U.S." reports that:

... the U.S. military drive to train and equip Iraq's security forces has unwittingly strengthened Muslin cleric Muqtada al-Sadr's Mahdi Army militia, which has been battling to take over much of the capital city as American forces are trying to secure it.

According to this new report, U.S. Army commanders and enlisted men who are patrolling East Baghdad, said al-Sadr's militias had heavily infiltrated the Iraqi police and Army units that they've trained and armed. Said one soldier:

They'll wave at us during the day and shoot at us during the night.

We need to inform the Iraqi Government, in no uncertain terms, that there are consequences, that we will take funds away from their troops—not from our troops, many of whom still lack armored vehicles and counter-insurgency measure devices and communications equipment. And we will not fund the Iraqis if our troops are going to enter into sectarian battles where some of the participants have received American training and support.

Third, I would hold the administration accountable for their empty promises as well. My bill requires the Bush administration to certify that Iraq has disarmed the militias, has ensured that a law has finally been passed for the equitable sharing of oil revenues; that the Iraqi Government, under American influence and even pressure, has made the constitutional changes necessary to ensure rights for minority communities; that the deBaathification process has been reversed to allow teachers, professionals, and others who joined the Baath Party as a means to get a job to serve in the new Iraqi Government.

I would also require the administration to engage in a regional diplomatic initiative, including all of Iraq's neighbors, to address Iraq's future and to understand and convey clearly that the United States expects Iraq's neighbors to be partners in the stability and security of the new Iraqi state.

If these conditions are not met or are not on their way to being met within 6 months, a new congressional authorization requirement would be triggered.

Finally, I would prohibit any spending to increase troop levels unless and until the Secretary of Defense certifies that our American troops will have the proper training and equipment for

whatever mission they are ordered to fulfill.

Yesterday, I read the classified report outlining the findings by the Department of Defense inspector general about the problems that have been faced by our troops getting the equipment they desperately need in combat areas such as Iraq.

The inspector general did not have the full cooperation of the Department of Defense. It is heartbreaking that the inspector general could conclude that the U.S. military still has failed to equip our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, especially for the kind of warfare they are confronting, with IEDs and insurgents who are attacking them in asymmetric, unconventional warfare.

This report comes on the heels of an article in the Washington Post last week titled "Equipment for Added Troops Is Lacking: New Iraq Forces Must Make Do, Officials Say." The Washington Post story raised serious questions about the adequacy of the supply of up-armored HMMWVs and trucks.

One of our generals is quoted as saying he does not have the equipment our forces need, and they will have to go into battle with what they have.

On my way back from Iraq and Afghanistan, I stopped at Landstuhl Hospital in Germany to visit with some of our wounded soldiers. I met with one young man who was lying in his bed with injuries he had suffered from one of the shape charges, these new more advanced, more sophisticated command-controlled IEDs, the improvised explosive devices. He told me that the armored, fully equipped HMMWV had saved his life and that of the lives of his buddies who were with him. But he also told me that not everybody he served with had that kind of protection because there were not enough of those armored vehicles to go around.

I do not believe the Congress can shirk its responsibility. It is past time we live up to our constitutional responsibility. If I had been President in October of 2002, I would have never asked for authority to divert our attention from Afghanistan to Iraq, and I certainly would never have started this war. But we are where we are, and this Congress must deliver a strategy to help us end this war in the right way and begin returning our troops home.

So on this most important issue of our time, I call on my colleagues not to hide from this debate but to welcome it, to welcome the opportunity to set forth whatever one's opinions might be because this debate is about more than our policy in Iraq. It is about the role and responsibility of this august institution. Great debates in our past have not only moved public opinion but furthered the progress of our country.

This debate is not merely about whether the President should escalate troops into Iraq, whether he has failed to grasp the complexity of the situation we confront in Iraq, and to take every diplomatic, political, economic,

and military strategy available to him, but it is about our democracy itself.

We should consider this resolution, and I hope we will. Our duty is rooted in the faith entrusted to us by our constituents and enshrined in our Constitution. When we think about the patriotism and bravery, the humor and resolve, the optimism and strength of our soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors, our Active Duty, our Guard, and Reserve, I think it humbles us all. But it comes out of this great democratic tradition that we are all blessed to be a part of.

I hope we have the opportunity in the next days to do our duty just as the men and women who are serving us have done and are doing theirs.

A week ago, I was privileged to go to San Antonio for the opening of a remarkable center called the Center for the Intrepid. It is a new state-of-the-art facility devoted to the rehabilitation and recovery of our wounded heroes. It was funded by contributions from more than 600,000 Americans. It was not built by our Government. It was built by our citizens.

It is not only going to be a place of great hope and healing for the brave men and women who have given their full measure, but it will also stand as a symbol of our democracy, of our values, of people coming together across our country—a unique partnership that you find nowhere else in the world except here.

As I sat on the stage during the ceremonies for the opening of this new rehabilitation center, I watched the hundreds of young men and women who had been injured march in, and in some cases wheeled in, to take their place in the audience. I believe they are owed this debate. And certainly all those who are currently serving, and the thousands who are on their way to carry out this escalation strategy, deserve it even more.

So I hope we will have a chance to express the will of our constituents, our deeply held opinions, and participate in a debate that is historic and necessary. That is the least we can do.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the consequences of our actions in Iraq entitled "Now What?" by Army Retired LTG Jerry Max Bunyard be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now What?

(By Jerry Max Bunyard)

At church every Sunday, the Fort Belvoir, VA Installation Chaplain uses the question "now what?" to get the congregation to analyze the message he just delivered and find a way to apply it to their lives. I believe as citizens and leaders of this nation we are at a point in the continuing War in Iraq that we must ask the same question; "Now What?"

Today we have been bombarded with facts, figures, commentaries, interpretations, and subjective thoughts concerning the Middle East activities. Depending on the writer, attempts are made to sway you one way or the

other concerning a particular issue. There are many half-truths that are spoken, which tend to lead the reader in a given direction. Our world-wide media has led us astray on many Middle East subjects. They tend to be over zealous to ensure what is being written follows the point they are attempting to make or stays within the bounds of being politically correct or meet their organization's marketing goals for selling air time or copy. They sometimes convince the reader to believe and support a particular political agenda. In many cases these misleading and unbalanced reports cause the reader to be convinced that what is being said is the truth. On the other hand, there are some excellent articles, books and writings that exist on the subject but they have been overlooked or ignored to some degree by both academia and the media because of political correctness coupled with political sensitivity for fear of offending major non-western religion, reigning political and ideological orthodoxies, or a mix of both. So the question is how do we get to the truth of the Middle East conundrum?

For many Americans (as well as other nationalities) they simply rely on what the newspaper, radio or TV is telling them. They do not question or seek other sources on any given event or subject being discussed. They make no attempt to understand the totality of the area of interest they just swing with the "news of the day" from their favorite news media or TV station. Then we have the politicians and their army of supporters who will do and say what they think John Q. Public wants to hear in order to glean their vote. They twist and slant the news to meet their agenda. As we approach the 2008 Presidential election this aspect has become the norm and is simply misleading the American people, causing great harm to our chances of achieving the National objectives throughout the world as well as showing, indirectly, lack of support for the members of our armed forces who are serving in harms way supporting these objectives. This, I consider personal aggrandizement and, unquestionably, it is not in the best interest of the country.

There are others, thank goodness, who do take the time and energy to study the subject pro and con and attempt to be objective and analyze the big picture along with the day to day events as they occur. Likewise, there are some very knowledgeable Middle East analysts who have made it their life's endeavor to understand the intricacies of the situation, various cultures, religion and politics of this volatile region of the world. Many of these people are not in the government. In my opinion, we should be listening to and incorporating their thoughts and experience into any decisions concerning that region of the world. These dedicated, unbiased "subject matter experts" should be consulted regularly for opinions and recommendations.

Based upon this multitude of diverse information one has to sort the wheat from the chaff. This requires some personal knowledge of the Middle East and Iraq war as well as the writer or speaker providing information concerning the area of interest. One must do his homework in order to place the information in "categories" to establish a prioritization of credible information. Once this task is completed then one only uses that information and "files" the rest. Throughout this paper I will use quotes or information from whom I consider credible sources and will footnote where the comments or quotes originated.

The purpose of this paper is to provide my two cents worth on how to answer the question of "Now What" relative to what we should be thinking about and doing concerning the Iraqi situation or, better yet, the

Middle East regional situation. There will not be any effort to address the question of how we got into this situation. We are where we are, so what course of action should we follow from this point forward? To address this one must take a look at the region itself and place into perspective the consequences of the various choices that are now before us.

THE CHALLENGE

I cautioned earlier about politicians and how they use or misuse information. However, there is at least one exception in the political arena, Senator Joseph Lieberman (I-CT) who very clearly summed up the current Iraqi situation and the challenge that faces Iraq, the United States and the free world in general. Based on his long term interest in the region, the wars (both past and current), and the information gleaned from his trip to Iraq in December of 2006, he provided the following comments upon his return:

"Because of the bravery of many Iraqi and coalition military personnel and the recent coming together of moderate political forces in Baghdad, the war is winnable. We and our Iraqi allies must do what is necessary to win it.

The American people are justifiably frustrated by the lack of progress, and the price paid by our heroic troops and their families has been heavy. But what is needed now, especially in Washington and Baghdad, is not despair but decisive action—and soon.

"The most pressing problem we face in Iraq is not an absence of Iraqi political will or American diplomatic initiative, both of which are increasing and improving; it is a lack of basic security. As long as insurgents and death squads terrorize Baghdad, Iraq's nascent democratic institutions cannot be expected to function, much less win the trust of the people. The fear created by gang murders and mass abductions ensures that power will continue to flow to the very thugs and extremists who have the least interest in peace and reconciliation."

Senator Lieberman brought out very salient points—the war is winnable; American people are frustrated by lack of progress; price paid by troops and families has been heavy; what is needed, especially in Washington and Baghdad, is not despair but decisive action—and soon; most pressing problem is the lack of basic security.

To me, that captures the status that continues to exist at present.

So, this sets the stage as to the situation we find ourselves in today. Now what do we do about it and how?

BACKGROUND

Before getting into the current Middle East issues and possible courses of action it is necessary one have a general understanding of the key religious aspects along with a basic knowledge of the Jewish, Arab, and Islamic history.

Religion has once again become a force that no government can safely ignore. The United States and other Western countries experts have failed to recognize the importance of faith as it relates to world affairs. One, if not the most, important aspects to be considered when discussing the Middle East and the growing dominance of the Islam religion concerns the differences of opinion between Islam and the Western World view of separation of Church and State.

Bruce Feiler states "Abraham, the great patriarch of the Hebrew Bible, is also the spiritual forefather of the New Testament and the grand holy architect of the Koran. Abraham is the shared ancestor of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. He is the linchpin of the Arab-Israeli conflict. He is the centerpiece of the battle between the West and Islamic extremists. He is the father—in many cases, the purported biological father—of 12

million Jews, 2 billion Christians, and 1 billion Muslims around the world. He is history's first monotheist."

Thomas Jefferson once remarked that in matters of religion "the maxim of civil government" should be reversed and we should rather say, "Divided we stand, united, we fall." In this remark Jefferson was setting forth with classic terseness an idea that has come to be regarded as essentially American: the separation of Church and State. This idea was not entirely new; it had some precedents in the writings of Spinoza, Locke, and the philosophers of the European Enlightenment. It was in the United States, however, that the principle was first given the force of law and gradually, in the course of two centuries, has become a reality.

Another very important aspect of this overall issue is to address the total Middle East environment. An important consideration is the countries that border Iraq and what impact our actions and those of others may have on these specific countries. Shown next is a map of the Middle East countries. The countries directly adjacent to Iraq are Iran, Jordan, Syria, Turkey, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

George Friedman describes the dilemma that now faces the United States as it relates to the potential influence of Iran on the outcome of the Iraqi war. "The Iraq war has turned into a duel between the United States and Iran. For the United States, the goal has been the creation of a generally pro-American coalition government in Baghdad—representing Iraq's three major ethnic communities. For Iran, the goal has been the creation of either a pro-Iranian government in Baghdad or, alternatively, the division of Iraq into three regions, with Iran dominating the Shiite south."

THE COSTS OF DISENGAGEMENT

The next logical step would be to understand as best as possible, the implications of not continuing our efforts in Iraq and, in so doing, what this would mean to the United States, in the future. One of the best analyses I have found thus far comes from two men outside the government who have significant experience in Middle East studies. Over the years Daniel Bynum and Kenneth Pollack have gained an excellent understanding of that region. In August of 2006 they published an article titled, "What Next," and have followed that up with a 130 page report titled, "Things Fall Apart" that was published in January 2007 by the Brookings Institution's Saban Center for Middle East Policy. This latest report states: "Iraq is rapidly sliding into all-out civil war that is likely to spill over into neighboring countries, resulting in mass deaths and refugees, serious disruption of oil supplies and a drastic decline in US influence."

In the August 2006 article, Bynum and Pollack state:

"... The consequences of an all-out civil war in Iraq could be dire. Considering the experiences of recent such conflicts, hundreds of thousands of people may die. Refugees and displaced people could number in the millions. And with Iraqi insurgents, militias and organized crime rings wreaking havoc on Iraq's oil infrastructure, a full-scale civil war could send global oil prices soaring even higher.

"However, the greatest threat that the United States would face from civil war in Iraq is from the spillover—the burdens, the instability, the copycat secession attempts and even the follow-on wars that could emerge in neighboring countries. Welcome to the new 'new Middle East'—a region where civil wars could follow one after another, like so many Cold War dominoes.

"And unlike communism, these dominoes may actually fall."

There are other consequences of civil war as explained by Bynum and Pollack. A top-

level summary of their in-depth study reveals: "... civil wars tend to spread across borders ... and Washington must decide how to deal with the most common and dangerous ways such conflicts spill across national boundaries. Only by understanding the refugee crises, terrorism, radicalization of neighboring populations, copycat secessions and foreign interventions that such wars frequently spark can we begin to plan for how to cope with them in the months and years ahead ... massive refugee flows are a hallmark of major civil wars ... refugee camps often become a sanctuary and recruiting grounds for militias, which use them to launch raids on their homelands ... terrorism finds new homes during civil wars ... radicalism is contagious as civil wars tend to inflame the passions of neighboring populations ... the problem worsens whenever ethnic or religious groupings also spill across borders ... Iraq's neighbors are just as fractured as Iraq itself ... should Iraq fragment, voices for secession elsewhere will gain strength ... the first candidate for secession is obviously Kurdistan ... another critical problem of civil wars is the tendency of neighboring states to get involved, turning the conflicts into regional wars ... covert foreign intervention is proceeding apace in Iraq, with Iran leading the way ... Iran has set up an extensive network of safe houses, arms caches, communications channels and proxy fighters, and will be well-positioned to pursue its interests in a full-blown civil war. The Sunni powers of Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Turkey are frightened by Iran's growing influence and presence in Iraq and have been scrambling to catch up ... Turkey may be the most likely country to overtly intervene in Iraq ... none of Iraq's neighbors thinks that it can afford to have the country fall into the hands of the other side ... an Iranian "victory" would put the nation's forces in the heartland of the Arab world, bordering Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Syria—several of these states poured tens of billions of dollars into Saddam Hussein's military to prevent just such an occurrence in the 1980s ... similarly, a Sunni Arab victory (backed by the Jordanians, Kuwaitis and Saudis) would put radical Sunni fundamentalists on Iran's doorstep a nightmare scenario for Tehran ... add in, too, each country's interest in preventing its rivals from capturing Iraq's oil resources ... if these states are unable to achieve their goals through clandestine intervention, they will have a powerful incentive to launch a conventional invasion."

George Friedman provides his assessment of Iran's concern if Iraq is able to stabilize its government and the country in general. He also indicates what the Iranians are doing to counter the U.S. efforts to accomplish stabilizing Iraq.

"A stable Iraq under U.S. influence represents a direct threat to Iran, while a fragmented or pro-Iranian Iraq does not. Therefore, the Iranians will do whatever they can to undermine U.S. attempts to create a government in Baghdad. Tehran can use its influence to block a government, but it cannot—on its own—create a pro-Iranian one. Therefore, Iran's strategy is to play spoiler and wait for the United States to tire of the unending conflict. Once the Americans leave, the Iranians can pick up the chips on the table. Whether it takes 10 years or 30, the Iranians assume that, in the end, they will win. None of the Arab countries in the region has the power to withstand Iran, and the Turks are unlikely to get into the game."

The National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq, released 2 February 2007, warns that

pulling U.S. troops out of the country too soon would lead to a collapse of the Iraqi military, outside intervention and the creation of safe havens for al Qaeda terrorists. It also states that if coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly . . . we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq, intensify Sunni resistance to the Iraqi government and have adverse consequences for national reconciliation. Additionally, if such a rapid withdrawal were to take place, we judge that the [Iraqi Security Force] would be unlikely to survive as a non-sectarian national institution; neighboring countries . . . might intervene openly in the conflict; massive civilian casualties and forced population displacement would be probable. The report also says that the al Qaeda terrorist group in Iraq would try to “use parts of the country”—particularly al-Anbar province—to plan increased attacks in and outside of Iraq. Additionally, Turkey could launch a military incursion if there were no U.S. or allied troops to block Kurdish attempts to control northern Iraq.

ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION (C/A) AND SUPPORTING BASE

Many alternatives and options have surfaced over the past several weeks and months. The repercussion of exercising certain alternatives have been looked at in considerable depth with some alarming results that not only impact what goes on in Iraq, but the impact they could have on the entire Middle East.

In my opinion, there are at least four alternatives that have been put on the table in respect to the way ahead in Iraq. These are not new but have been identified by different sources.

Cut and Run—The first C/A being considered was initiated by Congressman Murtha in what has been termed as the “cut and run” scenario. There are other variations of this C/A but, essentially, they all boil down to get the troops out of Iraq as quick as you can—some say immediately others say six months others say by the end of the year (2007). This is easy to say but carries with it tremendous implications and ramifications.

In my opinion, this C/A would simply embolden the terrorists to include Iran, Syria and other countries that are supportive of terrorism. At the same time it would demoralize our friends in the region. Once again it would place America in everyone's minds as a feckless country that does not have the will to see actions through to completion. How many times do we have to learn that lesson? This would be a strategic defeat for American interests with potentially catastrophic consequences both in the Middle East region and elsewhere. Thus, this C/A could lead to Iran expanding their influence throughout the region and utilizing Hamas and Hezbollah in Syria, Lebanon, Palestinian territories and Jordan. What Arab friends the U.S. may have would feel abandoned and it would place their governments in jeopardy. No longer could they look to the U.S. as a reliable ally or guarantor of peace and stability in this critical region. The implications are that the effects of pulling out of Iraq would spread over into the energy resources and transit choke points vital to the global economy. How this would all play out is unknown but these are potential outcomes of pursuing this C/A.

Annexation of Iraq—The second C/A would be the annexation of Iraq by American forces, which means the U.S. would govern with a military governor-general and local commanders, and a long-term commitment made that no matter the cost in resources (people and dollars) the U.S. would defend, assist, and help develop those who put their

trust in us, in every hamlet, village, and neighborhood until they are able to defend themselves. This would entail sealing the borders and providing local security, local civic actions and local government and public services. The oil industry, agriculture and other agencies would be franchised to U.S. companies to redevelop with royalties going to the governor-general to defray the costs of the occupation and security campaign. This C/A could take decades before they are ready to become an independent nation of Iraqis—no longer Kurds, Arabs and other minorities but Iraqis. Complicating this C/A is Islam and the differences that exist within the various interpretations of Islam. In my opinion, this C/A would never be supported by either Americans or Arabs/Iraqis and, therefore, is discarded for further discussion.

Stay the Course—The third is to “stay the course,” which falls in the unacceptable category, based on the failure to date, plus the votes from the recent elections and the sentiments of Congress. This C/A is not supported by the Administration, Congress or the Defense Department. Therefore, it is not considered viable and will be discarded for further discussion.

Presidential Proposal—The fourth C/A follows what the President is proposing. That is to provide support to the Iraqi government in order for it to, as quickly as possible, establish a unified democratic federal Iraq that can govern and defend itself and serve as an ally in the War on Terror. As I understand it, these have been the U.S. strategic goals and objectives from the outset.

Stephen Hadley, Presidential security advisor, described the President's proposal as follows:

“The Baker-Hamilton report explained that failure in Iraq could have severe consequences for our national interests in a critical region and for our national security here at home. In my many conversations with members of Congress and foreign policy experts, few have disagreed.

“Most people agree that we must focus on fighting al-Qaeda. The president's strategy steps up this fight—particularly in Anbar province, where al-Qaeda seeks a sanctuary. The administration also agrees that we must accelerate the training of Iraqi security forces. The president's strategy does this—with benchmarks to track progress and bolster the size and effectiveness of those forces. Training and supporting Iraqi troops will remain our military's essential and primary mission.

“But the president's review also concluded that the strategy with the best chance of success must have a plan for securing Baghdad. Without such a plan, the Iraqi government and its security institutions could fracture under the pressure of widespread sectarian violence, ethnic cleansing and mass killings. Chaos would then spread throughout the country—and throughout the region. The al-Qaeda movement would be strengthened by the flight of Sunnis from Baghdad and an accelerated cycle of sectarian bloodletting. Iran would be emboldened and could be expected to provide more lethal aid for extremist groups. The Kurdish north would be isolated, inviting separation and regional interference. Terrorists could gain pockets of sanctuary throughout Iraq from which to threaten our allies in the region and our security here at home.

