

is to remove this amnesty under the present condition and return those who are going to be here working in a legal status? Would the Senator think that is a fair characterization?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is very clear we worked very hard to make sure there was no amnesty and that there was a path to legalization. The people had to have a job, pay their taxes and stay out of trouble, learn English and pay penalties and fines and then move to the back of the line. What we did legislatively was nothing short of miraculous to get it passed in this body. It would be a disaster for this country not to move forward on this with the tremendous amount of work we have done. As I have said, on a bipartisan basis we did that. Here is a Senate action that was not in a partisan vein but in a bipartisan vein.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the consideration of S. 2766, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2766) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 4241, to name the act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.

Kennedy amendment No. 4322, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Enzi amendment No. 4376, to promote job creation and small business preservation in the adjustment of the Federal minimum wage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 1½ hours equally divided for debate between the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY or their designees.

Who yields time? The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in a short while, we will have an opportunity in the Senate to vote on whether we are going to provide an increase in the minimum wage that will affect approximately 15 million Americans. We have not, as has been pointed out in our discussions yesterday and the day before, increased the minimum wage in the last 9 years. Even the \$5.15 an hour, the current minimum wage, has lost, since 9 years ago, about 20 percent of its purchasing power.

The men and women who earn the minimum wage are men and women of dignity. They take pride in doing the jobs they do, although they do very menial work at the bottom rung of the economic ladder. They work as teachers assistants in our schools. They

work in the nursing homes looking after the men and women who have made this country the great country it is. They provide the essential services in many of the buildings of our Nation, where American commerce is taking place. They work and they play by the rules and still they fall further and further behind.

I think there is a broad agreement in this body—there should be—that if you are going to work in the United States and you are going to work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, you should not have to live in poverty. But these individuals do. We have seen what has happened to the minimum wage over recent years. The minimum wage jobs are not jobs that get you out of poverty. Minimum wage jobs are jobs that keep you in poverty. That is a rather dramatic difference from what we have had historically when we had Democratic and Republican administrations all voting for an increase in the minimum wage and an expansion of minimum wage coverage.

So that is the issue that is going to be before us, whether we are going to go over a 2-year period and raise the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour. There are those who are strongly opposed to it. We heard some of those voices yesterday. They say let's let the market decide on these issues. Let's let the market make the judgment and decide whether \$5.15 is fair or whether we should see even a reduction. We have a number of States that have no minimum wage whatsoever, none. It is amazing. Six States have no minimum wage. One State has minimum wage of \$2.65 an hour.

I think Americans have made the judgment that a minimum wage ought to be a minimum wage and people who work ought to be able to at least get the essentials in life. Of course, that is impossible today with the explosion in costs. We have seen the explosion of costs taking place, whether it is gasoline, education funds, health care or whether it is food, but we have not seen an increase in the minimum wage. We have seen an increase in salaries of the Members of the Senate. That has gone through. We have seen that over the last 9 years.

We have increased our salaries with the cost of living by some \$30,000, but we refuse to provide an increase in the minimum wage for primarily women because 59 percent of these individuals who would benefit are women. They work hard. Many of those women have children. So it is a women's issue and a children's issue. It is also a family issue. We hear a great deal in the public discourse about family values, about our value system in the United States. Is X, Y, and Z public policy issue consistent with our values? Certainly, if you are talking about having someone who is going to work 40 hours a week, a woman who works hard and is trying to raise a child, whether they are going to be able to have any family time together effectively or whether

that woman is going to have to work two or three jobs and have little or no time with that child is a family issue and is a values issue.

Americans understand that. So this is a values issue. The leaders of our great religions understand it.

That is why the members of the churches in our country have been in strong support—and I will come back to that in a minute—of an increase in the minimum wage. It is also a civil rights issue because so many of those men and women entering the job market at this level are men and women of color. It is a children's issue, a women's issue and, mostly I as I have said many times and continue to say, it is a fairness issue. Americans understand fairness. Work hard and play by the rules in the richest country in the world and you should not have to live in poverty. Yet we find that at the end of the year, these families are \$6,000 below the poverty line and they are falling further behind.

This is it. We're not going to get another chance. Arguments will be made that, well, you should not offer it on this particular legislation. This is the Defense authorization bill. We say: Look, Mr. Republican leader, give us a chance to have a direct up-or-down vote on the increase in the minimum wage. You have your alternative on it. Give us a freestanding bill and I have indicated that we would withdraw this amendment, but we have been unable to get that.

All of us understand legislatively that we are moving more and more rapidly into the appropriations, and there is going to be a point of order made against legislating on appropriations. This legislation is appropriate for a very basic and fundamental reason. That is why our men and women who wear the American uniform are fighting in Iraq and fighting in Afghanistan—to defend American values and ideals. One of the American values is fairness here at home. It is treating people fairly for a day's work. That is an American value. That is one of the values these Americans are fighting for. That is why it is appropriate here. I don