“The new plan for Baghdad specifically corrects the problems that plagued previous efforts. First, it is an Iraqi-initiated plan for taking control of their capital. Second, there will be adequate forces (Iraqi and American) to hold neighborhoods cleared of terrorists and extremists. Third, there is a new operational concept—one devised not just to pursue terrorists and extremists but to secure

the population. Fourth, new rules of engagement will ensure that Iraqi and U.S. forces can pursue lawbreakers regardless of their community or sect. Fifth, security operations will be followed by economic assistance and reconstruction aid—including billions of dollars in Iraqi funds—offering jobs and the prospect of better lives.”

Stephen Hadley continues his explanation of the totality of the President's plan by explaining the key strategic shifts that are major changes from previous approach:

“Reinforcing our military presence is not the strategy—it is a means to an end and part of a package of key strategic shifts that will fundamentally restructure our approach to achieving our objectives in Iraq.

“Building on experience elsewhere in the country, the new strategy doubles the number of provincial reconstruction teams (PRTs) in Iraq. These civilian-led units will target development aid where it is needed and help the Iraqi government extend its reach to all corners of the country.

“Because close civilian-military cooperation is key to success, 10 new civilian PRTs will be embedded with U.S. combat brigades.

The new strategy incorporates other essential elements of the Baker-Hamilton report, such as doubling the number of troops embedded with Iraqi forces, using benchmarks to help us and the Iraqis chart progress, and launching a renewed diplomatic effort to increase support for the Iraqi government and advance political reconciliation.”

DISCUSSION

Earlier in this paper the Byman-Pollack report identified consequences of an all-out civil war in Iraq. In their “what to do about it” part of their report they had the following to say:

“Much as Americans may want to believe that the United States can just walk away from Iraq should it slide into all-out civil war, the threat of spillover from such a conflict throughout the Middle East means it can't. Instead, Washington will have to devise strategies to deal with refugees, minimize terrorist attacks emanating from Iraq, dampen the anger in neighboring populations caused by the conflict, prevent secession fever and keep Iraq's neighbors from intervening. The odds of success are poor, but, nonetheless, we have to try.

“The United States, along with its Asian and European allies, will have to make a major effort to persuade Iraq's neighbors not to intervene in its civil war. Economic aid should be part of such an effort, but will not suffice. For Jordan and Saudi Arabia, it may require an effort to reinvigorate Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations, thereby addressing one of their major concerns—an effort made all the more important and complex in light of the recent conflict between Hezbollah and Israel. For Iran and Syria, it may be a clear (but not cost-free) path toward acceptance back into the international community.

“When it comes to foreign intervention, Iran is the biggest headache of all. Given its immense interests in Iraq, some involvement is inevitable. For Tehran, and probably for Damascus, the United States and its allies probably will have to put down red lines regarding what is absolutely impermissible—such as sending uniformed Iranian military units into Iraq or claiming Iraqi territory. Washington and its allies will also have to lay out what they will do if Iran crosses any of those red lines. Economic sanctions would be one possibility, but they could be effective only if the European Union, China, India and Russia all cooperate. On its own, the United States could employ punitive military operations, either to make Iran pay an unacceptable price for one-time infractions

or to persuade it to halt ongoing violations of one or more red lines.

"A full-scale war in Iraq could result in hundreds of thousands of deaths and millions of refugees streaming across the nation's borders. The level of killings and displacement from other major civil conflicts—such as those in Bosnia, Congo, Lebanon and Rwanda—suggests the toll in Iraq could surge even higher if conditions there deteriorate further."

David Dolan, a reputable journalist and author, who has spent the last 27 years living and working in Israel, provides his assessment of what is viewed from the lens of the Israeli military analysts concerning the turmoil that exists today in the Middle East and the prognosis for the coming year.

"Israeli military analysts said the main reason for growing regional instability is stepped up Iranian meddling throughout the Middle East. They noted that the oil-flushed theocratic Muslim regime in Tehran is pumping copious amounts of financial aid and weapons to its Syrian, Lebanese Hizbullah and Palestinian Hamas and Islamic Jihad allies, along with material aid going to Iranian-backed Shiite militias operating next door in violence-torn Iraq. Coming against the ominous backdrop of Iran's escalating nuclear uranium enrichment program, the mullah's meddling is succeeding in destabilizing the entire region, adding to growing prospects that major portions of the tense Middle East will erupt into full-scale warfare during 2007."

The Brookings Institution Saban Center Analysis Number 11, released 29 January 2007, examines the history of some dozen recent civil wars to reveal the general patterns by which such conflicts can "spill over" into neighboring states, causing further civil wars or regional conflicts. Historically, six patterns of spillover have been the most harmful in other cases of all-out civil war: refugees; terrorism; radicalization of neighboring populations; secession that breeds secessionism; economic losses; and neighborly interventions. The purpose of this review was to determine what policy options the United States could employ to try to contain the spillover effects of a full-scale Iraqi civil war. It is recognized that with each passing day, Iraq sinks deeper into the abyss of civil war. President Bush has proposed one last-chance effort to quell the fighting and jumpstart a process of political reconciliation and economic reconstruction. Comments coming from this review state:

"Should this last effort fail, the United States is likely to very quickly have to determine how best to handle an Iraq that will be erupting into Bosnia- or Lebanon-style all-out civil war. The history of such wars is that they are disastrous for all parties, but the United States will have little choice but to try to stave off disaster as best it can."

These tasks will be difficult and will require the deployment of large ground forces to accomplish them. Ending an all-out civil war requires overwhelming military power to nail down a political settlement. The Byman-Pollack report of 2006 states:

"It took 30,000 British troops to bring the Irish civil war to an end, 45,000 Syrian troops to conclude the Lebanese civil war, 50,000 NATO troops to stop the Bosnian civil war, and 60,000 to do the job in Kosovo. Considering Iraq's much larger population, it probably would require 450,000 troops to quash an all-out civil war there. Such an effort would require a commitment of enormous military and economic resources, far in excess of what the United States has already put forth [and planned future increases]."

MEANWHILE, BACK IN THE USA

This discussion would be incomplete if we did not discuss the home front and what is

going on here in the United States relative to the Iraq War. The November 2006 elections started a fire storm of various anti-war factions rising to the surface and demanding we pull out of the war immediately or within a short period of time. With the Democrats taking over both sides of the Congress we now have a political confrontation as to who can get his or her resolution to pass both sides of the Congress. Lately, the Congress is awash with resolutions. Senator Obama submitted legislation 30 January, which would remove all combat brigades from Iraq by March 31, 2008. This timetable for completing a withdrawal puts him at odds with other leading rivals for the Democratic nomination. Senator Hillary Clinton supports capping the number of troops at their levels of Jan. 1, 2007. Sen. Christopher J. Dodd (Conn.) has proposed a similar troop cap. But neither has embraced a timetable for a troop removal. Former Senator and Vice Presidential candidate in 2004 and now a Presidential candidate for 2008, John Edwards (D-NC), has been outspoken in his opposition to Bush's new plan and has called for the immediate withdrawal of 40,000 to 50,000 troops. But he, too, has stopped short of setting a firm date by which all would be removed. New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson is the only other prominent Democrat in the field to set a withdrawal timetable, declaring that troops "can and should" be brought home by the end of 2007. The Obama plan, called the Iraq War De-escalation Act of 2007, would begin a troop withdrawal no later than May 1, 2007, but it includes several caveats that could forestall a clean break: It would leave a limited number of troops in place to conduct counterterrorism activities and train Iraqi forces. (The question one must ask in respect to this proposal is how could you leave a small contingent of U.S. forces in a country rife with civil war?) And the withdrawal could be temporarily suspended if the Iraqi government meets a series of benchmarks laid out by the Bush administration. That list includes a reduction in sectarian violence; the equitable distribution of oil revenue; government reforms; and democratic, Iraqi-driven reconstruction and economic development efforts. Senator Obama's proposal also would reverse Bush's troop-increase plan.

On the other side of the aisle the Republicans have their own versions of resolutions. A resolution by Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) and Sen. Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.) demanding tough benchmarks for progress in Iraq was supposed to garner overwhelming Republican support, being a more palatable alternative to language by Sen. John W. Warner (R-Va.) that would state opposition to the troop buildup. Instead, rival measures continue to proliferate. Sen. Judd Gregg (R-N.H.) said he is circulating language that would forbid a cutoff of funding for troops in the field under any circumstance, similar to another proposal by Sen. Johnny Isakson (R-Ga.). Sen. John Cornyn (R-Tex.) is shopping around a measure that would demand that the president's policies be given a chance to work while calling for the reversal of perceived war-related mistakes, such as the wholesale purging of Baath Party members from the Iraqi government and the failure to ensure equitable oil-revenue sharing among Iraqi groups. "Resolutions are flying like snowflakes around here," Sen. Specter said. There may be more in the wings of Congress that have yet to surface but, at this writing, these appear to be the ones being discussed.

Meanwhile, the two camps promoting competing resolutions of opposition—one headed by Senators Joseph R. Biden Jr. (D-Del.) and Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.) and the other by Senator Warner (R-Va.) and Senator Levin (D-Mich.)—initially appeared to be closing in on

common language that could win a clear majority within the Senate, but, at this writing it appears that may not happen.

These non-binding resolutions, regardless of which side of the aisle they come from, are not constructive—they change nothing, take responsibility for nothing, and hurt both morale and whatever semblance of national unity the USA might project. They aid and abet the enemy just like the discussions that occurred during the Vietnam War. If we set deadlines or propose certain number of troops be withdrawn by a certain date then this gives the enemy a timetable to work to in respect to holding off until the Americans leave. It certainly doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure that one out. Rhetoric influences perceptions, and perceptions can drive responses.

Unless Congress can find the intestinal fortitude to assert its true Constitutional authority and actually freeze or even mandate a drawdown in spending on operations in Iraq and use of funds to move troops individually or as units to Iraq, this is just a lot of hypocritical political theater—attempts to look assertive while in fact denying responsibility and showing the lack of commitment and fecklessness of America—once again. J. D. Pendry said, "Our enemies, just as enemies past, know that winning a war with the United States is not about combat assaults, but about wearing down the will of the American people to continue to support the fight. Because they're winning the war of wills, they wouldn't dare attack inside the country. Our enemies know that our weak link in fighting a war is our politics, media, and the socialist elites who ally with them in waging war against the American will to sustain a fight."

General David Petraeus, the new U.S. commander of the forces in Iraq, explained in hearings before Congress, that reinforcing U.S. troops is necessary for this new plan to succeed. Any plan that limits our ability to reinforce our troops in the field is a plan for failure—and could hand Baghdad to terrorists and extremists before legitimate Iraqi forces are ready to take over the fight. General Petraeus made clear his disdain for ideas that are very much in vogue in Washington these days: getting out of Iraq altogether, or the current favorite of the Democratic leadership: passing resolutions critical of the war.

In the Congressional confirmation hearing Sen. John McCain asked what would happen if we were to leave Iraq. Gen. Petraeus pointed to "the very real possibility of involvement of countries from elsewhere in the region, around Iraq, entering Iraq to take sides with one or the other groups." He added that there "is the possibility, certainly, of an international terrorist organization truly getting a grip on some substantial piece of Iraq." In response to questions from Sen. McCain and Sen. Joe Lieberman, Gen. Petraeus added that resolutions of disapproval for the war would be unhelpful to American troop morale and would encourage our enemies in Iraq.

During the recent confirmation hearing of Admiral Fallon to be the Central Command Commander Sen. Carl M. Levin (D-Mich.), the committee chairman, proposed to hold the Iraqi leaders accountable to meeting benchmarks. Admiral Fallon said he believed that imposing "edicts" or "deadlines" would be unconstructive. He also suggested a need to lower American expectations for Iraq, indicating that U.S. goals for Iraq following the 2003 invasion were unrealistically ambitious.

Sen. John Cornyn, Texas Republican said, "Congress is sending mixed messages to the troops, to voters and to the world with a 'no confidence' vote that carries no force . . . We

can't claim to support the troops and not support their mission," he said in a floor speech 31 January. "If we don't support the mission, we shouldn't be passing nonbinding resolutions. We should be doing everything in our power to stop it . . . we should send them the message that, yes, we believe you can succeed and it's important to our national security that you do."

We also hear from Congress and others about how "we support the troops" but also we hear anti-Iraq war and anti-surge overtones. If Congress and the American public truly support the troops then they must provide the full support. It is incoherent and irresponsible to say one supports the troops but not the war. How can Congress on one hand unanimously approve the appointment of General Petraeus to command the troops in Iraq and execute the war plan and, at the same time, refuse to support the war effort and provide resolutions restricting the necessary troops and wherewithal to accomplish the task they have assigned to him? This simply does not pass the common sense test. It is simply a cop out!

Summarization—America cannot win a counter-insurgency campaign in a Muslim territory as long as it is ruled by Muslims. That is why the effort must be led by the Muslims (Iraq) in order to win their own counter-insurgency campaign. Absolutely, we must assist them and apply more forces but the Iraqi leaders are the ones who have to gain the confidence of the populace as well as subdue and disassemble the militias, particularly that of Al Sadr. If Maliki and his government do not take the lead and insist on the breakup of the militias then we are wasting our time, soldier's lives and billions of dollars to help reconstruct that country. The world is watching to see what course of action Maliki takes and whether we will continue to provide support. If this fails we will have least tried to make it work. I don't know how long we continue this support—probably a year to eighteen months to see if it is going to work and then decide if it is being successful or not. If not, then we execute a strategic withdrawal removing our troops, equipment, and supplies. Concurrently we must have made plans for dealing with the aftermath of our withdrawal—a point which no politicians are talking about right now. This action will embolden Iran and Syria plus others and then the "global" terrorist and economic problems will start to build. The predictions of all-out civil war will prevail and the spillover to adjacent countries will most likely occur. How will the United States address this situation Madam Speaker of the House/Mr. President of the Senate?

PROBABLE SCENARIO FOLLOWING A COLLAPSE OF IRAQI GOVERNMENT AND US WITHDRAWAL

"Responsible" Middle East experts say that if we withdraw it will be a blood bath to start with and then the "Middle East region" will turn into a haven for terrorists that will be controlled by Iran and Syria—primarily Iran—all under the guise of Islam and in preparation for the return of the 12th Imam. This in turn will cause our quasi Arab friends, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait (and perhaps a few others) to begin making alliances with Iran in fear for their own country and lives therein.

Then, guess what? Terrorism will spread like wild fire and Iran et al will now control the majority of the world oil reserves (which can be used for terrorist activities) and the rest of the world will start experiencing an economic disaster just over the price of oil. One may rest assured that President Chavez in Venezuela will chime right in there with them and raise the price of his oil as well.

The OPEC will be overtaken by Iran et al and the free world will have no choice but to,

most likely, use military force to sort this out—assuming the free world has the will and determination to do so. The free world would have no leverage via the UN to do anything in respect to sanctions against Iran et al as they would just thumb their nose at them. It is a "pay me now or pay me later" situation and it appears at present that Congress and much of the American public are just sticking their heads in the sand and hoping it will all go away. We continue to debate the overwhelming importance of oil. Unfortunately, our efforts to find substitutes will not pay off in a big way for most likely another 15–20 years.

A stronger and more pointed discussion needs to occur in this country relative to the radical/militant Islamists. Our enemy is not only terrorists. Terrorism is a symptom, not the basic cause. Our true enemy is radical or militant Islam and their goals and objectives are to take over the world by jihad and impose on EVERYONE their beliefs, which include living by the law of Shari'a under their interpretation of the Koran. Daniel Pipes said, "The problem at hand is not the religion of Islam but the totalitarian ideology of militant Islam. Islam is one of the world's major religions in terms of duration, extent, and numbers of adherents; as a faith, it has meant very different things over fourteen centuries and several continents. Two common points one can note are that: Islam is, more than any other major religion, deeply political in the sense that it pushes its adherents to hold power; and once Muslims gain power, there is a strong impetus to apply the law of Islam, the Shari'a." There is no separation of Church and State. Under their belief they are one in the same.

Anyone who has any knowledge about the Islamic goals and objectives knows full well that they are not going away and will continue their pursuit to control the entire world and have it under the Islamic law/religion and, in the meantime, kill us infidels along the way. We have been told that Islam is the religion of peace, and that the vast majority of Muslims just want to live in peace. Although this unqualified assertion may be true, it is entirely irrelevant. It is meaningless fluff, meant to make us feel better, and meant to somehow diminish the specter of fanatics rampaging across the globe in the name of Islam. The fact is, in the Middle East, the fanatics rule Islam at this moment in history. The "peaceful majority" is the "silent majority" and it is cowed and extraneous. Peace-loving Muslims have been made irrelevant by their silence. Not a pretty picture at all!

CONSEQUENCES OF CURRENTLY PROPOSED ACTIONS NEED TO BE REVISITED

The proposed Congressional alternatives of capping the number of troops, cutting off funds for the war, withdrawal within six months or a year or sending our troops to "control the borders and search out terrorists but don't get involved in Baghdad" is irrational thinking. If that is what they think we should be doing then we should withdraw completely now and turn the country over to these radical Islamists, terrorists, thugs and criminals and let them kill each other off and watch Iran come in behind us and take control. Then, watch Congress and the American public howl and complain about how "we lost the war." Sometime later this would come back to haunt us here in the US when we start having our fair share of terrorists attacks and encroachment of radical Islamists on our soil.

SO, NOW WHAT?

I submit that in lieu of the defeatist attitude shown by so many in the Congress and the media, that this is no time to feel desperate. What we need is a sense of mission, a

purposeful dynamism. General Petraeus will be issuing a progress report on Iraq every two weeks. He'll report on what progress we are having on de-Baathification, disarming the Shia militias, on taking the fight to the bad guys in a very methodical way.

To lose this war is to lose our soul, the soul of our country, the soul of America. If we lose in Iraq, it is inevitable that the terrorists and radical Islamists will be here. The war will come to our shores and threaten the freedoms we so dearly cherish. It is not too late to resolve to win instead. We still have an enormously strong hand to play and we must play it.

The alternative of pursuing the President's proposal is the only viable alternative we have at present time. The Brookings Institute recent report states: "If there is anything that should make us recognize the need to stay engaged in Iraq, it is the likely impact that such a war could have on the Persian Gulf region (if not the entire Middle East) and the enormous difficulties we will face in trying to contain that impact. If we cannot prevent such a full-scale civil war, then containment, as awful as it threatens to be, might still prove to be our least bad options."

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, earlier this week the Senate had an opportunity to begin debate on Iraq and the current plan proposed by President Bush. While I and 48 of my colleagues supported moving forward with this important debate, others in this Chamber elected to prevent discussion on an issue of national importance.

I understand that there are doubts as to what is the proper course of action to pursue in Iraq. We all wish for victory. We all wish for an end to the death and destruction. None of us want to waste additional lives in futile missions, or futile gestures. We all wish for a stable, democratic Iraq—and I would add to that Afghanistan, as this conflict is being waged on more than one front. We all share those common desires and none of us, none of us can predict the future. But what we can do is to apply our wisdom and judgement as to what is the best course of action for the United States to take. That task is our solemn duty.

We cannot perform that duty with all the honesty and clarity that this great body—the United States Senate—is known for if we cannot begin debate. Denying an open discussion of the issues of grave importance to our national security does not serve our Nation well.

We are at a great turning point and the consequences of this policy must be debated. Future generations will be affected by the course of action our Nation takes in the Middle East. No one can say with certainty which path will lead us toward light and which could lead us toward a darker future. But these courses of action demand debate.

Right now our Nation's wealth is being poured into a growing maelstrom in the Middle East—a storm that is engulfing the lives of our most talented soldiers, a storm that is exhausting our national treasure and sinking us deeper into a debt that our grandchildren and great-grandchildren will be paying off. It means our Nation's education, environment, health, and transportation

systems are eroding for a lack of basic resources.

Again, the consequences of this policy must be debated. In Iraq, there is a clear choice: support the President's policy of full steam ahead and continue the current policy of putting American soldiers in harm's way or shift strategy and make it clear that it is time for the Iraqi government to govern and Iraqi troops to protect the Iraqi people.

In any case, whatever policy advocated—whether one supports staying in, getting out now, or getting out later—those choices deserve to be fully and completely debated and voted on in the United States Senate.

I urge my colleagues on the other side to support a full and open debate on the President's Iraq policy.

Madam President, I yield the floor and 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. 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.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is my understanding we are now in executive session; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 16 through 22, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. William J. Fallon, 0000

THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Travis, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. David H. Cyr, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the

grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Douglas J. Robb, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brigadier General Frank J. Casserino, 0000

Brigadier General Stephen P. Gross, 0000

Brigadier General Clay T. McCutchan, 0000

Brigadier General Frank J. Padilla, 0000

Brigadier General Loren S. Perlstein, 0000

Brigadier General Jack W. Ramsaur, II, 0000

Brigadier General Bradley C. Young, 0000

To be brigadier general

Colonel Frank E. Anderson, 0000

Colonel Patrick A. Cord, 0000

Colonel Craig N. Gourley, 0000

Colonel Donald C. Ralph, 0000

Colonel William F. Schaufert, 0000

Colonel Jack K. Sewell, Jr., 0000

Colonel Richard A. Shook, Jr., 0000

Colonel Lance D. Dndhjem, 0000

Colonel John T. Winters, Jr., 0000

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James M. Dubik, 0000

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

J. Michael McConnell, of Virginia, to be Director of National Intelligence,

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE

SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN200 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning MICHAEL D. JACOBSON, and ending TERRILL L. TOPS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 18, 2007.

PN201 AIR FORCE nominations (11) beginning STUART C. CALLE, and ending EDWIN O. RODRIGUEZPAGAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 18, 2007.

NOMINATION OF JOHN M. MCCONNELL TO BE DNI

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today the Senate has confirmed the nomination of VADM Mike McConnell to be the next Director of National Intelligence. It is hard for me to imagine a better choice than Admiral McConnell.

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence received Admiral McConnell's nomination to replace John Negroponte on January 22, 2007. He completed all the requisite paperwork and the committee held a hearing with Admiral McConnell on February 1. The committee met on February 6, and voted unanimously to report the nomination to the Senate with a favorable recommendation.

I am pleased that the Senate has moved quickly to act on this recommendation. I think this swift consideration of the nomination is recognition of both the importance of this position and of the qualifications of Admiral McConnell.

As my colleagues know, the position of Director of National Intelligence

was created by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act 2004. That legislation drew on recommendations from the congressional and commission reports on the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the Senate Intelligence Committee report on Iraq prewar intelligence, the Report of the Joint Inquiry by the House and Senate Intelligence Committees into the events of 9/11, and the recommendations of numerous other commissions and reviews going back 50 years.

The creation of the DNI was an important step. We now have, for the first time, an individual whose primary job is to run the intelligence community as a whole. Until the creation of the DNI, the old Director of Central Intelligence wore two hats—as the head of the Intelligence Community and as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. But this structural change, while important, was only the first step to reforming intelligence. The DNI must make the 16 agencies of the intelligence community work as one toward a common goal. Director Negroponte has started the community down that path. It is going to be up to Admiral McConnell to move us further along.

A quick review of his resume will show even the casual observer that Admiral McConnell is incredibly well qualified for this critical position. He retired from the Navy as Vice Admiral after 29 years of service. Most of his service during this distinguished career was as an intelligence officer.

While on active duty he served as Director of Intelligence on the Joint Staff during the Persian Gulf War. This made him the principal intelligence advisor to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, GEN Colin Powell. He went on to become the Director of the National Security Agency, our Nation's largest intelligence agency.

Upon retiring from the Navy, Admiral McConnell went to work for Booz Allen Hamilton where he has been a senior vice president for intelligence and national security. He also is currently chairman and chief executive officer of the Intelligence and National Security Alliance, an industry group that works with the Government looking for ways to solve some of our complex intelligence problems. He has the requisite Government experience supplemented by a decade in the private sector.

In his appearance before the Intelligence Committee last week I think it is fair to say that he impressed all members of the committee with his knowledge of the issues and the difficulty of the task ahead. But I was particularly encouraged by his answers to questions about the relationship with Congress.

It is no secret that I have not always been happy with the level of access the intelligence committee has had to materials it needs to do its job. On some of the most important and sensitive programs in the Intelligence Community, we have been frustrated in our attempts to do oversight because we have

not been able to get documents and other information critical to understanding and therefore evaluating these programs. In other cases the administration has placed burdensome and unwarranted limits on access by Senators and staff.

Vice Chairman Bond and I are making a concerted bipartisan effort to deal with these questions. And we are making headway. One issue that we both raised with Admiral McConnell at his hearing has now been resolved. We also have seen movement, if not complete satisfaction, in other areas. Admiral McConnell's answers convinced me that he will be an ally in this area. It is my view that the intelligence community needs to view Congress as a partner in supporting intelligence activities that protect America and I think he will do that.

I thank all of my colleagues for supporting support the confirmation of Admiral McConnell and I look forward to working with him in his new role as Director of National Intelligence.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECOGNIZING REAR ADMIRAL CHARLES HAMILTON

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Rear Admiral Charles "Charlie" S. Hamilton, upon the completion of his current tour of duty as the Program Executive Officer, Ships, PEO Ships. Since assuming the position nearly 4 years ago, Rear Admiral Hamilton has worked with Congress on numerous issues of vital importance to our Navy and our Nation. His successes and accomplishments have been significant and many. Rear Admiral Hamilton has earned my deep respect and that of my colleagues through his exceptional competence, integrity, and innate ability to cut through bureaucracy in order to get the job done. Today, it is my pleasure to recognize some of Rear Admiral Hamilton's many accomplishments, and commend his service to the Navy, the Congress, and our grateful Nation.

Rear Admiral Hamilton was born in Amityville, NY. He entered military service in 1974 as an ensign after receiving a bachelor of science degree in Zoology from Duke University where he was a member of the Navy ROTC program. He continued his education at the Naval Post Graduate School, where

he earned a master of arts degree in national security affairs, and at the National War College, where he earned a master of science degree in national security strategy. He is also a graduate of the Defense Systems Management College, and a designated surface warfare officer and joint specialty officer.

Rear Admiral Hamilton served in a variety of assignments at sea, where he consistently excelled as a leader of the highest caliber. His positions included combat information center officer aboard USS *Hawkins*, DD 873, mission fire control officer aboard USS *Coontz*, DDG 40, and operations officer aboard USS *Callaghan*, DDG 994. In September 1986, he became the executive officer aboard USS *Fox*, CG 33, where his leadership played a key role in the success of Operation Earnest Will, ensuring the safe passage of tankers and merchant vessels during the fiercest days of the Iran-Iraq conflict. In February 1991, he assumed command of USS *O'Brien*, DD 975, where he was hailed by his subordinates and superiors for his extraordinary leadership.

Rear Admiral Hamilton has also excelled in a variety of key staff positions, where he helped define and execute key elements of our national security strategy. These assignments included serving as the arsenal ship program manager; head of the Fleet Introduction and Lifetime Support Directorate, program executive officer for Theater Surface Combatants; two tours with the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations as Anti-Submarine Warfare Program analyst, OP-91, and Head of the AEGIS Destroyer Section, OP-355. He also served in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology as military staff specialist for naval warfare.

On May 15, 2003, Rear Admiral Hamilton assumed command of PEO Ships, then a newly established organization responsible for acquisition and support of the Navy's entire nonnuclear surface fleet, including boats and craft, special mission ships, and foreign military sales. In this capacity, he skillfully planned and executed current and future shipbuilding programs that will carry our surface Navy well into the 21st century.

During his tenure, 16 major surface ships were delivered to the U.S. Navy and 300 boats and craft were delivered to U.S. and foreign navies. To place that in perspective, it is my understanding that Rear Admiral Hamilton successfully shepherded the design and construction of more types of new ships than has ever been accomplished under a single flag officer since the passage of the Naval Act of 1794. These new classes of surface ships included *San Antonio*, LPD 17, *Lewis and Clark*, T-AKE 1, *Makin Island* LHD 8; *Freedom*, LCS 1, and *Zumwalt*, DDG 1000, classes of ships.

In addition, he tirelessly strove to facilitate the realistic consideration of next-generation architectures as well as ship concepts such as maritime

prepositioning force future, MPFF, Mobile Landing Platform, MLP, and joint high speed vessel, JHSV. Rear Admiral Hamilton's extraordinary legacy of service will be clearly reflected not only in the improved warfighting capability of this Nation, but also in the safety, readiness, and quality of life of our sailors and marines.

On the eve of Rear Admiral Hamilton's change of command ceremony, I offer my congratulations to him, his wife Debbie and his children Chip, Mike, and Christina. Rear Admiral Hamilton will be greatly missed, and I know I speak for all my colleagues in expressing our heartfelt appreciation to him. He is a man of extraordinary honor, courage, and commitment, who always shot straight regardless of risk or possible peril. He is a credit to both the Navy and the United States of America. We wish our friend the best of luck in future endeavors, and congratulate him on the successful completion of an unprecedented tour of duty.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I regret that on January 24, 30, and 31, I was unable to vote on certain provisions of H.R. 2, the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2007. I wish to address these votes, so that the people of the great State of Kansas, who elected me to serve them as Senator, may know my position.

Regarding vote No. 22, the motion to invoke cloture on the Gregg amendment (No. 101), I would have supported Senator GREGG's amendment and would have voted to bring debate to a close. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

Regarding vote No. 23, the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 2, I would not have voted to invoke cloture on H.R. 2. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

Regarding vote No. 34, the motion to invoke cloture on the Baucus substitute amendment (No. 100), I would have supported ending the debate on the Baucus substitute amendment. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

Regarding vote No. 37, on the motion to table the Kyl amendment (No. 209), I supported Amendment No. 209 from my colleague Senator KYL and would have voted against the tabling motion.

Regarding vote No. 38, I would have supported the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to the Kyl Amendment (No. 115) to the Baucus substitute amendment (No. 100) to H.R. 2. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

Regarding vote No. 39, the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 2, as amended, I would have supported ending the debate on H.R. 2. My vote would not have altered the result of this motion.

Madam President, I regret that I was unable to vote the afternoon of January 30 on the confirmation of the nomination of both Judge Lisa Godbey

Wood and Judge Philip Gutierrez to be U.S. district judges. In neither case would my vote have altered the outcome of these confirmations; however, I wish to address these confirmations so that the people of the great State of Kansas, who elected me to serve them as U.S. Senator, may know my position.

Regarding vote No. 35, the confirmation vote on the nomination of Lisa Godbey Wood, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia, Executive Calendar No. 6: I support the confirmation of Ms. Godbey Wood.

Regarding vote No. 36, the confirmation vote on the nomination of Philip S. Gutierrez, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Executive Calendar No. 7: I support the confirmation of Mr. Gutierrez.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS MERRELL

• Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, today I ask the Senate to join me in recognizing Dr. Dennis Merrell on the occasion of his retirement from York Technical College in Rock Hill, SC. Dr. Merrell officially stepped down last week as president of York Tech following over 30 years of service at the vocational college. For the last seventeen of those thirty years, Dr. Merrell led York Tech as the school's president. He leaves York Tech having transformed the college into a powerful source of economic development and manufacturing workforce creation for South Carolina and the country.

After serving 2 years in the military, Dr. Merrell earned a bachelor's degree in business and computer science from Winthrop University and a master's degree in computer science from Virginia Tech. He joined the faculty at York Tech to teach computer technology and programming in 1976 and in time became chair of the Computer Technology Division. Eventually Dr. Merrell was named the college's Vice President of Instruction. He served in that capacity until he was appointed president of the school in 1989 following the death of his predecessor, Dr. Baxter Hood.

To deliver true quality technical education, Dr. Merrell understood that York Tech would need to rely on resources outside of those provided by State and local government. To that end, Dr. Merrell developed a culture of industry partnerships from which the school has tremendously benefited during his tenure. Under Dr. Merrell's leadership, enrollment in the college's continuing education programs nearly doubled. Six buildings including a child development center, library, student services building, continuing education center, institute for manufacturing productivity, and science and technology building were all constructed on

Dr. Merrell's watch. Construction on a new economic development training center is also currently underway—the product of a collaboration with 3D Systems Corporation.

Like the relationship with 3D Systems, Dr. Merrell also championed partnerships with regional construction companies and other manufacturing businesses to address practical job-training issues. In the last year, York Tech has also joined with utility companies and contractors in the Carolinas to help meet the growing need for entry-level line workers in the region. For efforts like these York Tech was recognized as a Bellweather Awards Finalist in 2006 for its unique approach to industry alliances. The United States Department of Education has even acknowledged York Tech for its innovative approach to meeting the local and national workforce needs in the area of manufacturing.

Dr. Merrell even promoted distance learning, namely online instruction, allowing countless students the opportunity to reach educational goals without giving up their jobs. As such the American Association of Community Colleges named York Tech the number one digital-savvy college among the country's largest and urban community colleges.

Dr. Merrell's community service outside of his work at York Tech includes leadership roles at the Rock Hill and York County Economic Development Boards, the Rock Hill Rotary Board, the Charlotte Area Education Consortium Board, and the York County Red Cross Board, among a host of other technical education organizations.

York Tech is sure to miss Dr. Merrell's leadership and vision, but I am confident that the school will build on his impressive legacy. In conclusion, I ask that the Senate join me in wishing Dr. Merrell a healthy and happy retirement.●

IN RECOGNITION OF FLOWERS FOODS

• Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Flowers Foods of Thomasville, GA, which has just been named by *Forbes* magazine as this year's "Best-Managed" publicly traded food company. This honor comes on top of a record fourth quarter and a record year for Flowers Foods.

Flowers Foods has clearly set a standard of excellence for which all of us should strive. Operating out of Thomasville, GA, since 1919, Flowers Foods has a proven record of success and dedication not only to its customers and employees but also to the State of Georgia. I have watched as this company has grown over the years to the point where it now serves almost 40 percent of the U.S. population. I expect its continued success to serve as a shining example to businesses across Georgia and the United States.

I want to commend chief executive officer George E. Deese and all the em-

ployees of Flowers Foods and their families on a job well done.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD SHAPIRO

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I join my colleagues in saluting Richard H. Shapiro, the executive director of the Congressional Management Foundation. As Rick moves on to new challenges, I want to thank him for his remarkable service to the U.S. Senate.

Rick Shapiro is responsible for bringing 21st century management skills to an institution built on 18th century rules and practices. We still have spittoons in the Senate—yet we also have blackberries.

Rick Shapiro helped us wrestle with issues that our Founding Fathers didn't even dream about. How do you answer thousands of e-mails a week? How do you hire, train, and retain excellent staff? How do you set goals and measure progress—so that promises made can be promises kept? How do you ensure that state and Washington offices communicate, coordinate and cooperate? Whenever I had a question about managing my office, I turned to Rick Shapiro—and my staff did the same.

Under Rick Shapiro's leadership, the Congressional Management Foundation has helped Members to set up their offices, upgrade office systems, and adjust to new ways of connecting with constituents. His book "Setting Course" is a must-read for all new Members of Congress. He was the first to compile and analyze information from individual offices—to enable Senators to learn from the best practices of others.

Rick Shapiro is a part of our Senate family. In fact, he met his wife Trudy Vincent when she was my legislative director. Their daughter Abby has been spotted selling Girl Scout cookies around the Capitol.

Rick Shapiro has made a lasting impact on the U.S. Senate. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his service. While he is stepping down from the Congressional Management Foundation, I look forward to great things from Rick in the years ahead.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:11 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 161. An act to adjust the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument to include the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial in Bainbridge Island, Washington, and for other purposes.

H.R. 235. An act to allow for the renegotiation of the payment schedule of contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the Redwood Valley County Water District, and for other purposes.

H.R. 356. An act to remove certain restrictions on the Mammoth Community Water District's ability to use certain property acquired by that District from the United States.

H.R. 386. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District.

H.R. 512. An act to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino to develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, DC, and for other purposes.

At 4:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 434) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through December 31, 2007, and for other purposes.

At 4:48 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Chairman.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 161. An act to adjust the boundary of the Minidoka Internment National Monument to include the Nidoto Nai Yoni Memorial in Bainbridge Island, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 235. An act to allow for the renegotiation of the payment schedule of contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the Redwood Valley County Water District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 356. An act to remove certain restrictions on the Mammoth Community Water District's ability to use certain property acquired by that District from the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 386. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 512. An act to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of the National Museum of the American Latino to develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino in Washington, DC, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-721. A communication from the Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Electronic Filing of Notices of Exemption and Exclusion Under Part 4 of the Commission's Regulations" ((RIN3038-AC33)(72 FR 1658)) received on February 6, 2007; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-722. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's annual report on its operations for fiscal year 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-723. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 16-674, "National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Grant Authority Temporary Act of 2007" received on February 6, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-724. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 16-676, "School Without Walls Development Project Temporary Amendment Act of 2007" received on February 6, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-725. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 16-677, "D.C. Housing Authority Rent Supplement Temporary Amendment Act of 2007" received on February 6, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-726. A communication from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 16-675, "Fiscal Year 2007 Operating Cash Reserve and Revised Revenue December Allocation Temporary Act of 2007" received on February 6, 2007; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-727. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's semi-annual report on the Department for the period ending September 30, 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 510. A bill to specify that the 100 most populous urban areas of the United States, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be eligible for grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 511. A bill to provide student borrowers with basic rights, including the right to timely information about their loans and the right to make fair and reasonable loan payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 512. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of enlarging the Arthur V. Watkins Dam Weber Basin Project, Utah, to provide additional water for the Weber Basin Project to fulfill the purposes for which that project was authorized; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. BOND):

S. 513. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revive previous authority on the use of the Armed Forces and the militia to address interference with State or Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ):

S. 514. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Muscogee Nation of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 515. A bill to provide a mechanism for the determination on the merits of the claims of claimants who met the class criteria in a civil action relating to racial discrimination by the Department of Agriculture but who were denied that determination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the option of including combat pay when computing earned income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 517. A bill to amend the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide additional assistance to State and local governments for utility costs resulting from the provision of temporary housing units to evacuees from Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 518. A bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 to require the Statistics Commissioner to collect information from coeducational secondary schools on such schools' athletic programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. KYL):

S. 519. A bill to modernize and expand the reporting requirements relating to child pornography, to expand cooperation in combating child pornography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 520. A bill to enhance ecosystem protection and the range of outdoor opportunities protected by statute in the Skykomish River valley of the State of Washington by designating certain lower-elevation Federal lands as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 521. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse located at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, as the "Gerald W. Healy Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 522. A bill to safeguard the economic health of the United States and the health and safety of the United States citizens by improving the management, coordination, and effectiveness of domestic and international intellectual property rights enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 523. A bill to amend the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 to authorize the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide additional assistance to State and local governments for utility costs resulting from the provision of temporary housing units to evacuees from Hurricane Katrina and other hurricanes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 524. A bill to provide emergency agricultural disaster assistance for agricultural producers, manufacturers, and workers in the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 74. A resolution designating each of February 7, 2007, and February 6, 2008, as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. BAYH):

S. Res. 75. A resolution congratulating the Indianapolis Colts on their victory in Super Bowl XLI; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 57

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 57, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 85

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify that territories and Indian tribes are eligible to receive grants for confronting the use of methamphetamine.

S. 231

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to authorize the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program at fiscal year 2006 levels through 2012.

S. 336

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 336, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army to operate and maintain as a system the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal dispersal barriers, and for other purposes.

S. 355

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 355, a bill to establish a National Commission on Entitlement Solvency.

S. 357

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 357, a bill to improve passenger automobile fuel economy and safety, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce dependence on foreign oil, and for other purposes.

S. 413

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 and the Revised Statutes of the United States to prohibit financial holding companies and national banks from engaging, directly or indirectly, in real estate brokerage or real estate management activities, and for other purposes.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation.

S. 442

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of S. 442, a bill to provide for loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders.

S. 446

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 446, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize capitation grants to increase the number of nursing faculty and students, and for other purposes.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 481

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 481, a bill to recruit and retain more qualified individuals to teach in Tribal Colleges or Universities.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MARTINEZ) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 502, a bill to repeal the sunset on the reduction of capital gains rates for individuals and on the taxation of dividends of individuals at capital gains rates.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish long-term care trust accounts and allow a refundable tax credit for contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 510. A bill to specify that the 100 most populous urban areas of the United States, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be eligible for grants under the Urban Area Security Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Urban Area Security Initiative Improvement Act," which addresses eligibility for the Department of Homeland Security's Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant program.

This bill will improve the existing grant award process by broadening the number of urban areas eligible to apply. In Fiscal Year 06, the Department of Homeland Security made arbitrary decisions about areas' need for homeland security funding, threatening the eligibility of eleven worthy areas to apply for future grants.

The eligibility of Sacramento and San Diego, in my State of California, were threatened in this way. Sacramento is the capital of the most populous State in the Nation and home to

dozens of critical Federal and State government buildings. In addition, much of the State's water, electricity, and telecommunication systems are managed from Sacramento. The San Diego area contains the Nation's seventh-largest city adjacent to a heavily trafficked international border, a busy port, tourist attractions, and major military installations.

My bill would ensure that the 100 most populous urban areas of the country are eligible to apply for UASI grants each year. The Department of Homeland Security would then have the discretion to award funds to as many applicants as it deems worthy and needy.

The bill would also require that the Department employ a "sensitivity analysis" in its grant process, to deal with uncertainty in the mathematical models that it uses to evaluate the risk of terrorism for urban areas. The Department's leadership could make better-informed policy decisions if it used a sensitivity analysis to better understand the effects of policy judgments in estimating risk each year.

I urge my colleagues to consider and pass this bill, with its important implications for making our Nation more secure against terrorism.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 511. A bill to provide student borrowers with basic rights, including the right to timely information about their loans and the right to make fair and reasonable loan payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to give rights to student borrowers. The Student Borrower Bill of Rights Act will provide student borrowers with five basic rights to protect them when trying to repay their loans.

Students are borrowing now more than ever to pay for higher education. Need-based grant aid has stagnated while college costs have grown, resulting in more students borrowing and at higher levels. In 1993, less than one-half of students graduating from 4-year colleges and universities had student loans. Now two-thirds are faced with this debt.

Unlike other debt, young people take out student loans to invest in themselves. Because these loans help to pay for college, student loans can help people earn more money over the course of their lifetimes and offer students greater choices in their careers. Student borrowers must take the responsibility of repaying their debt seriously so that future generations of students can have the chance to invest in themselves.

However, too many borrowers in New York, and around the country, are overly burdened or treated unfairly as they repay their student loans. That is

why I am introducing the Student Borrower's Bill of Rights Act.

This bill will make it easier for students to repay loans and give them a basic set of enforceable rights. This bill would give student borrowers the right to fair monthly payments that do not exceed a percentage of their incomes, as well as access to fair interest rates and fees. This bill would also give students the right to shop in a free marketplace for their lender and to borrow without exploitation. Finally, the bill will give students access to better information about their loans to provide students with better options during repayment.

The unfortunate truth is that student loan debt may even prevent borrowers from pursuing a higher degree. According to the Nellie Mae Corporation, 40 percent of college graduates cite alarming student loan debt as the reason for not pursuing a graduate degree. Most disturbingly, the burden of student loan debt alone can force graduates out of important, but low-paying professions, such as social workers, teachers and police officers. Our Nation cannot remain competitive in the global economy if these trends continue.

I am happy to report that two of the provisions from the Student Borrower Bill of Rights Act of the 109th Congress were enacted into law through the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense 2006. These provisions, a repeal of the single holder rule and consolidation between loan programs, will enable borrowers to choose lenders with acceptable income-sensitive repayment terms when consolidating student loans.

We need to make sure that student loans do not prevent students from following their dreams. It is in our Nation's economic interest to provide student borrowers with effective rights to make repayment of student loans easier.

The rights found in my bill are long overdue. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Student Borrower Bill of Rights.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 512. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of enlarging the Arthur V. Watkins Dam Weber Basin Project, Utah, to provide additional water for the Weber Basin Project to fulfill the purposes for which that project was authorized; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, not long ago, Utahns suffered a long and devastating drought, from which we have not fully recovered. The drought has instilled in us the need to plan for the future and ensure sound management of our water resources. For that reason, I rise to introduce an important bill that will help make better use of Utah's scarce water supply.

The Arthur V. Watkins Dam Enlargement Act of 2007 would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a

feasibility study on raising the height of the Arthur V. Watkins Dam in Weber County. The bill would give the Bureau of Reclamation access to the dam to study it and make adjustments as necessary to cater to the ever growing needs of Utah citizens. This is no ordinary dam. It is roughly 14 miles long and encloses a reservoir containing more than 200,000 acre-feet of water.

Thousands of Utahns rely on the water provided by the reservoir. And the Weber Basin is one of Utah's fastest growing areas, making the need to find additional water resources even more pressing. In my view, expanding the dam is a simple and inexpensive way to increase water storage capacity in an area that desperately needs it.

Moreover, last year, the Watkins Dam began to leak slightly. If the dam were to breach, it would flood many hundreds of acres of farm and grazing land, which would spell an agricultural disaster. This legislation would provide the resources and the opportunity to address quickly that looming problem, as well.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 512

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Arthur V. Watkins Dam Enlargement Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Arthur V. Watkins Dam is a feature of the Weber Basin Project, which was authorized by law on August 29, 1949.

(2) Increasing the height of Arthur V. Watkins Dam and construction of pertinent facilities may provide additional storage capacity for the development of additional water supply for the Weber Basin Project for uses of municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, fish and wildlife, and

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF FEASIBILITY STUDY.

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, is authorized to conduct a feasibility study on raising the height of Arthur V. Watkins Dam for the development of additional storage to meet water supply needs within the Weber Basin Project area and the Wasatch Front. The feasibility study shall include such environmental evaluation as required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and a cost allocation as required under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485 et seq.).

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. BOND):

S. 513. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revive previous authority on the use of the Armed Forces and the militia to address interference with State and Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last year, Congress quietly made it easier for this

President or any President to declare martial law. That's right: In legislation added at the Administration's request to last year's massive Defense Authorization Bill, it has now become easier to bypass longtime posse comitatus restrictions that prevent the Federal Government's use of the military, including a federalized National Guard, to perform domestic law enforcement duties. That change runs counter to our founding principles, to the optimal use of our superb National Guard here at home, and to whatever sensible reforms are needed to improve our Nation's emergency response capabilities.

Today Senator BOND and I are introducing legislation to repeal these unwarranted and perilous changes, which were made to a little-known law called the Insurrection Act. Our amendment replaces every word, comma, and period from the original act and returns it to its original form. Repealing this ill-considered change in the Insurrection Act would allow Congress to have a more orderly, thoughtful, open and consultative discussion on whether such sensitive and massive powers should be changed, if at all. It is difficult to see how any Senator could disagree with the advisability of having a more transparent and thoughtful approach to this sensitive issue.

The Insurrection Act is a Reconstruction-era law that provides the major exemption from posse comitatus—the legal doctrine that bars the use of the military for law enforcement directed at the American people here at home. The Insurrection Act is designed to ensure that Federal laws are enforced and to ensure that American citizens' basic constitutional rights are respected and protected. When the Insurrection Act is invoked, the President can—without the consent of the respective governors—federalize the National Guard and use it, along with the entire military, to carry out law enforcement duties. Treading as this does across basic constitutional issues relating to separation of power and to state and local sovereignty, this is a sweeping grant of authority to the President. Because the use of the military for domestic law enforcement is so sensitive an issue, the Act has been invoked only sparingly since it was enacted.

The primary reason that the law has been invoked so rarely is that there has been an inherent tension in the way it was crafted. Before it was changed last year, the law was purposefully ambiguous about when the President could invoke the Act in cases beyond a clear insurrection or when a state clearly violated Federal law in its actions. Because there was this useful ambiguity—a constructive friction in the law—a President until now would have to use the power with great caution, and with the impetus for appropriate consultation.

Yet by the time committee work was completed in the House and the Senate

on the Fiscal Year 2006 Defense Authorization Bill, the law had been changed and that useful ambiguity had vanished. In addition to the cases of insurrection, the Act can now be invoked to restore public order after a terrorist attack, a natural disaster, a disease outbreak, or—and this is extremely broad—“other condition.” Restoring public order has suddenly become an entirely new purpose for the Insurrection Act. And, as if to underscore this fundamental change, the conference committee changed the name of the Act from “Insurrection” to “Enforcement of the Laws to Restore Public Order.”

This significant change was made without consulting the Nation's Governors, mayors, sheriffs, or the National Guard Adjutants General. It was made without consulting the other relevant policy committees in the Senate and the House. It was merely slipped in, at the Administration's request, as rider to a bill that was hundreds of pages long. And when the Nation's Governors learned of the change and expressed their strong opposition, they were ignored, and this facilitation of presidential ability to federalize the National Guard—even over the objections of the Nation's Governors—remained in the bill that was signed into law by President Bush.

Now this President and future Presidents can more easily take control of the National Guard and use our entire military apparatus for law enforcement at home. In a situation like another Katrina or even a more contained incident like a terrorist incident, the President will be able to bring in Federal troops and take away control from the Governors, the Emergency Managers, the Sheriffs, and the State Adjutants General who know their communities best and are responsible for responding.

What we should be doing instead is buttressing the response abilities of these local and State officials. We should ensure every State has a state-of-the-art emergency operations center, that our first responders have the best equipment and training, and that the National Guard has adequate equipment and available people at home to provide support. Any Federal assets—military or otherwise—that might come into a State should be in a supporting and not commanding role. The local officials who know their communities are in the best positions to control the situation, not the President or the military.

Some have argued that the changes made were only a clarification of existing law or that the Insurrection Act already gave the power to the President to use the military for law enforcement in an emergency. I strongly disagree with that explanation, and so do the Governors, Adjutants General, and a host of other officials. They see it, as Senator BOND and I see it, as a tangible and troubling expansion of the President's powers and a parallel reduction

in State sovereignty. But if some believe the original Act already gave the President this expansive power, they should not object to bringing the law back to its original form.

Repeal of the recent changes to the Insurrection Act will help ensure that our National Guard and larger emergency response capabilities remain strong. Repeal is crucial to ensuring that our Governors and local officials remain in control and that they are consulted when anyone considers overriding their authority. Repeal is simply essential to ensuring the military is not used in a way that offends and endangers some of our more cherished values and liberties.

We enter this effort with the strong support of Governors and of the National Guard community, including the National Governors Association, the National Guard Association, the Adjutants General Association, and the Enlisted Association of the National Guard. I ask unanimous consent that support letters from the National Governors Association, the Adjutants General Association, and the Enlisted Association of the National Guard be printed at this point in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Last year's Insurrection Act rider reflects the general lack of close oversight that has taken a toll on our system of government. I hope the days of rubberstamping are over, and I hope the Senate will quickly remedy this situation by considering and passing the bill that we introduce today.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED STATES, INC.,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2007.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHRISTOPHER BOND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LEAHY AND BOND: The National Guard Association of the United States (NGAUS) is pleased to support your efforts to repeal those provisions of Section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 109-364) enacted in the 109th Congress.

We believe those provisions removed the governors of the several states from their constitutional role as the commanders in chief of their respective states' National Guard forces in responding to domestic emergencies, in both an unnecessary and unwarranted manner.

We further believe that the exploitation of the language of the Insurrection Act as a surreptitious method to gain special presidential authority where clearly the Congress has never intended the federal executive to hold sway is “creative” but “poor” public policy. Please spare no effort to reverse this dangerous precedent.

Thank you for your reasoned and forthright protection of the prerogatives of the governors and the National Guard.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN M. KOPER,
Brigadier General (Ret).
President.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2007.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. CHRISTOPHER "KIT" BOND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY AND SENATOR BOND: Section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 109-364) unnecessarily expanded the President's authority to federalize the National Guard during certain emergencies and disasters. The nation's governors opposed the inclusion of this section in the bill because responsibility for responding to disasters and other local emergencies to assure the security and wellbeing of our residents along; with managing the Guard within a state must rest with the governor. The changes made in Section 1076 of the National Defense Authorization Act undermine governors' authority over the Guard, place the safety and welfare of citizens in jeopardy and should be repealed.

Unless activated in purely federal service, the National Guard is and should remain under state control with governors as commanders-in-chief. The dual mission of the Guard, a combat ready force that can be called on by the President and a first responder in domestic emergencies or disasters under the command and control of the governor, requires that federal law clearly delineate chains of command for each mission. The changes made to the "Insurrection Act" by Section 1076 of the National Defense Authorization Act are likely to confuse the issue of who commands the Guard during a domestic emergency. By granting the President specific authority to usurp the Guard during a natural disaster or emergency without the consent of a governor, Section 1076 could result in confusion and an inability to respond to residents' needs because it calls into question whether the governor or the President has primary responsibility during a domestic emergency.

The Insurrection Act, prior to passage of the National Defense Authorization Act served the nation well as an extraordinary remedy that allowed the President to take control of the Guard in the most rare and exceptional of cases. Despite the role of governors as commander-in-chief of the Guard in their states, Section 1076 of the National Defense Authorization Act was drafted without consultation with governors and without full discussion or debate regarding the ramifications of such a change on domestic emergency response. We urge Congress to repeal the provision in Section 1076 of the Act and open a dialogue with governors regarding how to best enhance the effectiveness of the Guard in responding to domestic disasters and emergencies.

Sincerely,

GOVERNOR MICHAEL F.
EASLEY,
Co-Lead on the Na-
tional Guard.
GOVERNOR MARK SANFORD,
Co-Lead on the Na-
tional Guard.

ADJUTANTS GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, 2001, February 7, 2007.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. KIT BOND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

The Adjutants General Association of the United States (AGAUS) represents the 54 Adjutants General of the fifty states, three territories, and District of Columbia who are responsible for training and readiness of Army and Air National Guard units under their jurisdiction. We are united in support of your

legislation that repeals all language contained in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 that significantly altered existing law known as the Insurrection Act.

The language in the NDAA seriously upset the delicate balance between Governors and the President in determining the authority under which the National Guard will be used to respond to domestic conditions endangering citizens. The language significantly broadens the President ability to declare martial law and mobilize the National Guard under national command without consulting with the Governors. It may in fact cause factions to pressure the President into ill advised actions because the constructive ambiguity of the original language which encourages consultation with Governors no longer exists. For the National Guard this can mean being federalized prematurely thereby losing important capabilities available under State Active Duty and Title 32.

The National Guard has proven capable of operating flexibly and responsively when retained under governor control. This is well documented from the airport security mission in the aftermath of 9/11 to sending 6,000 National Guard Soldiers and Airmen to the southwest border in 2006 (with over 50,000 citizen-soldiers rapidly deployed under EMAC and Title 32 to support Hurricane Katrina recovery sandwiched in between). The language in NDAA 2207 would likely discourage using the National Guard in these innovative, responsive, and cost effective ways.

NDAA 2007 enabled something completely unnecessary without committee or floor debate in either legislative chamber and with explicit opposition from the Governors. Your bill restores the Insurrection Act to a proper balance. Expect willing and energetic support from the AGAUS.

Sincerely,

ROGER P. LEMPKE,
Major General
President.

EANGUS,
Alexandria, VA, February 6, 2007.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
U.S. Senate Washington, DC.
Hon. CHRISTOPHER BOND,
U.S. Senate Washington, DC.

The Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States (EANGUS) is the only military service association that represents the interests of every enlisted soldier and airmen in the Army and Air National Guard. With a constituency base of over 414,000 soldiers and airmen, their families, and a large retiree membership, EANGUS engages Capitol Hill on behalf of courageous Guard persons across this nation.

On behalf of EANGUS, and the soldiers and airmen it represents, I'd like to communicate our support for legislation to repeal the changes to the Insurrection Act as passed in Public Law 109-364, Section 1076, and to restore the authority of the Governors as our founding fathers designed over 230 years ago.

Public Law 109-364 stripped the nation's Governors of their rightful authority to use the militia of the United States (to wit, the National Guard) in times of natural disasters and major public emergencies. Congress made this move without any consultation with those Governors, duly elected by the people of this great nation. It was an obvious knee-jerk reaction to the events surrounding Hurricane Katrina in 2005, yet without merit.

We applaud you for taking legislative steps to repeal this law, and to restore to the Governors their rightful authority over the militia when not in Federal service. The people of America have a unspoken need for the National Guard in times of public emergencies,

and Washington is too far removed from the challenges in each state. We look forward to working with your staff as this legislation works its way into law.

Working for America's Best!

MSG MICHAEL P. CLINE, USA (Ret),
Executive Director.

S. 513

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REVIVAL OF PREVIOUS AUTHORITY ON USE OF ARMED FORCES AND MILITIA TO ADDRESS INTERFERENCE WITH STATE OR FEDERAL LAW.

(a) REPEAL OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY PUBLIC LAW 109-364.—Section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), and the amendments made by that section, are repealed.

(b) REVIVAL OF PREVIOUS AUTHORITY.—The provisions of chapter 15 of title 10, United States Code, that were amended by section 1076 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, as such provisions were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, are hereby revived.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) HEADING AMENDMENT.—The heading of chapter of 15 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 15—INSURRECTION".

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(A) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, and at the beginning of part I of such subtitle, are each amended by striking the item relating to chapter 15 and inserting the following new item:

"15. Insurrection 331".

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 15 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 333 and inserting the following new item:

"333. Interference with State and Federal law."

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself,
Mr. OBAMA, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr.
KENNEDY):

S. 515. A bill to provide a mechanism for the determination on the merits of the claims of claimants who met the class criteria in a civil action relating to racial discrimination by the Department of Agriculture but who were denied that determination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am introducing the Pigford Claims Remedy Act of 2007. This bill establishes a new cause of action for those African-American farmers who filed late claim petitions as required by the Pigford v. Glickman Consent Decree, but whose petitions were rejected.

These rejections have effectively barred African-American farmers from the one process that was established to bring closure to the claims of discrimination by African-American farmers, many of which have been pending for decades.

My bill attempts to remedy what appears to be a lack of sufficient notice,

indicated by the late applicants. It helps bring justice for farmers who have historically been discriminated against while being mindful of the constitutional constraints on Congress's authority. This bill will provide a new cause of action that will assist those putative claimants whose claims have never been evaluated on the merits.

Studies conducted by the USDA revealed the depth and impact of this disparate treatment. In 1994, the Department of Agriculture commissioned a study to analyze the treatment of minorities and women in farm programs and payments.

In 1997, Secretary Glickman commissioned the Civil Rights Action Task Force to look into allegations of racial discrimination in the agency's loan program. In conjunction with this the Inspector General conducted its own investigation into the allegations of disparate treatment.

Each report confirmed what African-American farmers already experienced first hand. USDA failed to act to adequately address these past wrongs. It took a class action lawsuit filed by African-American farmers in 1997 to get USDA to respond.

The resulting *Pigford v. Glickman* Consent Decree was believed to be a turning point in this unfortunate history. Hopes were high that African-American farmers would finally be compensated for the history of injustice. The consent decree was intended to provide a swift resolution for the claims of discrimination that had gone unaddressed for decades.

Yet, in a sad twist, the process that was created to provide a forum for those whose claims had been shut out, has itself shut out more than 75,000 African American farmers who wish to have their claims of discrimination heard.

Hearings before the House Subcommittee on the Constitution revealed that almost 76,000 farmers who submitted late claim petitions were denied entry because they could not show that extraordinary circumstances prevented them from filing a timely complaint.

Despite the lack of knowledge about the consent decree, which was cited by more than half of these petitioners, lack of notice was not deemed an extraordinary circumstance under the consent decree. So these petitioners are left without any recourse to have their claims of discrimination heard on the merits. These people should be allowed to have their case heard.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

By Mr. PRYOR (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the option of including combat pay when computing earned income; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to make

the Tax Relief for Americans in Combat Act permanent. This measure corrects a discrepancy in the Tax Code that penalizes certain service men and women serving in combat situations.

To give my colleagues a bit of history and perspective on this: In 2003 I approached the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, and ranking member of the committee, Senator MAX BAUCUS, and asked them to join me in an effort to get a fresh look at the overall picture of how our Tax Code treats our military.

I was very pleased when they agreed to work with me, and was delighted to jointly request an expedited study by the General Accounting Office, GAO. It was an honor to work with them and their staffs throughout this process.

The GAO raised many interesting findings but there was one especially important issue that demanded our immediate attention. In a nutshell service men and women who were serving in combat zones and receiving non-taxable combat pay were not able to also take advantage of the Earned Income Tax Credit, EITC, and the Child Care Tax Credit.

The result was that thousands of our men and women serving in combat—serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the globe—were seeing a reduction or elimination of their EITC or child credit and in effect losing money. In other words, the Tax Code had the impact of penalizing them because they are serving in combat zones.

The GAO report characterized this result as an “unintended consequence.” I saw it as just plain wrong and I am pleased to introduce legislation to fix this glitch.

In 2004, we passed the Tax Relief for Americans in Combat Act. The bill allowed men and women in uniform serving in combat to include combat pay for the purpose of calculating their earned income and child tax credit benefits. In other words, they would be able to continue receiving their rightful combat pay exclusions while having the ability to take full advantage of other tax credits.

However, this legislation only made permanent the child tax credit benefit, while the earned income tax credit provision must be continuously extended.

As of December 2006, the earned income provision was extended for another year, but I believe we must work to permanently resolve this glitch and ensure our men and women in combat are fairly treated.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank cosponsors Senator JOHN WARNER and Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN for their leadership and assistance to help garner support for this bill.

The urgency of this situation is highlighted especially when you focus on those of our troops which this really affects. We're talking about troops that tend to be in combat for more than 6 months, those in lower pay grades, those who are married with

children, and have little or no savings or spousal income.

The GAO analysis suggested that the amount of the tax benefit loss could be up to \$4,500 for enlisted personnel and \$3,200 for officers. This is real money—make or break money—to many of these families that are already under enormous stress.

I want to work in bipartisan fashion and permanently extend this tax provision. This bill corrects the problem and lets our troops, risking life and limb, know that while they are away fighting for us we will be here in the Senate fighting for them and their families.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. KYL):

S. 519. A bill to modernize and expand the reporting requirements relating to child pornography, to expand cooperation in combating child pornography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined today by Senator SCHUMER in introducing the Securing Adolescents From Exploitation-Online Act of 2007, otherwise known as the SAFE Act. This bill would clarify and strengthen the requirement that has been a Federal law for almost a decade for electronic communications providers to report images of child pornography to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) and then law enforcement. Simply put, this bill is designed reduce the sexual exploitation of our children, and punish those who cause them physical and emotional harm through sexual exploitation.

This bill would state specifically what information must be reported by electronic communications providers to NCMEC; impose higher penalties on companies that do not report child pornography; and require the Department of Justice to report on the number of investigation and convictions of sex offenders and purveyors of child pornography. In addition, the bill would make the use of the Internet for the exploitation of a child an aggravating factor to the underlying offense that would add 10 years imprisonment to a convicted offender's sentence.

Almost 20 years ago, President Reagan inaugurated the opening of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, and called on the Center to “wake up America and attack the crisis of child victimization.” Today, thanks to the efforts of NCMEC and many others in the public and private sectors, America is more conscious of the dangers of child exploitation. Unfortunately, our children still face significant threats from those who see their innocence as an opportunity to do harm. The continuing victimization of our children is readily and all too painfully apparent in the resurgence of child pornography in our world via the Internet.

Technology has contributed to the greater distribution and availability,

and, some believe, desire for child pornography. Cyberspace is host to more than one million images of tens of thousands of children subjected to sexual abuse and exploitation, according to a report by the Texas State legislature. The same report estimated that the over 14 million pornography sites on the Internet house an estimated one million pornographic images of children with 200 new images being posted daily.

According to ECPAT International, a group dedicated to eliminating the sexual exploitation of children, the production and distribution of abuse images of children is estimated to be at least a 3 billion dollar business annually in the U.S. alone. Of all the child pornography images on the Internet, 55 percent are generated from the United States, according to the same group, but these images are also produced around the world.

Just today, the Associated Press reported that Austrian authorities uncovered a major international child pornography ring involving more than 2,360 suspects from 77 countries, including over 600 in the United States, who paid to view videos of young children being sexually abused. According to authorities, the children shown in the videos were under the age of 14 and could be heard screaming in fear.

This investigation would not have happened without the good work of an employee of a Vienna-based Internet file hosting service who noticed the pornographic material during a routine check and then approached authorities. The employee blocked access to the videos while recording the I.P. addresses of people who continued to try to download the material, and gave the details to authorities. Within a 24-hour period, investigators recorded more than 8,000 hits from 2,361 computer I.P. addresses in 77 countries ranging from Algeria to South Africa.

The Federal Government already has a system in place for electronic communications providers to report these images to NCMEC. The Center is directed by law to relay that information to local, State and Federal law enforcement agencies. This reporting system has been useful, but it is in need of several vital improvements.

Today, Federal law requires electronic communication service providers to report child pornography they discover to NCMEC through the CyberTipline, but the current reporting system does not specify exactly what information should be reported. This failure to set forth specific reporting requirements makes the current statute both difficult to comply with and tough to enforce. This omission may have led to less effective prosecution of child pornographers. During a Senate Commerce Committee hearing I chaired last September, NCMEC testified that, "because there are no guidelines for the contents of these reports, some [companies] do not send customer information that allows NCMEC to

identify a law enforcement jurisdiction. So potentially valuable investigative leads are left to sit in the CyberTipline database with no action taken." This is unacceptable.

This bill would address the problem by requiring that reporting companies convey a defined set of information to the Center, which is in large part the information that is provided to NCMEC today by the nation's leading Internet service providers. Among other things, the bill would require electronic communications providers to report specific information about any individual involved in producing, distributing, or receiving child pornography. In addition, it would require reporting companies to provide NCMEC with the geographic location of the involved individual such as the individual's physical address and the IP address from which the individual connected to the Internet.

To ensure that law enforcement officials have better odds of prosecuting involved individuals, the bill would also require online service providers to preserve all data that they report to NCMEC for at least 180 days. The bill would help to ensure greater compliance with the child pornography reporting requirements under Federal law by increasing the penalties threefold for knowing failure to report child pornography to NCMEC. It would also move the reporting requirement from title 42, which relates to the public's health and welfare, to title 18, our Federal criminal code. This is to underscore that a breach of the reporting obligations constitutes a violation of criminal law. In addition, the legislation would eliminate the legal liability of online service providers for actions taken to comply with the child pornography reporting requirements.

The goal of this legislation, is to ensure more thorough reporting of child pornography to NCMEC. I expect that more and better information provided to the Center will lead to a greater number of prosecutions and enhanced protection of our children. However, let me stress that this bill does not require surveillance by electronic communications providers or require that they monitor the content of any communication. The legislation also does not require electronic communications providers to affirmatively seek out child pornography. Rather, it requires online service providers to report child pornography when they become aware of it, either through a report from a subscriber or user, or through a discovery of the material by an employee. As a result, the reporting requirement would protect children while not imposing a financial or administrative burden on online service providers.

To emphasize the heinous nature of these crimes, this bill would make the use of the Internet in the commission of a crime of child exploitation an aggravating factor that would add 10 years to the offender's sentence. The Internet is likely the greatest inven-

tion of the 21st century; however, it has also allowed these children to be victimized again and again as these images are widely distributed via the Internet. The fight to protect our children from exploitation has moved from the playground to the Internet, and we must update our laws to reflect this reality.

To address the international nature of child pornography, the bill would permit NCMEC to share reports with foreign law enforcement agencies, subject to approval by the Department of Justice. In addition, the legislation would state the sense of Congress that the executive branch should make child pornography a priority when engaging in negotiations or talks with foreign countries.

The bill would authorize \$25 million for our Nation's Internet Crimes Against Children Task Forces, which is identical to the amount requested by the Administration in its FY 2008 budget. NCMEC, the National Sheriffs Association, and others believe that such funding would significantly improve the efforts of local, State and Federal law enforcement officials dedicated to identifying and prosecuting those who use the Internet to prey upon our Nation's children.

Lastly, in order to aid law enforcement, the bill would reiterate the position of the Administration that all suppliers of web site domain names should investigate and correct inaccurate data regarding registered domain names so that law enforcement can more easily locate the hosts of such vile pictures of children. To aid Congress in understanding the need for more resources or legislation to combat the proliferation and distribution of child pornography, the bill would require the Department of Justice to report on the number of investigations, prosecutions and convictions of crimes involving the sexual exploitation of children.

This is the second bill Senator SCHUMER and I have introduced this session to protect our nation's children. Last month, we introduced the Keeping the Internet Devoid of Sexual-Predators Act of 2007, known as the KIDS Act, which would establish a database of e-mail addresses and other Internet identifying information of convicted sex offenders. The database information would then be available to commercial social networking sites for the purpose of screening their sites' to ensure convicted sex offender are not using the site to prey on children.

Protecting our children is a top priority for all members of Congress. I look forward to working with my colleagues to eradicate the victimization and exploitation of our children, the most innocent members of society, by enacting the KIDS Act and the SAFE Act.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 520. A bill to enhance ecosystem protection and the range of outdoor opportunities protected by statute in the

Skykomish River valley of the State of Washington by designating certain lower-elevation Federal lands as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the Wild Sky Wilderness Act, a bill to protect some of Washington's most unique and remarkable public lands for families today and for future generations.

For more than six years, citizens, community leaders, groups and organizations have worked together with Representative Rick Larsen and me to make this proposal a reality. I am proud to offer our bill here in the Senate on their behalf. This is the fourth time I've introduced this bill, and I'm really excited about finally moving this bill across the finish line this year.

The Wild Sky Wilderness Act reflects the best values of my home State of Washington—environmental protection, stewardship of our land, and community partnership. It also respects the economic and recreational interests of the people of Snohomish County. Our bill will protect an important area while keeping it accessible for recreation and enjoyment today and for generations to come.

For many years, I've been concerned by the rapid growth taking place in Western Washington. It's no surprise that more people want to live and work in the region, but we need to make sure that development does not destroy the natural beauty that is such an important part of our State's identity and our quality of life. We also need to ensure that growth and development do not destroy native species of plants and animals that have flourished here for centuries.

So several years ago, I began to consider new wilderness legislation. I learned that we haven't added any new wilderness areas in Washington state since 1984. I knew that if we were going to protect public land, I wanted to do it in an inclusive way by seeking input from local communities and stakeholders and working with them to develop a sound proposal. I am proud to say that the fruits of our labor are now before the United States Senate. My partner in the House of Representatives, Congressman Larsen, and I worked alongside all of the local stakeholders every step of the way to select these particular areas in the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Forest.

The Wild Sky Wilderness will protect wildlife and promote clean water by preserving the landscapes that host many native plants and animals. We can still find many of the species that have historically called this area home, but their populations are much smaller today. If these animals are going to be here centuries from now, we must protect their habitats. This wilderness designation is especially critical for threatened species of salmon, steelhead and trout, and it will protect the upper reaches of water to ensure prime habitat and clean water.

In addition, our bill ensures that the public will have access to these remarkable, protected places. It's estimated that 2.4 million people live nearby in King, Snohomish and Skagit counties. Our bill will ensure they have new recreational opportunities in the Wild Sky Wilderness. In this hectic, fast-paced time, more and more people and their families are turning to outdoor recreation on our public lands. This bill will provide new opportunities for the public to use this land by directing the U.S. Forest Service to develop a series of hiking and equestrian trails.

In addition to the environmental protections and recreational opportunities, the Wild Sky Wilderness Area will be good for the local economy. Every climber, hiker, hunter and angler setting out for the Wild Sky Wilderness will be stopping at hotels, campgrounds, restaurants, and stores in the gateway communities of Index, Skykomish, Monroe, Miller River, Startup, Grotto, Baring, Sultan, and Gold Bar.

Over the years, so many people have worked hard to make this bill possible. I can't name all of them, but I do want to recognize one great leader who is not with us to see the progress she helped make possible, Karen Fant. Anyone involved in wilderness protection knows the legacy that Karen has left us through her years of advocacy for our state's natural places. Early on, Karen recognized the need to bring together and involve local people in efforts to protect wilderness. She co-founded and directed the Washington Wilderness Coalition, and she was instrumental in forming a statewide community of wilderness advocates.

To those who knew her—and especially those lucky enough to sample her famous cookies—Karen provided never-ending inspiration and enthusiasm to continue working to protect wilderness and wild lands in the Pacific Northwest and beyond.

I cannot summarize Karen's amazing four decades of service, but I think some of her many friends said it best when they wrote:

"There are thousands of miles of trails and millions of acres of wilderness that are protected due to her work and the work of others she organized to make a difference. As we walk these trails and gain renewal from these lands, we should all remember the work we shared and the fun and camaraderie we all experienced with Karen."

With Karen's passing, we've lost a pioneer in the fight to protect our wild spaces, but thankfully she's left a clear trail and a generation of inspired, empowered advocates to continue her work.

I urge my colleagues to help my State take a great step forward in protecting our environment, improving recreation and supporting economic development by supporting the Wild Sky Wilderness Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 520

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Wild Sky Wilderness Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONS TO THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

(a) ADDITIONS.—The following Federal lands in the State of Washington are hereby designated as wilderness and, therefore, as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System: certain lands which comprise approximately 106,000 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled "Wild Sky Wilderness Proposal" and dated February 6, 2007, which shall be known as the "Wild Sky Wilderness".

(b) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description for the wilderness area designated under this Act with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives. The map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary of Agriculture may correct clerical and typographical errors in the legal description and map. The map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Subject to valid existing rights, lands designated as wilderness by this Act shall be managed by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and this Act, except that, with respect to any wilderness areas designated by this Act, any reference in the Wilderness Act to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) To fulfill the purposes of this Act and the Wilderness Act and to achieve administrative efficiencies, the Secretary of Agriculture may manage the area designated by this Act as a comprehensive part of the larger complex of adjacent and nearby wilderness areas.

(b) NEW TRAILS.—

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture shall consult with interested parties and shall establish a trail plan for Forest Service lands in order to develop—

(A) a system of hiking and equestrian trails within the wilderness designated by this Act in a manner consistent with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(B) a system of trails adjacent to or to provide access to the wilderness designated by this Act.

(2) Within two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall complete a report on the implementation of the trail plan required under this Act. This report shall include the identification of priority trails for development.

(c) REPEATER SITE.—Within the Wild Sky Wilderness, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use helicopter access to construct and maintain a joint Forest Service and Snohomish County telecommunications repeater site, in compliance with a Forest Service approved communications site plan, for the purposes of improving communications for safety, health, and emergency services.

(d) **FLOAT PLANE ACCESS.**—As provided by section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the use of floatplanes on Lake Isabel, where such use has already become established, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be desirable.

(e) **EVERGREEN MOUNTAIN LOOKOUT.**—The designation under this Act shall not preclude the operation and maintenance of the existing Evergreen Mountain Lookout in the same manner and degree in which the operation and maintenance of such lookout was occurring as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION FOR LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire lands and interests therein, by purchase, donation, or exchange, and shall give priority consideration to those lands identified as “Priority Acquisition Lands” on the map described in section 2(a). The boundaries of the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and the Wild Sky Wilderness shall be adjusted to encompass any lands acquired pursuant to this section.

(b) **ACCESS.**—Consistent with section 5(a) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134(a)), the Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure adequate access to private inholdings within the Wild Sky Wilderness.

(c) **APPRAISAL.**—Valuation of private lands shall be determined without reference to any restrictions on access or use which arise out of designation as a wilderness area as a result of this Act.

SEC. 5. LAND EXCHANGES.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall exchange lands and interests in lands, as generally depicted on a map entitled “Chelan County Public Utility District Exchange” and dated May 22, 2002, with the Chelan County Public Utility District in accordance with the following provisions:

(1) If the Chelan County Public Utility District, within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, offers to the Secretary of Agriculture approximately 371.8 acres within the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest in the State of Washington, the Secretary shall accept such lands.

(2) Upon acceptance of title by the Secretary of Agriculture to such lands and interests therein, the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to the Chelan County Public Utility District a permanent easement, including helicopter access, consistent with such levels as used as of date of enactment, to maintain an existing telemetry site to monitor snow pack on 1.82 acres on the Wenatchee National Forest in the State of Washington.

(3) The exchange directed by this Act shall be consummated if Chelan County Public Utility District conveys title acceptable to the Secretary and provided there is no hazardous material on the site, which is objectionable to the Secretary.

(4) In the event Chelan County Public Utility District determines there is no longer a need to maintain a telemetry site to monitor the snow pack for calculating expected runoff into the Lake Chelan hydroelectric project and the hydroelectric projects in the Columbia River Basin, the Secretary shall be notified in writing and the easement shall be extinguished and all rights conveyed by this exchange shall revert to the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 74—DESIGNATING EACH OF FEBRUARY 7, 2007, AND FEBRUARY 6, 2008, AS “NATIONAL WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS DAY”

Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 74

Whereas women’s athletics are one of the most effective avenues available for women of the United States to develop self-discipline, initiative, confidence, and leadership skills;

Whereas sports and fitness activities contribute to emotional and physical well-being;

Whereas women need strong bodies as well as strong minds;

Whereas the history of women in sports is rich and long, but there has been little national recognition of the significance of women’s athletic achievements;

Whereas the number of women in leadership positions as coaches, officials, and administrators has declined drastically since the passage of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-318; 86 Stat. 373);

Whereas there is a need to restore women to leadership positions in athletics to ensure a fair representation of the abilities of women and to provide role models for young female athletes;

Whereas the bonds built between women through athletics help to break down the social barriers of racism and prejudice;

Whereas the communication and cooperation skills learned through athletic experience play a key role in the contributions of an athlete at home, at work, and to society;

Whereas women’s athletics has produced such winners as Flo Hyman, whose spirit, talent, and accomplishments distinguished her above others and who exhibited the true meaning of fairness, determination, and team play;

Whereas parents feel that sports are equally important for boys and girls and that sports and fitness activities provide important benefits to girls who participate;

Whereas early motor-skill training and enjoyable experiences of physical activity strongly influence life-long habits of physical fitness;

Whereas the performances of female athletes in the Olympic Games are a source of inspiration and pride to the people of the United States;

Whereas the athletic opportunities for male students at the collegiate and high school levels remain significantly greater than those for female students; and

Whereas the number of funded research projects focusing on the specific needs of women athletes is limited and the information provided by these projects is imperative to the health and performance of future women athletes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates each of February 7, 2007, and February 6, 2008, as “National Women and Girls in Sports Day”; and

(2) encourages local and State jurisdictions, appropriate Federal agencies, and the people of the United States to observe “National Women and Girls in Sports Day” with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 75—CONGRATULATING THE INDIANAPOLIS COLTS ON THEIR VICTORY IN SUPER BOWL XLI

Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. BAYH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 75

Whereas, on Sunday, February 4, 2007, the Indianapolis Colts defeated the Chicago Bears by a score of 29-17 to win Super Bowl XLI;

Whereas Colts owner and chief executive officer Jim Irsay and the Irsay family have worked to build the Colts organization not only into a championship caliber team, but also a group dedicated to service in communities across the State of Indiana;

Whereas Tony Dungy is the first head coach of African-American descent to lead a team to victory in the Super Bowl;

Whereas Peyton Manning, having thrown for 247 yards and made 1 touchdown, was named the game’s Most Valuable Player;

Whereas the Colts’ defense and special teams were able to force 5 turnovers and to limit the Bears to 17 points;

Whereas Colts president Bill Polian, widely considered the “architect” of much of the Colts’ recent success, and the Colts management have assembled a group of players and coaches that has worked together to win 4 straight championships in the Southern Division of the American Football Conference;

Whereas the Colts’ regular season record of 12-4 marks the team’s fourth straight year with at least 12 wins, and makes the Colts only the second team to achieve such consistent success in the history of the National Football League;

Whereas the Colts are committed to community leadership, working to help those in Indiana communities who are disadvantaged and underserved, through the generosity of the Irsay family and player groups such as the Payback Foundation and D.R.E.A.M. Alive, Inc.;

Whereas tens of thousands of fans braved bitterly cold temperatures to line the streets of Indianapolis, Indiana for a victory parade and the rally that followed in the RCA Dome; and

Whereas Hoosiers from across Indiana and the Nation have rallied together to cheer the Colts not just for winning, but for winning the right way, with dignity and professionalism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates the Indianapolis Colts on their victory in Super Bowl XLI.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 233. Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 234. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 235. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 236. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 233. Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 25, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

“SEC. 20125. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated or made available in this division, \$400,000,000 is appropriated to make safety net payments for fiscal year 2007 under section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393).

“(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount provided by this Act is reduced by the pro rata percentage required to reduce the total amount provided by this Act by \$400,000,000.

SA 234. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 65, line 8, strike “: (1)” and all that follows through “or (2)” on line 10.

SA 235. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AIDS DRUG ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Resolution, of the amount appropriated to the Department of Commerce to carry out the Advanced Technology Program, \$75,000,000 shall be transferred to the Health Resources and Services Administration to carry out the AIDS Drug Assistance Program.

SA 236. Mr. COBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 20, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: “That the Continuing Ap-

propriations Resolution, 2007 (Public Law 109-289, division B) is amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting ‘March 1, 2007’.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry be authorized to conduct a full committee hearing during the session of the Senate on Wednesday February 7, 2007, at 9:15 am in SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building. The purpose of this hearing will be to discuss the United States Department of Agriculture Farm Bill Proposal with Secretary of Agriculture, Michael Johanns.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 7, 2007, at 10 a.m. to mark up an original bill entitled “Public Transportation Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007;” immediately following the executive session, the Committee will meet in open session to conduct a hearing on “Preserving the American Dream: Predatory Lending Practices and Home Foreclosures.”

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a hearing during the sessions of the Senate on Wednesday, February 7, 2007, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building. The purposes of the hearing is to discuss climate change research and scientific integrity.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to hold a hearing during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 7, 2007, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The purpose of the hearing is to consider the President's Proposed budget for FY 2008 for the Department of Energy.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session on Wednesday, February 7, 2007, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to hear testimony on “The President's Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Proposal.”

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 7, 2007, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the Hazards of Electronic Voting—Focus on the Machinery of Democracy.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 7, 2007 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a closed hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVATE SECTOR AND CONSUMER SOLUTIONS TO GLOBAL WARMING AND WILDLIFE PROTECTION

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Private Sector and Consumer Solutions to Global Warming and Wildlife Protection be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 7, 2007.

The agenda to be considered: Global Warming and Wildlife.

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

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Martha Scott Poindexter:									
United States	Dollar				10,228.70				10,228.70
India	Rupee		1,285.24						1,285.24
Elizabeth Croker:									
United States	Dollar				10,228.70				10,228.70
India	Rupee		1,285.24						1,285.24
Total			2,570.48		20,457.40				23,027.88

SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry,
Jan. 4, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul Grove:									
United Arab Emerites	Dirham		842.00						842.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		300.00						300.00
China	Yuan		322.00						322.00
Japan	Yen		800.00						800.00
United States	Dollar				11,318.00				11,318.00
Tom Hawkins:									
United Arab Emerites	Dirham		842.00						842.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		300.00						300.00
China	Yuan		322.00						322.00
Japan	Yen		800.00						800.00
United States	Dollar				11,318.00				11,318.00
Jonathan Kamarck:									
Russia	Ruble		1,746.00			300.00			2,046.00
United States	Dollar				903.00				903.00
Ellen Stein:									
Russia	Ruble		1,746.00			300.00			2,046.00
United States	Dollar				903.00				903.00
Rachel Jones:									
Russia	Ruble		1,746.00			300.00			2,046.00
United States	Dollar				903.00				903.00
Heideh Shahmoradi-Holley:									
Russia	Ruble		1,746.00			300.00			2,046.00
United States	Dollar				903.00				903.00
Tim Rieser:									
Vietnam	Dollar		995.00			45.00			1,040.00
United States	Dollar				5,358.00				5,358.00
Katherine M. Kaufer:									
Germany	Dollar		850.00						850.00
Romania	New Leu		507.42						507.42
Bulgaria	Lev		464.00						464.00
United States	Dollar				6,442.55				6,442.55
Sid Ashworth:									
Germany	Dollar		850.00						850.00
Romania	New Leu		507.42						507.42
Bulgaria	Lev		464.00						464.00
United States	Dollar				7,278.55				7,278.55
Brian T. Wilson:									
Germany	Dollar		850.00						850.00
Romania	New Leu		507.42						507.42
Bulgaria	Lev		464.00						464.00
United States	Dollar				7,278.55				7,278.55
Galen Fountain:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,974.00						1,974.00
Uganda	Shilling		664.59						664.59
Italy	Euro		2,007.00						2,007.00
United States	Dollar				9,130.83				9,130.83
Jessica Frederick:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,974.00						1,974.00
Uganda	Shilling		664.59						664.59
Italy	Euro		2,007.00						2,007.00
United States	Dollar				9,130.83				9,130.83
Dianne Preece:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,974.00						1,974.00
Uganda	Shilling		664.59						664.59
Italy	Euro		2,007.00						2,007.00
United States	Dollar				9,130.83				9,130.83
Fitzhugh Elder:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,974.00						1,974.00
Uganda	Shilling		664.59						664.59
Italy	Euro		2,007.00						2,007.00
United States	Dollar				9,130.83				9,130.83
Warren Harper:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,974.00						1,974.00
Uganda	Shilling		664.59						664.59
Italy	Euro		2,007.00						2,007.00
United States	Dollar				9,130.83				9,130.83
Stacy McBride:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,974.00						1,974.00
Uganda	Shilling		664.59						664.59
Italy	Euro		2,007.00						2,007.00
United States	Dollar				9,130.83				9,130.83
Senator Richard J. Durbin:									
Pakistan	Rupee		309.00						309.00
Qatar	Rial		338.00						338.00
United States	Dollar				8,705.41				8,705.41
Michael Daly:									
Pakistan	Rupee		309.00						309.00
Qatar	Rial		338.00						338.00
United States	Dollar				8,705.41				8,705.41
Scott O'Malia:									
Switzerland	Franc		864.00						864.00
France	Euro		347.00						347.00
United States	Dollar				6,495.76				6,495.76

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Drew Willison:									
Switzerland	Franc		864.00						864.00
France	Euro		347.00						347.00
United States	Dollar				6,495.76				6,495.76
Total			49,560.80		137,792.97		1,245.00		188,598.77

THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Feb. 2, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ambrose R. Hock:									
United States	Dollar				8,143.20				8,143.20
Kuwait	Dinar		611.42						611.42
Elaine A. McCusker:									
United States	Dollar				8,143.38				8,143.38
Kuwait	Dinar		604.55						604.55
Evelyn N. Farkas:									
United States	Dollar				12,487.00				12,487.00
Djibouti	Franc		365.00						365.00
Kenya	Shilling		227.00						227.00
Michael J. McCord:									
United States	Dollar				8,869.00				8,869.00
Italy	Dollar		263.00		28.00		6.00		297.00
Spain	Dollar		82.00						82.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		202.00				37.00		239.00
Lucian L. Niemeyer:									
United States	Dollar				8,600.35				8,600.35
Italy	Dollar		777.69		78.95				856.64
Spain	Dollar		75.55						75.55
United Kingdom	Dollar		132.65						132.65
Gregory T. Kiley:									
United States	Dollar				8,600.40				8,600.40
Italy	Dollar		645.50						645.50
Spain	Dollar		158.00						158.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		617.00						617.00
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Jordan	Dinar		258.00						258.00
Israel	Dollar		709.00						709.00
Arch Galloway:									
Jordan	Dollar		258.00						258.00
Israel	Dollar		709.00						709.00
Charles S. Abell:									
Jordan	Dollar		305.00						305.00
Israel	Dollar		665.00						665.00
Senator Bill Nelson:									
Israel	Shekel		791.42				113.86		905.28
Jordan	Dinar		102.09				2.82		104.91
Lebanon	Pound		5.00				18.00		23.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		434.96				95.57		530.53
Bahrain	Dinar		110.84				7.95		118.79
Kuwait	Dinar		35.82				1.67		37.49
Pete Mitchell:									
Israel	Shekel		797.52				10.77		808.29
Jordan	Dinar		111.19				2.82		114.01
Lebanon	Pound		5.00				0.00		5.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		406.75				3.07		409.82
Bahrain	Dinar		117.10				7.95		125.05
Senator John McCain:									
Kuwait	Dollar		309.00						309.00
Pakistan	Dollar						35.00		35.00
Israel	Dollar						36.00		36.00
Senator Susan M. Collins:									
Kuwait	Dollar		309.00						309.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		5.00						5.00
Pakistan	Dollar		70.00						70.00
Israel	Dollar		156.00						156.00
Senator Lindsey O. Graham:									
Kuwait	Dollar		309.00						309.00
Senator Lindsey O. Graham:									
United States	Dollar				4,509.10				4,509.10
Senator John Thune:									
Kuwait	Dollar		406.00						406.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Pakistan	Dollar		339.00						339.00
Israel	Dollar		434.00						434.00
United States	Dollar						25.00		25.00
Michael J. Kuiken:									
Niger	Dollar		324.00						324.00
Nigeria	Dollar		1,127.00						1,127.00
Chad	Dollar		640.00						640.00
United States	Dollar				12,403.04				12,403.04
Total			15,086.05		71,862.42		403.48		87,351.95

JOHN WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Jan. 31, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Valerie West:									
Austria	Euro		138.00						138.00
Italy	Euro		747.00						747.00
United States	Dollar				6,014.98				6,014.98
Garret Graves:									
Republic of Kenya	Shilling		1,333.00						1,333.00
United States	Dollar				7,942.00				7,942.00
Floyd Deschamps:									
Republic of Kenya	Shilling		1,315.00						1,315.00
United States	Dollar				7,854.74				7,854.74
Total			3,533.00		21,811.72				25,344.72

TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
Dec. 31, 2006.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kathryn Clay:									
Japan	Dollar		839.84						839.84
Kenya	Dollar				8,287.13				8,287.13
Kenya	Dollar		1,440.00						1,440.00
Kenya	Dollar				7,476.31				7,476.31
Total			2,279.84		15,763.44				18,043.28

PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
Feb. 1, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Stephen Higley:									
United States	Dollar				6,411.23				6,411.23
Belgium	Euro		310.00						310.00
Michael Goo:									
United States	Dollar				6,326.23				6,326.23
Belgium	Euro		310.00						310.00
Bettina Poirier:									
United States	Dollar				6,326.23				6,326.23
Belgium	Euro		310.00						310.00
Total			930.00		19,063.69				19,993.69

JAMES M. INHOFE,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works,
Jan. 26, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank Fannon:									
United States	Dollar				7,002.00				7,002.00
Brazil	Real		2,224.00						2,224.00
John Shanahan:									
United States	Dollar				8,166.68				8,166.68
Kenya	Shilling		1,440.00						1,440.00
Stephen Higley:									
United States	Dollar				8,451.85				8,451.85
Kenya	Shilling		1,728.00						1,728.00
Marc Morano:									
United States	Dollar				10,447.31				10,447.31
Kenya	Shilling		1,728.00						1,728.00
Michael Goo:									
United States	Dollar				7,869.14				7,869.14
Kenya	Shilling		2,016.00						2,016.00
Eric Thu:									
United States	Dollar				7,869.14				7,869.14
Kenya	Shilling		2,016.00						2,016.00
Total			11,152.00		49,806.12				60,958.12

JAMES M. INHOFE,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works,
Jan. 26, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Norm Coleman:									
Bahrain	Dinar		214.92				189.92		404.84
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		800.00				775.00		1,575.00
United States	Dollar				8,682.53				8,682.53
Senator Russ Feingold:									
Kenya	Shilling		600.00						600.00
Ethiopia	Birr		700.00						700.00
United States	Dollar				9,172.00				9,172.00
Senator Chuck Hagel:									
Japan	Yen		208.00						208.00
Vietnam	Dollar		251.00						251.00
United States	Dollar				8,969.00				8,969.00
Senator John Kerry:									
Egypt	Dollar		366.40						366.40
Jordan	Dollar		969.00						969.00
Syria	Dollar		875.32						875.32
Israel	Dollar		217.00						217.00
United States	Dollar				10,963.18				10,963.18
Senator Richard Lugar:									
Latvia	Dollar		378.00						378.00
Austria	Dollar		476.00						476.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		546.00						546.00
United States	Dollar				6,756.77				6,756.77
Jay Branegan:									
Germany	Euro		1,677.50						1,677.50
Cameroon	CFA		344.30						344.30
Nigeria	Dollar		868.00		708.00				1,576.00
Senegal	CFA		96.21		464.00				560.21
United States	Dollar				11,384.43				11,384.43
Isaac Edwards:									
Norway	Krone		316.00		50.00				366.00
United States	Dollar				6,059.00				6,059.00
Paul Foldi:									
United Kingdom	Pound		80.00						80.00
Switzerland	Franc		1,666.00						1,666.00
United States	Dollar				6,358.99				6,358.99
Grey Frandsen:									
Niger	CFA		364.00						364.00
Nigeria	Naira		1,041.00						1,041.00
Chad	CFA		479.00						479.00
United States	Dollar				12,403.04				12,403.04
Grey Frandsen:									
Kenya	Shilling		714.00						714.00
Ethiopia	Birr		672.00						672.00
United States	Dollar				9,172.00				9,172.00
Frank Lowenstein:									
Egypt	Dollar		366.40						366.40
Jordan	Dollar		969.00						969.00
Syria	Dollar		875.32						875.32
Israel	Dollar		217.00						217.00
United States	Dollar				8,278.43				8,278.43
Carl Meacham:									
Dominican Republic	Peso		560.00						560.00
Panama	Balboa		1,180.00						1,180.00
Venezuela	Bolivares		320.00						320.00
Chile	Peso		540.00						540.00
Peru	Nuevo Sol		576.00						576.00
Ecuador	Dollar		512.00						512.00
Guyana	Dollar		92.00						92.00
United States	Dollar				6,499.00				6,499.00
Thomas Moore:									
Austria	Euro		1,128.00						1,128.00
United States	Dollar				5,917.35				5,917.35
Austria	Euro		700.00						700.00
United States	Dollar				5,093.90				5,093.90
Kenneth Myers, Jr.:									
Latvia	Dollar		378.00						378.00
Austria	Dollar		476.00						476.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		546.00						546.00
United States	Dollar				6,756.77				6,756.77
Kenneth Myers, III:									
Latvia	Dollar		378.00						378.00
Austria	Dollar		476.00						476.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		546.00						546.00
United States	Dollar				6,756.77				6,756.77
Janice O'Connell:									
Jordan	Dollar		639.00						639.00
Syria	Dollar		195.31						195.31
Israel	Dollar		346.00						346.00
United States	Dollar				7,300.23				7,300.23
Michael Phelan:									
Germany	Euro		1,488.00		70.00		986.00		2,544.00
Chad	Franc		928.00				462.00		1,390.00
Ethiopia	Birr		822.00				885.00		1,707.00
Kenya	Shilling		1,152.00				1,114.00		2,266.00
Djibouti	Franc		478.00				150.00		628.00
United States	Dollar				13,241.97		60.00		13,301.97
Rexon Ryu:									
Japan	Yen		162.00						162.00
Vietnam	Dollar		283.00						283.00
United States	Dollar				8,969.00				8,969.00
Jennifer Simon:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,676.00						1,676.00
United States	Dollar				6,350.00				6,350.00
Jordan Talge:									
Bahrain	Dinar		214.92				195.55		410.47
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		800.00				763.00		1,563.00
United States	Dollar				9,554.04				9,554.04
Caroline Tess:									
Israel	Dollar		1,191.00						1,191.00
Syria	Dollar		273.00						273.00
Qatar	Dollar		160.00						160.00
Saudia Arabia	Dollar		430.00						430.00
Bahrain	Dollar		523.00						523.00
Kuwait	Dollar		146.00						146.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				8,860.15				8,860.15
Bernard Tooh:									
Dominican Republic	Peso		560.00						560.00
Panama	Balboa		1,180.00						1,180.00
Argentina	Peso		3,348.00						3,348.00
Ecuador	Dollar		512.00						512.00
Guyana	Dollar		92.00						92.00
United States	Dollar				6,865.40				6,865.40
Patrick Garvey:									
Jordan	Dinar		1,414.00		25.00		360.00		1,799.00
Kuwait	Dinar		50.00						50.00
United States	Dollar				9,487.91				9,487.91
Keith Luse:									
Sri Lanka	Rupee		357.00						357.00
Cambodia	Riel		382.19						382.19
Thailand	Baht		1,340.00						1,340.00
Burma	Kyat		247.50						247.50
United States	Dollar				3,756.63				3,756.63
Christopher Stevens:									
Lebanon	Dollar		154.00						154.00
Syria	Dollar		850.00						850.00
Jordan	Dollar		546.00						546.00
Israel	Dollar		1,589.00						1,589.00
Saudi Arabia	Dollar				638.00				638.00
United States	Dollar				11,995.98				11,995.98
Puneet Talwar:									
Switzerland	Dollar		838.00						838.00
Lebanon	Dollar		504.00						504.00
Syria	Dollar		250.00						250.00
United States	Dollar				7,168.01				7,168.01
Total			51,876.29		224,727.48		5,940.47		282,544.24

RICHARD G. LUGAR,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Jan. 22, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Arlen Specter:									
United States	Dollar				6,933.43				6,933.43
United Kingdom	British Pound		72.05						72.05
India	Rupee		1,546.59						1,546.59
Qatar	Riyal		311.71						311.71
Syria	Pound		355.59						355.59
Israel	Shekel		1,028.80						1,028.80
Italy	Euro		163.82						163.82
Scott Boos:									
United States	Dollar				6,330.30				6,330.30
United Kingdom	Pound		230.00						230.00
India	Rupee		2,009.77						2,009.77
Qatar	Riyal		387.00						387.00
Syria	Pound		250.00						250.00
Israel	Shekel		1,191.00						1,191.00
Italy	Euro		233.00						233.00
Total			7,779.33		12,580.16				20,359.49

ARLEN SPECTER,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, Jan. 29, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Adam Briddell:									
United States	Dollar				657.86				657.86
Italy	Euro		2,240.00						2,240.00
Total			2,240.00		657.86				2,897.86

MICHAEL B. ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
Dec. 20, 2006.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Edward B. Pusey:									
United States	Dollar				6,375.96				6,375.96
Germany	Euro		656.00						656.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Luxembourg	Euro		369.00						369.00
Italy	Euro		645.00						645.00
Dahlia Melendrez									
United States	Dollar				6,355.96				6,355.96
Germany	Euro		656.00						656.00
Luxembourg	Euro		369.00						369.00
Italy	Euro		645.00						645.00
Total			3,340.00		12,731.92				16,071.92

LARRY E. CRAIG,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Dec. 11, 2006.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul Matulic	Dollar		1,125.00		8,568.82				1,125.00 8,568.82
Thomas J. Pack			1,140.75						1,140.75
Gregory Thielmann	Dollar				8,568.82				8,568.82
David Grannis	Dollar		1,272.00		7,619.77				1,272.00 7,619.77
Jennifer Wagner	Dollar		1,463.00		8,581.77				1,463.00 8,581.77
Todd Rosenblum	Dollar		1,736.00		8,568.82				1,736.00 8,568.82
Eric Rosenbach	Dollar		828.00		1,966.00				828.00 1,966.00
Evan Gottesman	Dollar		2,372.00		8,441.00				2,372.00 8,441.00
Lorenzo Goco	Dollar		1,172.00		9,123.77				1,172.00 9,123.77
Randall Bookout	Dollar		1,612.00		3,151.18				1,612.00 3,151.18
Louis Tucker	Dollar		1,730.00		3,151.18				1,730.00 3,151.18
Nancy St. Louis	Dollar		1,780.00		3,704.20				1,780.00 3,704.20
Christopher White	Dollar		1,839.00		6,079.78				1,839.00 6,079.78
Darren Dick	Dollar		1,839.00		6,079.78				1,839.00 6,079.78
Melvin Dube	Dollar		2,375.00		8,441.00				2,375.00 8,441.00
Michael Davidson	Dollar		2,420.00		8,440.86				2,420.00 8,440.86
John Dickas	Dollar		2,447.00		8,441.00				2,447.00 8,441.00
Total			28,989.75		115,007.53				143,997.28

PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Jan. 26, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL FRIST FOR TRAVEL FROM NOV. 30 TO DEC. 2, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator William H. Frist, M.D. Mexico	Pesos		514.00						514.00
Stephen Rademaker: Mexico	Pesos		510.00						510.00
Anna M. Gallagher: Mexico	Pesos		590.00						590.00
Delegation Expenses:* Mexico	Pesos					6,211.63			6,211.63
Total			1,614.00			6,211.63			7,825.63

WILLIAM H. FRIST,
Majority Leader, Dec. 13, 2006.
* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State, and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL FRIST FOR TRAVEL FROM SEPT. 30 TO OCT. 5, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator William H. Frist, M.D.: Pakistan	Rupee		199.22						199.22

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), CODEL FRIST FOR TRAVEL FROM SEPT. 30 TO OCT. 5, 2006—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kuwait	Dinar		260.00						260.00
Senator Mel Martinez:									
Pakistan	Rupee		199.22						199.22
Kuwait	Dinar		260.00						260.00
Amy Call:									
Pakistan	Rupee		184.00						184.00
Kuwait	Dinar		260.00						260.00
Eric Ueland:									
Pakistan	Rupee		184.00						184.00
Kuwait	Dinar		260.00						260.00
John Klemmer:									
Pakistan	Rupee		184.00						184.00
Kuwait	Dinar		260.00						260.00
Anna Gallagher:									
Pakistan	Rupee		184.00						184.00
Kuwait	Dinar		260.00						260.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
Estonia	Kroon					1,237.55			1,237.55
Pakistan	Rupee					2,138.01			2,138.01
Afghanistan	Afghani					1,007.12			1,007.12
Kuwait	Dinar					2,933.67			2,933.67
Iraq	Dinar					924.32			924.32
Jordan	Dinar					2,034.36			2,034.06
Total			2,694.44			10,274.73			12,969.17

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State, and the Department of Defense under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

WILLIAM H. FRIST,
Majority Leader, Dec. 13, 2006.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
H. Knox Thames:									
United States	Dollar				6,822.24				6,822.24
Poland	Zloty		1,041.00						1,041.00
Dorothy Douglas Taft:									
United States	Dollar				6,500.26				6,500.26
Poland	Zloty		1,288.37						1,288.37
Kyle Parker:									
United States	Dollar				6,687.91				6,687.91
Poland	Zloty		1,719.93						1,719.93
Erika Schlager:									
United States	Dollar				6,844.51				6,844.51
Poland	Zloty		3,679.52						3,679.52
Cliff Bond:									
United States	Dollar				6,798.23				6,698.23
Poland	Zloty		3,821.00						3,821.00
Ron McNamara:									
United States	Dollar				6,500.26				6,500.26
Poland	Zloty		1,740.00						1,740.00
Janice Helwig:									
Germany	Euro				486.33				486.33
Poland	Zloty		3,457.00						3,457.00
Shelly Ham:									
United States	Dollar				12,028.98				12,028.98
Kazakhstan	Tenge		795.00						795.00
United Kingdom	Pound		1,420.00						1,420.00
Kyle Parker:									
United States	Dollar				9,664.55				9,664.55
Tajikistan	Somoni		595.00						595.00
Kyrgyzstan	Som		466.00						466.00
H. Knox Thames:									
United States	Dollar				7,249.17				7,249.17
Tajikistan	Somoni		682.00						682.00
Kyrgyzstan	Som		718.45						718.00
Shelly Ham:									
United States	Dollar				5,608.32				5,607.32
Kyrgyzstan	Som		932.00						932.00
Sean Woo:									
United States	Dollar				8,341.28				8,341.28
Laos	Kip		444.00						444.00
Thailand	Baht		218.00						218.00
South Korea	Won		1,680.00						1,680.00
Total			24,697.27		83,531.54				108,228.81

SAM BROWNBACK,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Jan. 9, 2007.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), DEMOCRATIC LEADER FOR FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marcel Lettre II:									
United States	Dollar				9,506.05				9,506.05
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,030.00						1,030.00
United Kingdom	Pound		312.37						312.37

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), DEMOCRATIC LEADER FOR FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2006—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Oman	Rial		309.00						309.00
Total			1,651.37		9,506.05				11,157.42

HARRY REID,
Democratic Leader, Jan. 24, 2007.

CONGRATULATING THE INDIANAPOLIS COLTS FOR WINNING SUPER BOWL XLI

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 75, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 75) congratulating the Indianapolis Colts on their victory in Super Bowl XLI.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I am pleased to join my colleague Senator BAYH in submitting a resolution congratulating the Indianapolis Colts on their historic season, culminating Sunday in a thrilling victory over the Chicago Bears in Super Bowl XLI.

Like so many of my fellow Hoosiers, I have enjoyed cheering on the Colts since the Irsay family brought them to Indianapolis almost a quarter of a century ago. Over the years Colts owner and CEO Jim Irsay and president Bill Polian have brought together a remarkable group of dedicated professionals such as Tony Dungy and players who through their hard work and dedication to community service are a credit to the Colts organization, the City of Indianapolis, and the State of Indiana.

Special recognition should be given to Tony Dungy as the first head coach of African-American descent to lead his team to victory in the Super Bowl. I have enjoyed following Coach Dungy remarkable leadership and appreciate the example he sets for all Hoosiers.

I am hopeful that each of my colleagues in the Senate will join Senator BAYH and me in congratulating the Colts on this signal achievement.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 75

Whereas, on Sunday, February 4, 2007, the Indianapolis Colts defeated the Chicago

Bears by a score of 29-17 to win Super Bowl XLI;

Whereas Colts owner and chief executive officer Jim Irsay and the Irsay family have worked to build the Colts organization not only into a championship caliber team, but also a group dedicated to service in communities across the State of Indiana;

Whereas Tony Dungy is the first head coach of African-American descent to lead a team to victory in the Super Bowl;

Whereas Peyton Manning, having thrown for 247 yards and made 1 touchdown, was named the game's Most Valuable Player;

Whereas the Colts' defense and special teams were able to force 5 turnovers and to limit the Bears to 17 points;

Whereas Colts president Bill Polian, widely considered the "architect" of much of the Colts' recent success, and the Colts management have assembled a group of players and coaches that has worked together to win 4 straight championships in the Southern Division of the American Football Conference;

Whereas the Colts' regular season record of 12-4 marks the team's fourth straight year with at least 12 wins, and makes the Colts only the second team to achieve such consistent success in the history of the National Football League;

Whereas the Colts are committed to community leadership, working to help those in Indiana communities who are disadvantaged and underserved, through the generosity of the Irsay family and player groups such as the Payback Foundation and D.R.E.A.M. Alive, Inc.;

Whereas tens of thousands of fans braved bitterly cold temperatures to line the streets of Indianapolis, Indiana for a victory parade and the rally that followed in the RCA Dome; and

Whereas Hoosiers from across Indiana and the Nation have rallied together to cheer the Colts not just for winning, but for winning the right way, with dignity and professionalism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate congratulates the Indianapolis Colts on their victory in Super Bowl XLI.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2007

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m., Thursday, February 8; that on Thursday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for the transaction of morning business for 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein during the period for morning business, with the first 30

minutes under the control of the majority, with Senator WYDEN allocated 20 minutes of that 30 minutes and Senator NELSON of Florida the following 10 minutes; that the next 30 minutes be under the control of the Republicans; further, that at the close of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of GEN George Casey; that there be 30 minutes of debate remaining on the nomination, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators LEVIN and MCCAIN or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, without further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; that upon disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session and then proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 18, H.J. Res. 20, the continuing funding resolution.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate the ability to move forward on this joint resolution. The distinguished Republican leader and I are going to spend some time tomorrow talking about amendments to this joint resolution. The Republican leader has been consistent in asking for amendments to the continuing resolution, and staff has exchanged paper on this matter. We are going to see what we can do to meet the demands of the Republicans.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Senate just entered into an agreement which establishes parameters for the final debate on the nomination of General Casey. The vote on confirmation will occur around 11:30 a.m. tomorrow. We don't know the exact time because it is according to how much time is used by the leaders, and other matters may get in the way.

After we dispose of that nomination, the Senate will begin consideration of the continuing funding resolution. As I indicated, the Republican leader and I have had discussions about this CR, and we will continue to have discussions as we move forward with this most important legislation.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:59 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 8, 2007, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 2007:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS/COMMANDING GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY, WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3036:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT L. VAN ANTWERP, JR., 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARC L. WARREN, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. TRACY L. GARRETT, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. TIMOTHY J. KEATING, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

GINO L. AUTERI, 0000
PETER G. BREWER, 0000
JAMES J. BURKS, 0000
LINES L. CHESTER, JR., 0000
LESLIE L. DIXON, 0000
KEVIN W. GLASZ, 0000
THOMAS S. HAINES, JR., 0000
MARK A. KOPPEN, 0000
LESLIE K. NESS, 0000
BRUCE D. PETERS, 0000
BRIAN L. RIGGS, 0000
MARK S. WHITE, 0000
GLENN A. YAP, 0000
JESUS E. ZARATE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRIAN E. BERGERON, 0000
DOUGLAS B. CURRY, 0000
DOUGLAS E. FORD, 0000
LEE A. FULSAAS, 0000
JAY D. GRAVER, 0000
SCOTT R. GREENING, 0000
TIMOTHY C. KIRKPATRICK, 0000
STEVEN L. KLYN, 0000
ALLAN S. PARKE, 0000
JOHN K. PAUL III, 0000
MICHAEL E. POTH, 0000
GLENN L. TERRY, 0000
FRANCESCA VASTAFALLDORF, 0000
JAMES A. WIMSATT III, 0000
LOLO WONG, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRIAN D. AFFLECK, 0000
JIMMIE D. BAILEY II, 0000
JAMES R. BENNION, 0000
KEITH E. BRANDT, 0000
GERRY L. BROWER, 0000
JEFFREY N. DAVILA, 0000
PAUL S. DOAN, 0000

ALDO J. DOMENICHINI, 0000
DANIEL K. FLOOD, 0000
SPENCER J. FRINK, 0000
MARK D. GOODWIN, 0000
TIMOTHY P. GREYDANUS, 0000
DOUGLAS J. GRIDER, 0000
MICHAEL D. GRINKEMEYER, 0000
BRIAN H. HALL, 0000
BARTLETT H. HAYES, 0000
WOODSON S. JONES, 0000
BRIAN S. KENDALL, 0000
JOSEPH J. LEGAN, 0000
JOHN T. MANSFIELD, 0000
BRIAN F. MCCRARY, 0000
KEITH H. MORITA, 0000
DIANE C. NAPOLI, 0000
RANDALL H. NEAL, 0000
SANDRA S. OSSWALD, 0000
RORY G. OWEN, 0000
WILLIAM B. PERRY, 0000
TOD S. RUSSELL, 0000
ROBERT A. SCHMITZ, 0000
GARY N. STOKES, 0000
CHARLES S. TEDDER, 0000
GUILLERMO J. TELLEZ, 0000
WILLIAM A. THOMAS, JR., 0000
WILLIAM E. VENANZI, JR., 0000
LORNA A. WESTFALL, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM R. BAEZ, 0000
ROBERT K. BOGART, 0000
TIMOTHY D. BONNIWELL, 0000
MATTHEW J. BRONK, 0000
SOTO D. CANDELARIO, 0000
RENEE D. CARLSON, 0000
WILLIE T. CHI, 0000
MARGARET A. CURRY, 0000
DANNY R. ELLER, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. GARZA, 0000
KATHLEEN A. GATES, 0000
MARTIN E. JORDAN, 0000
JAMES F. KNOWLES, 0000
RICHARD A. MCCLURE, 0000
EVERETT S. ONG, 0000
ERIC R. SCHMIDT, 0000
DARRELL S. SMITH, 0000
BRENT A. SONDAY, 0000
COREY M. STANLEY, 0000
BRYAN K. TALLENT, 0000
RICHARD A. VANDERWEELE, 0000
JAMES E. VANGILDER IV, 0000
JOHN K. WALTON, 0000
MICHAEL D. WEBB, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

KENT D. ABBOTT, 0000
JAYE E. ADAMS, 0000
PER K. AMUNDSON, 0000
DINA M. ANDREOTTI, 0000
CHESTER P. BARTON III, 0000
KRISTEN J. BEALS, 0000
RACHEL L. BECK, 0000
CELESTE S. BLANKEN, 0000
DAVID E. BLOCKER, 0000
KENNETH J. BOOMGAARD, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. BORCHARDT, 0000
LINDA R. BOYD, 0000
KIMBERLY R. BRADLEY, 0000
JOSEPH V. BROWNE, 0000
KEVIN BRYAN, 0000
DAVID S. BUSH, 0000
MARK E. CAMPBELL, 0000
THOMAS J. CANTILINA, 0000
ALEXIA C. CARRIZALES, 0000
SCOTT C. CARRIZALES, 0000
JAMES A. CHAMBERS, 0000
ARTEMIO C. CHAPA, 0000
MOLINDA M. CHARTRAND, 0000
JOHN H. CHOE, 0000
DIXON L. CHRISTIAN, 0000
VALERIE J. CLEGG, 0000
JASMIN K. COLE, 0000
JOSEPH CONNOLLY III, 0000
JOHN J. COTTON, 0000
MITCHELL W. COX, 0000
STEVEN J. CYR, 0000
MONICA A. DALRYMPLE, 0000
PIERRE ALAIN L. DAUBY, 0000
EDWIN P. DAVIS, JR., 0000
YVONNE M. DIETRICH, 0000
REYNOLD R. M. DLIM, 0000
PETER G. DREWES, 0000
RITA L. DUBOYCE, 0000
CASEY E. DUNCAN, 0000
JAMES M. EGBERT, JR., 0000
CHRISTINE R. ERDIELALENA, 0000
JOYCE P. FIEDLER, 0000
DOUGLAS S. FILES, 0000
VAL W. FINNELL, 0000
MICHAEL L. GALLETINE, 0000
ARTHUR J. GAMACHE, JR., 0000
VINOD K. GIDVANIDIAZ, 0000
STEPHEN A. GILL, 0000
HOWARD R. GIVENS, 0000
PAUL D. GLEASON II, 0000
SANDRA L. GRAVES, 0000
KERYL J. GREEN, 0000
PATRICK M. GROGAN, 0000
MELINDA B. HENNE, 0000
MICHAEL J. HIGGINS, 0000
PATRICK E. HILL, 0000
MARK A. HINTON, 0000
DUNCAN G. HUGHES, 0000
KATHRYN G. HUGHES, 0000
JAMES E. HUIZENGA, 0000
GREGORY S. HYLAND, 0000
CONSTANCE L. JACKSON, 0000
JOHN F. JAMES, 0000
SAMUEL O. JONES IV, 0000
SARAH S. JONES, 0000
ROBERT F. KACPROWICZ, 0000
WARREN R. KADRMAS, 0000
PATRICK S. KELLEY, 0000
GREGORY A. KENNEBECK, 0000
ROBERT S. KENT, 0000
CHETAN U. KHAROD, 0000
STEVEN M. KINDSVATER, 0000
TODD T. KOBAYASHI, 0000
PETER J. KOBES, 0000
DONALD C. KOWALEWSKI, 0000
ROBERT J. KOWALSKI, JR., 0000
DONALD J. LANE, 0000
JANICE M. LANGER, 0000
HENRY K. K. LAU, 0000
JIMMY J. S. LAU, 0000
DAVID P. LAUGHLIN, 0000
CRYSTINE M. LEE, 0000
ADMIRADO A. LUZURIAGA, 0000
WALTER M. MATTHEWS, 0000
JOHN D. MCARTHUR, 0000
JEFFREY D. MCNEILL, 0000
ANITA L. MCSWAIN, 0000
EVAN R. MEEKS, 0000
MICHAEL L. MILLER, 0000
DANIEL I. MIRSKI, 0000
TERENCE B. MITCHELL, 0000
ANDREW E. MOORE, 0000
PATRICK M. MUEHLBERGER, 0000
DAVID W. MUNITZ, 0000
CABOT S. MURDOCK, 0000
JEFFREY G. NALESNIK, 0000
SALLY W. NALESNIK, 0000
JUSTIN B. NAST, 0000
DOUGLAS A. NELSON, 0000
STEPHEN L. NELSON, JR., 0000
THOMAS C. NEWTON, 0000
WILFREDO J. NIEVES, 0000
STEVEN L. OLSEN, 0000
DONALD T. OSBORN, 0000
JOSEPH A. OUMA, 0000
ROBERT G. PATTERSON, 0000
CHRISTOPHER P. PAULSON, 0000
BARAK PERAHIA, 0000
KENNY J. PETERSON, 0000
JOSEPH A. POCREVA, 0000
MANOJ RAVI, 0000
LYRAD K. RILEY, 0000
JOY A. N. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
DAVID M. ROGERS, 0000
ROBERT J. SCHIMMEL, 0000
KEITH E. SCHLECHTE, 0000
JAMES M. SCOTT III, 0000
MELINDA D. SCREWS, 0000
GUY M. SHOAF, 0000
FERNANDO SILVA, 0000
PETER T. SIPOS, 0000
PAMELA D. SMITH, 0000
BRANDON T. SNOOK, 0000
JOHN B. STETSON, 0000
ROBERT T. SULLIVAN, 0000
GREGORY B. SWETZER, 0000
DEREK A. TAGGARD, 0000
MICHAEL A. TALL, 0000
NATHAN L. TAYLOR, 0000
STEVEN B. TAYLOR, 0000
ROBERT E. THAXTON, 0000
NICOLE M. THOMAS, 0000
ALICIA L. TSCHIRHART, 0000
DANIEL R. TUCKEY, 0000
ANTHONY P. TVARYANAS, 0000
LAURENCE A. ULISSEY, 0000
GINA G. VITIello, 0000
ANTHONY W. WALDRUP, 0000
CRAIG A. WARDELL, 0000
DANIEL J. WATTENDORF, 0000
LEE D. WILLIAMS, 0000
PAMELA M. WILLIAMS, 0000
WILLIAM E. WINTER III, 0000
BRUCE A. WOODFORD, 0000
EDWARD B. WOODWARD, 0000
YI YANG, 0000
ROBERT B. YORK, 0000
JEFFREY M. YOUNG, 0000
SHAWN P. ZARR, 0000
JIANZHONG J. ZHANG, 0000
AN ZHU, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531(A):

To be lieutenant colonel

ANTHONY J. PACENTA, 0000
BARNEY E. SELPH, 0000

To be major

GWENDOLYN A. FINLEY, 0000
CHARLES J. MALONE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

TANSEL ACAR, 0000

LAURA A. AESCHLIMANN, 0000
 COURTNEY A. ANDERSON, 0000
 DEBORAH ASHCRAFT OLMSCHEID, 0000
 AREZOO BARANI, 0000
 ELHAM BARANI, 0000
 STEVEN W. BLACK, 0000
 ERIC W. BLUDAU, 0000
 SETH R. BRIGGS, 0000
 BRYAN E. CARDON, 0000
 JASON A. CARTER, 0000
 JACK K. CHUNG, 0000
 PAUL M. CREER, 0000
 MICHAEL J. DAILEY, 0000
 JOHN C. DAVIS, 0000
 PEGGY L. DICKSON, 0000
 WILLIAM J. DICKSON, 0000
 KERRI FONT, 0000
 JEFFREY A. FORD, 0000
 STEPHEN R. GASPAROVICH, 0000
 USHA S. GOKHALE, 0000
 SHANNON K. GRABARKEWITZ, 0000
 JEREMY D. HAMAL, 0000
 SHANE R. HANSON, 0000
 JOSHUA M. HETHCOX, 0000
 FRED P. KREY, 0000
 SCOTT J. LAFONT, 0000
 BEN S. LEE, 0000
 DAVID R. LUKE III, 0000
 JAMES F. MASON, 0000
 CHRIS Y. MAYEDA, 0000
 ROBERT B. MCLEOD, 0000
 ROGER L. MILLER, 0000
 BRIAN G. MIN, 0000
 JEFFREY A. MOELLER, 0000
 MICHELLE M. MOFFA, 0000
 LEON A. NIEH, 0000
 JAMES W. PLEDGER II, 0000
 BRIAN RHEUDE, 0000
 MARK D. ROBERTS, 0000
 JEREMY F. SCARPATE, 0000
 DONALD R. SCHMITT, 0000
 DANIEL J. SIMON, 0000
 ERIC D. SMITH, 0000
 JUAN M. TEODORO, 0000
 STUART P. THOMPSON, 0000
 SCOTT E. THOMSON, 0000
 CHAD M. WATTS, 0000
 AMY E. WESTERMAN, 0000
 BRANDON H. WILLIAMS, 0000
 DAVID A. ZIMLIKI, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRIAN G. ACCOLA, 0000
 DERICK H. ADAMS, 0000
 SAMUEL E. AIKELE, 0000
 NIMA A. ALINEJAD, 0000
 ANDREW T. ALLEN, 0000
 CANDENA L. ALLENBRAND, 0000
 JOSHUA B. ALLEY, 0000
 GREGORY W. ANDERSON, 0000
 MARK A. ANDERSON, 0000
 PETER I. ANDERSON, 0000
 SHANE K. ANDERSON, 0000
 FLORIN D. ANDRECA, 0000
 JONATHAN L. ARNHOLT, 0000
 AARON S. ASHBRANER, 0000
 MICHAEL S. ATHA, 0000
 NORMAN D. BAKER, JR., 0000
 TIMOTHY P. BALLARD, 0000
 ROBERT L. BALTZER, JR., 0000
 ERIC W. BARNES, 0000
 ANDY S. BARNETT, 0000
 JASON BARNETT, 0000
 JOHN P. BARON, 0000
 MICHAEL J. BENCA, 0000
 RONALD M. BERNARDIN III, 0000
 JONATHAN M. BISHOP, 0000
 DAVID J. BONILLA, 0000
 EDWARD J. BORMAN, 0000
 LANCE H. BORUP, 0000
 JEFFEREY L. BOWDEN, 0000
 KENNETH J. BRASLOW, 0000
 REBEKAH C. BRISCOE, 0000
 MATTHEW W. BROWN, 0000
 SANDRA BRUNO, 0000
 STEPHEN A. BURKY, 0000
 TREVER M. BURNETT, 0000
 ANTOINETTE T. BURNS, 0000
 CASSANDRA J. BURNS, 0000
 GLENN D. BURNS, 0000
 KENT D. BURR, 0000
 GEORGE J. BUSE, 0000
 DAVID M. CALL, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER N. CARAGAN, 0000
 JEFFREY J. CARLSON, 0000
 MICHAEL C. CAROZZA, 0000
 LYDIA CARPENTER, 0000
 YOVANNI CASABLANCA, 0000
 HEATHER X. CERESTE, 0000
 CHRISTY Y. H. CHAI, 0000
 EDWARD CHAMPOUX, 0000
 MICHAEL J. CHASE, 0000
 MICHAEL CHIEN, 0000
 MARC A. CHILDRESS, 0000
 JARED A. CHUGG, 0000
 TRICIA L. CLARK, 0000
 PETER M. CLIFTER, 0000
 FRANCIS J. CLORAN, 0000
 JASON G. COISMAN, 0000
 AMY E. COLEMAN, 0000
 DEAN R. CRANNEY, 0000
 PETER J. CRONIN, 0000
 SCOTT J. CROSBY, 0000
 JUSTIN L. CUMMINGS, 0000
 MATTHEW J. DARLING, 0000
 EVERETT J. DE LEON, 0000
 PATRICK D. DEAN, JR., 0000
 ADAM M. DEBIN, 0000
 KAYLYNN DECARLI, 0000
 STEVEN D. DEMARTINI, 0000
 MICHAEL V. DEMASI, 0000
 MICHAEL J. DERR, 0000
 JUSTIN F. DEVITO, 0000
 ERIN M. DOLAN, 0000
 KENDRA L. DOLAN, 0000
 JOHN R. DORSCH, 0000
 ELIZABETH DUNCAN, 0000
 ANTHONY M. DURSO, 0000
 MARYANN J. ELACATE, 0000
 ROBERT L. EMERY, 0000
 RICHARD ENDORF, 0000
 KELLY M. ENGLUND, 0000
 GREGORY A. ERICKSON, 0000
 JEFFREY S. FAIT, 0000
 KEVIN A. FAJARDO, 0000
 MARION B. FARNSWORTH, 0000
 JACQUELINE S. FERNANDES, 0000
 CECELIA M. FICEK, 0000
 IRENE FOLARON, 0000
 LEELEE E. FRANCISCO, 0000
 JULIE A. FREILINO, 0000
 BRIAN L. FRENCH, 0000
 TRAVIS W. GERLACH, 0000
 DANIELLE L. GIDDINS, 0000
 MATTHEW C. GILL, 0000
 TERRY A. GODFREY, 0000
 ERIKA G. GONZALEZ, 0000
 ANNE GRAY, 0000
 ELIZABETH A. GREENE, 0000
 DAVID S. GROUNDS, 0000
 BRANDON T. GROVER, 0000
 ALAN D. GUHLKE, 0000
 GREGORY D. GUTKE, 0000
 PATRICK A. HAGEMAN, 0000
 CHARLES J. HAGGERTY, 0000
 LENONIE M. HANLEY, 0000
 MELISSA E. HANNA, 0000
 RYAN D. HANSON, 0000
 HERBERT J. HARMAN, 0000
 KIRBY G. HARVEY, JR., 0000
 STEVEN D. HELD, 0000
 GIAN P. HERNANDEZ, 0000
 ERIC A. HIGH, 0000
 WILLIAM M. HILTON, 0000
 BRADLEY S. HOCHSTETTLER, 0000
 BRIAN K. HOGAN, 0000
 FAWN S. HOGAN, 0000
 ROBERT L. HOLMES, 0000
 JESSICA G. HORNE, 0000
 STEPHANIE E. HORTON, 0000
 MATTHEW D. HOWELL, 0000
 LARA F. HUFFMAN, 0000
 JONATHAN C. JACKSON, 0000
 NORRIS J. JACKSON, 0000
 HANS C. JENKINS, 0000
 CASEY JIMENEZFERREIRA, 0000
 KEITH J. JOE, 0000
 ROY L. JOHNSON III, 0000
 ANDREA R. JUDY, 0000
 CARRIE A. JUDY, 0000
 JEREMY S. KENNEDY, 0000
 JESSICA A. KENT, 0000
 MATTHEW R. KEYSOR, 0000
 DAVID D. KIM, 0000
 GARY S. KIM, 0000
 KELLY S. KING, 0000
 SCOTT A. KING, 0000
 KRISTI N. KINSEY, 0000
 DAVID J. KIRBY, 0000
 SARAH V. KRINER, 0000
 DAVID E. KUHLMAN, 0000
 TRISTAN T. LAI, 0000
 JEFFREY M. LAMMERS, 0000
 DANIEL R. LAMOTHE, 0000
 FRANCESCA M. LANE, 0000
 THOMAS M. LARGE, 0000
 BRIAN D. LAYTON, 0000
 DEWAYNE C. LAZENBY, 0000
 BENJAMIN D. LEDERER, 0000
 VINCENT J. LEE, 0000
 MICHELLE K. LEGGETT, 0000
 AARON D. LEIS, 0000
 RUSSELL L. LEMMON, 0000
 MARK R. LENTHE, 0000
 MICHELLE R. LESTER, 0000
 ADRIAN G. LETZ, 0000
 HUI L. LI, 0000
 MATTHEW B. LIPPSTONE, 0000
 JOSEPH D. LOVE, 0000
 FRANK L. LOYD IV, 0000
 SEAN MACDERMOTT, 0000
 MATTHEW M. MALAN, 0000
 VALERIE J. MALLOY, 0000
 KENNETH A. MARRIOTT III, 0000
 BRYANT R. MARTIN, 0000
 JOSHUA MATTISON, 0000
 LENA M. MAYES, 0000
 OLIVER MAYORGA, 0000
 DEIRDRE M. MCCULLOUGH, 0000
 JOSEPH H. MCDERMOTT, 0000
 KERI J. MCHUGH, 0000
 MARIEFRANCE M. MCINTEE, 0000
 GREGORY M. MEIS, 0000
 KENT A. MELDRUM, 0000
 MICHAEL MICHEL, 0000
 MARVIN J. MIKESKA, 0000
 CHRISTINA M. MILLHOUSE, 0000
 AASIF H. MIRZA, 0000
 JENNIFER M. MOHR, 0000
 NISHA N. MONEY, 0000

BENJAMIN E. MONTGOMERY, 0000
 ZACHARY R. MUCHER, 0000
 JOHN J. MURDOCK, 0000
 SCOTT R. NASPINSKY, 0000
 CUONG M. NGUYEN, 0000
 NEIL B. NIPPER, 0000
 ERIK V. NOTT, 0000
 LANCE M. NUSSBAUM, 0000
 ERIK D. OBERG, 0000
 ELIZABETH A. OCONNOR, 0000
 KEVIN W. O'DONNELL, 0000
 MARY J. M. O'DTOHAN, 0000
 JASON F. OKULICZ, 0000
 DEREK A. OLDHAM, 0000
 KRISTINA E. ORIO, 0000
 PETER J. OSTERBAUER, 0000
 TREMIKAE R. OWENS, 0000
 PAUL C. PALECEK, 0000
 VASUDHA A. PANDAY, 0000
 TARANG V. PATEL, 0000
 CHRISTINE M. PATTON, 0000
 THOMAS B. PAYNTER, 0000
 NATHAN H. PEKAR, 0000
 MARIA E. PEREZJOHNSON, 0000
 JOHN K. PLEMMONS, 0000
 ANDREA M. PORROVECCIO, 0000
 PAUL PUCHTA, 0000
 BRADLEY S. PUTTY, 0000
 AARON R. QUINN, 0000
 ROLANDO Y. RAMOS, 0000
 CARL S. RAMSEY, 0000
 JENNIFER R. RATCLIFF, 0000
 LANCE D. REAL, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. REED, 0000
 DAVID G. REEL, 0000
 LUCIENNE L. REIDDUNCAN, 0000
 JOHN S. RENSCHAW, 0000
 RICHARD D. RHODES, 0000
 DEVIN A. RICKETT, 0000
 IAN C. RIDDOCK, 0000
 HEATHER D. RIGGS, 0000
 JON K. B. RIGGS, 0000
 JANELLE L. ROBERTSON, 0000
 JON M. ROBITSCHEK, 0000
 JONATHAN M. ROGERS, 0000
 JOHN RUSHTON, 0000
 MICHAEL J. RUSSELL, 0000
 TOMEKA D. RUSSELL, 0000
 RAFAEL SANTIAGO, 0000
 TAMAR E. SAUTTER, 0000
 TREVOR J. SCHAR, 0000
 TANJA R. SCHERM, 0000
 CARRIE A. SCHMID, 0000
 MELISSA SCHOENWETTER, 0000
 ERICH W. SCHROEDER, 0000
 DANIEL R. SCHULTEIS, 0000
 ERIK R. SCHWALIER, 0000
 TROY M. SCHWARTZ, 0000
 ANDREW D. SEDIVY, 0000
 CARRIE L. SELVARAJ, 0000
 JAMES D. SENECHAL, 0000
 AALOK D. SHAH, 0000
 TAVIS M. SHAW, 0000
 ERIC SHERMAN, 0000
 JEFFREY W. SIMMONS, 0000
 SUSANNAH L. SIMONE, 0000
 CHRISTY R. SKIBICKI, 0000
 BENJAMIN D. SMITH, 0000
 BRENT W. SMITH, 0000
 CHRISTIAN J. SMITH, 0000
 JEANINE A. SOMMERVILLE, 0000
 THOMAS D. SPRINKLE, 0000
 JENNINGS R. STALEY, 0000
 ERIC S. STOVER, 0000
 JONATHAN L. STREETER, 0000
 IVETTE E. SUBER, 0000
 DREW N. SWASEY, 0000
 JASON SWEENEY, 0000
 WILLIAM D. TALLEY, JR., 0000
 ARLO M. TAN, 0000
 PEI Y. TANG, 0000
 GREGORY H. TAYLOR, 0000
 AARON S. THAKER, 0000
 THOMAS J. THERIEN, 0000
 ELSA THOMAS, 0000
 MONICA J. TILLMAN, 0000
 JUSTIN J. TINGEY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. TSUEDA, 0000
 JOHN M. TUDELA, 0000
 MARISSA M. VALENCIA, 0000
 LOUIS M. VARNER, 0000
 GUY C. VENUTI, 0000
 FRANKLIN D. WADDELL, 0000
 CLAUDINE T. WARD, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER M. WEBBER, 0000
 BENJAMIN D. WEINTRAUB, 0000
 DAVID J. WEITZ, 0000
 SUK C. WHANG, 0000
 BRIAN K. WHITE, 0000
 BRYAN M. WHITE, 0000
 ANNETTE L. WILLIAMS, 0000
 JON P. WINKLER, 0000
 OLIVER J. WISCO, 0000
 JESSICA M. WRIGHT, 0000
 MATTHEW W. WRIGHT, 0000
 DARRELL M. ZAUGG, 0000
 SCOTT M. ZELASKO, 0000
 ALEXANDER J. ZENZICK, 0000
 DAVID H. ZONIES, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF
 THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO
 THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

TODD A. PLIMPTON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

PERRY L. HAGAMAN, 0000
WILLIAM A. HALL, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

DAVID W. ADMIRE, 0000
SUZANNE A. AKULEY, 0000
DOUGLAS W. AVILLA, 0000
LORIE Y. BARKER, 0000
RACHELLE M. BESEMAN, 0000
WILLIAM J. BOWMAN, 0000
KIMBERLY D. BRENDA, 0000
ALEXANDER K. BRENNER, 0000
TRACY H. BROWN, 0000
BRIAN E. BURK, 0000
RICHARD CAPO, 0000
RONALD A. CARDEN, 0000
PAUL T. CIECHOSKI, 0000
LARRY P. CLIFTON, 0000
JACQUELINE L. COLEY, 0000
ROBERT F. COLLINS, 0000
TIMOTHY S. CONGDON, 0000
PETER J. CONTOS, 0000
KYLE G. COOPER, 0000
THEODORE W. CROY III, 0000
SAEZ J. CRUZ, 0000
JOHN P. DANA, 0000
CHARLES K. DEAN, 0000
JOHN F. DETRO, 0000
JAMES C. DICKINSON, 0000
GAIL A. EVANS, 0000
SCARLETT A. FOSTER, 0000
JAMES C. FULTON, 0000
MICHAEL S. GAGNET, 0000
MICHAEL K. GARCIA, 0000
FLORIE GONZALES, 0000
JAY M. HARDY, 0000
PAUL J. HAWKENS, 0000
NEIL T. HEDDEN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. HINTZ, 0000
FREDDIE C. HOBSON, 0000
KEVIN M. HOUCK, 0000
KENNETH E. HYDE, 0000
RODERICK KELLY, 0000
TOMMY W. LAIRD, JR., 0000
SHELENA I. LAY, 0000
ESTHER L. LAZO, 0000
IAN E. LEE, 0000
ANDREW E. LEIGH, 0000
DAVID S. LEVY, 0000
LARRY T. LINDSAY, 0000
SUE L. LOVE, 0000
ROBERTO E. MARIN, 0000
STEPHANIE A. MEYER, 0000
JOHN A. MILLWARD, 0000
ROBERT D. MONTZ, 0000
KEARY J. MUDIE, 0000
ROBERT P. NUTTER, 0000
ARNE E. OAS, 0000
EDWARD B. OBRIAN, 0000
DAWN L. ORTA, 0000
JAMES G. PAIRMORE, 0000
MARLIN D. PAYNE, JR., 0000
EVAN J. PETERSEN, 0000
ANN M. PIERCE, 0000
LANCE J. PLATT, 0000
KEITH A. POWELL, 0000
JAMES L. PULLIAM, 0000
MARC C. RACITI, 0000
JERRY L. RIDER, 0000
CHARLES A. ROBERTS, 0000
LAWRENCE A. ROBINSON, 0000
JOSEPH T. SENESI, 0000
HOLLIS L. SMITH, JR., 0000
JORGE E. SMITHEON, 0000
LEANDRO SOLIS, JR., 0000
CAMERON C. STOKES, 0000
KERRY L. STORY, 0000
MARK D. THELEN, 0000
RONNA L. TRENT, 0000
FRANKLIN L. TUCKER, 0000
BETH A. VANDERPOOL, 0000
JOSEPH W. WALBERT, JR., 0000
ROY E. WALLACE, 0000
SHELDON WATSON, 0000
RHONDA WYNDER, 0000
KATHLEEN E. YANCOSEK, 0000
ARTHUR F. YEAGER, 0000
D000041

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JAMES A. ADAMEC, 0000
ELIZABETH E. ADAMS, 0000
RICHARD C. ALES, 0000
JEFFREY M. ALLERDING, 0000
MAEVELYN A. ANDALIS, 0000
LARRY B. ARAMANDA, 0000
JESSICA J. ARENS, 0000

VON M. ARNEY, 0000
FRANKIE B. BAILEY, 0000
RODDEX G. BARLOW, 0000
NEVADA D. BEDWELL, JR., 0000
ANNABEL J. BIGLEY, 0000
JEFFERY R. BORDERS, 0000
PHILLIP T. BRAY, 0000
WILLIAM J. BROWN, 0000
WINSTON C. BRUCE, 0000
KARI A. BRULEY, 0000
ANISSA J. BUCKLEY, 0000
JESS A. CALOHAN, 0000
ROMICO D. CAUGHMAN, 0000
MEKEISHA M. CAULK, 0000
ERIC K. CHA, 0000
MONIQUE R. COURTSCARTER, 0000
PAUL M. CRUM, 0000
PATRICIA L. DAVIS, 0000
STEVEN W. DAVIS, 0000
THOMAS J. DERION, 0000
JODY L. DUGAI, 0000
ROBERT P. DUPREY, JR., 0000
JAMES A. EADS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER L. ERKKILA, 0000
PAUL F. ESTES, 0000
CARABALLO D. ESTRADA, 0000
DARRELL B. EVANS, 0000
BRETT W. EVERS, 0000
JONATHAN F. FELLION, 0000
STACEY L. FERREIRA, 0000
ELIZABETH A. FINDLEY, 0000
CHARLES M. FISHER, JR., 0000
JAMES R. FOX, 0000
TAMARA S. FUNARI, 0000
KRISTEN J. GOODWIN, 0000
KENNETH R. GORE, 0000
AMY J. HADSALL, 0000
GREGORY D. HALL, 0000
ROBIN R. HARROLD, 0000
CARLA M. HERRERA, 0000
JENISE L. HILL, S. 0000
DANIELLE T. HOCKEY, 0000
LAURA M. HUDSON, 0000
TODDY F. INGRAM, 0000
BONNIE F. JEANICE, 0000
JACK M. JENKINSON, 0000
JIMMIE C. JOHNSON II, 0000
JAROLD T. JOHNSTON, JR., 0000
JERROMY L. JONES, 0000
JOHN D. KEENER, 0000
MARK C. KILLEBREW, 0000
JOHNNY KING III, 0000
JULIE E. LEE, 0000
JENNIFER D. LORILLA, 0000
CHRISTINE M. LUDWIG, 0000
THERESA C. MACK, 0000
BRUCE MATHEWS, 0000
TERRY MATHEWS, 0000
DENISE A. MCPARLAND, 0000
WILLIAM J. MEEK II, 0000
ELBRIDGE A. MERRITT, 0000
VIVIANNA MESTAS, 0000
CARRIE B. MILLES, 0000
GENERA D. MILLER, 0000
MICHAEL K. MOHAMMADI, 0000
RANDALL L. MOORE, 0000
ANNE M. MORGAN, 0000
TINA M. MORGAN, 0000
LELAND B. MORGANS, 0000
JOHN A. MURPHY, JR., 0000
TINA J. MURRY, 0000
LISA K. MUTZIG, 0000
STACEY E. NAPPER, 0000
JAMES R. NOLIN, 0000
KELLIE J. NORRIS, 0000
DORENE A. OWEN, 0000
TROY J. PALMER, 0000
SHARON Z. PARKER, 0000
KIM L. PARKS, 0000
BRANDI L. PECK, 0000
CLAUDIA A. PETERSON, 0000
CLAUSYL J. PLUMMER, 0000
AMBER L. POGRNICH, 0000
PRENTICE R. PRICE, 0000
RIKKINA G. PULLIAM, 0000
RODOLFO G. QUINTANA, JR., 0000
THOMAS O. RAWLINGS, 0000
WESLEY A. REYNOLDS, 0000
ARMI T. RHODES, 0000
SHERRI K. RIBBING, 0000
LAURA E. RICARDO, 0000
CHERYL C. RIVERA, 0000
SONYA R. ROBERTS, 0000
AMY K. ROY, 0000
PERRY C. RUIZ, 0000
JEFFREY D. RUMFIELD, 0000
RANDALL M. SCHAEFER, 0000
JODELLE M. SCHROEDER, 0000
DARIN S. SCHWARTZ, 0000
BENJAMIN E. SEELEY, 0000
DAWN M. SEELEY, 0000
PAUL A. SEXTON, 0000
JACK D. SHAPIRO, 0000
GREGORY V. SHUMATE, 0000
LEILANI A. SIAKI, 0000
JERRMIE V. SIEGFRIED, 0000
ANN C. SIMS, 0000
KEVIN E. SNYDER, 0000
WARREN A. STEWART, 0000
TINA M. STREKER, 0000
MICHAEL G. SWINDLE, 0000
BING TANWINTERS, 0000
MEEMIE J. THA, 0000
KENNETH J. THOMPSON, 0000
BRADLEY C. TIBBETTS, 0000
PAUL R. WARE, 0000
KEITH A. WARHURST, 0000

KEVIN M. WHELAN, 0000
EUNOTCHOL WHITE, 0000
MARK WILKINSON, 0000
CONREAU L. WILLIAMS, 0000
VANESSA WORSHAM, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

DENNIS R. BELL, 0000
MICHAEL BEREZCZ, 0000
STEPHANIE L. BOYD, 0000
RONALD L. BURKE, 0000
TAYLOR B. CHANCE, 0000
MARK G. CHAPPELL, 0000
MATTHEW J. ENROTH, 0000
GERRI L. FLETCHER, 0000
CHAD D. FOSTER, 0000
MICHELLE E. GOODNIGHT, 0000
MARGARET A. HANSON, 0000
CARY HONNOLD, 0000
BRYAN D. HUX, 0000
GWYNNE E. KINLEY, 0000
NORMAN KREISELMEIER, 0000
ERIC LOMBARDINI, 0000
ANDREW L. MCGRAW, 0000
AUDREY C. MCMILLANCOLE, 0000
RACHEL S. MOULTON, 0000
ROBERT PAUL, 0000
CONNIE W. SCHMITT, 0000
TRACY H. SCHMITT, 0000
KRISTIE L. SOUDERS, 0000
BRETT J. TAYLOR, 0000
APRIL ULMER, 0000
KENT J. VINCE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

RONALD J. AGUINO, 0000
ORTIZ E. ARROYO, 0000
CAROL A. ASADOORIAN, 0000
ROBERT T. ASHBURN, 0000
PRINCESS L. ATUNASE, 0000
SEREKAL L. BARLOW, 0000
MICHAEL F. BELENKY, 0000
ALVIN BLACKMON III, 0000
JEFFERY K. BLACKWELL, 0000
GERALD L. BONNER, JR., 0000
MICHAEL W. BOYCE, 0000
DAVID A. BOYER, 0000
PATRICK J. BRADY, 0000
DANIEL D. BRIDON, 0000
BURKEL L. BRISTOW, 0000
ALAN D. BRYANT, 0000
PATRICK M. CAREY, 0000
CLAYTON A. CARL, 0000
PHILLIP W. CHRISTY, 0000
DAMON P. CLEATON, 0000
JAMES F. COLE, 0000
JUSTIN D. COLE, 0000
GARY S. COOPER, 0000
JASON B. CORRY, 0000
MATTHEW T. COX, 0000
JAMES E. CRAIG, 0000
GARRICK L. CRAMER, 0000
RICHARD L. CURTIS, 0000
LORNETTE D. DALLAS, 0000
COREY V. DAUGHTREY, 0000
JASON S. DAVIS, 0000
LANA G. DAVIS, 0000
CLARISSA DEJESUSMORALES, 0000
DAVID A. DERRICK, 0000
MICHAEL DESENA, 0000
DAVID L. DOUGLAS, 0000
JAMES A. EDDIS III, 0000
JASON FAIRBANKS, 0000
MATTHEW A. FARISHON, 0000
SEAN P. FARLEY, 0000
GLEN F. FIORENZA, 0000
LEE C. FREEMAN, 0000
OSCAR S. FRIENDLY, 0000
BRADY A. GALLAGHER, 0000
JAMES H. GERLACH, 0000
KATHLEEN M. GIBSON, 0000
GEORGE O. GILBERT, JR., 0000
JACOB H. GIN, 0000
PAUL C. GRAVES, 0000
ANTHONY D. GRAY, 0000
NIZAMETTIN GUL, 0000
MICHAEL HADDT, 0000
VERONICA L. HAGER, 0000
JAMES T. HAMACHER, 0000
MICHELLE HANNON, 0000
SHIRLEY L. HARPER, 0000
DARIN L. HARPER, 0000
ANDREW J. HARTMAN, 0000
BERNARD J. HARVEY, 0000
CORY L. HEINEKEN, 0000
KENNETH S. HELGREN, 0000
ROBERT C. HOERAU, 0000
TIMOTHY J. HUNT, JR., 0000
RAYMOND J. JABLONKA, 0000
DOUGLAS R. JACKSON, 0000
FREDERICK C. JACKSON, 0000
MARY A. JOHNSON, 0000
TAMMIE M. JONES, 0000
STEVIE T. JORDAN, 0000
NICOS KARASAVVA, 0000
ALEXANDER K. KAYATANI, 0000
AMY S. KING, 0000

ANTHONY M. KING, 0000
 DANNY KITTRELL, JR., 0000
 CLEMENS S. KRUSE, 0000
 THOMAS M. LANDINO, 0000
 KENDRA L. LAWRENCE, 0000
 JOHN W. LEE, 0000
 SEAN C. LESTER, 0000
 JACQUELINE N. LEWIS, 0000
 DANIEL M. LIEDL, 0000
 ROBERT A. LINDSAY, 0000
 ROBERT G. LOWEN, 0000
 PETER B. MARKOT, 0000
 WINICO M. MARTINEZ, 0000
 JAMES N. MASTERSON, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER D. MAYHUGH, 0000
 YVETTE M. MCCREA, 0000
 DARRYL A. MCGUIRE, 0000
 DAVID S. MCILWAIN, 0000
 SEAN A. MCMURRY, 0000
 STEVEN A. MEADOW, 0000
 MARK D. MELLOTT, 0000
 MICHAEL S. MENDENHALL, 0000
 SCOTT C. MENKING, 0000
 WANDA L. MICHAELS, 0000
 DAVID R. MILLER, 0000
 DANIEL MISIGOY, 0000
 SHELLEY N. MIZELLE, 0000
 HEIDI P. MON, 0000
 JAMES A. MORRISON, 0000
 JITTAWADEE MURPHY, 0000
 BERNADETTE A. NITER, 0000
 MARCO A. OCHOA, 0000
 TERRIE L. PITTMAN, 0000
 MATOS J. PIZARRO, 0000
 MARK C. PLOOSTER, 0000
 PETER J. PRESLEY, 0000
 JOSE F. QUESADA, 0000
 MCKINLEY N. RAINY, 0000
 PETER A. RAMOS, 0000
 LYLE D. RASMUSSEN, JR., 0000
 DEVON O. REED, 0000
 JEFFREY L. REIBESTEIN, 0000
 CRAIG D. RIENNARD, 0000
 CABRERA E. REYES, 0000
 DANIEL E. REYNOLDS, 0000
 RANDALL W. RHEES, 0000
 FRANK E. RIGGLE, JR., 0000
 SHANE A. ROACH, 0000
 CODY R. ROBERSON, 0000
 JASON L. ROBERTS, 0000
 ADMINDA L. RODRIGUEZ, 0000
 DAVID L. ROLLINS, 0000
 PHILLIP D. ROOKS, 0000
 KURT E. SCHAECHER, 0000
 TIMOTHY A. SHARPE, 0000
 JEFFREY S. SIGMON, 0000
 MICHAEL S. SMITH, 0000
 SAUDIA D. SMITH, 0000
 NELSON S. SO, 0000
 EDWARD SONAK, 0000
 STEPHEN T. SPEER, 0000

RAYMOND D. SPIAK, JR., 0000
 ERIC SPOTTS, 0000
 SCOTT J. STOKOE, 0000
 KEVIN L. STRAIT, 0000
 SCOTT F. SWANDAL, 0000
 NICOLA A. THOMPSON, 0000
 ARISTOTLE A. VASELIADES, 0000
 RICHARD VELAZQUEZ, 0000
 CARYN R. VERNON, 0000
 GEORGE C. WALKER, 0000
 KENNETH L. WALTERS, 0000
 LAWANDA D. WARTHEN, 0000
 HANS H. WEI, 0000
 STATON W. WEST, 0000
 JO A. WHISENHUNT, 0000
 DANIEL M. WOODLOCK, 0000
 TODD M. YOSICK, 0000
 HASSAN ZAHWA, 0000
 PATRICK A. ZENK, 0000
 DAVID R. ZINNANTE, 0000
 REBECCA A. ZINNANTE, 0000
 JOHN P. ZOLL, 0000
 D0000
 D0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by
 the Senate Wednesday, February 7,
 2007:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

J. MICHAEL MCCONNELL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

ADM. WILLIAM J. FALLON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS W. TRAVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID H. CYR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DOUGLAS J. ROBB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANK J. CASSERINO
 BRIGADIER GENERAL STEPHEN P. GROSS
 BRIGADIER GENERAL CLAY T. MCCUTCHAN
 BRIGADIER GENERAL FRANK J. PADILLA
 BRIGADIER GENERAL LOREN S. PERLSTEIN
 BRIGADIER GENERAL JACK W. RAMSAUR II
 BRIGADIER GENERAL BRADLEY C. YOUNG

To be brigadier general

COLONEL FRANK E. ANDERSON
 COLONEL PATRICK A. CORD
 COLONEL CRAIG N. GOURLEY
 COLONEL DONALD C. RALPH
 COLONEL WILLIAM F. SCHAUFFERT
 COLONEL JACK K. SEWELL, JR.
 COLONEL RICHARD A. SHOOK, JR.
 COLONEL LANCE D. UNDHJEM
 COLONEL JOHN T. WINTERS, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES M. DUBIK

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL D. JACOBSON AND ENDING WITH TERRILL L. TOPS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 18, 2007.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STUART C. CALLE AND ENDING WITH EDWIN O. RODRIGUEZPAGAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 18, 2007.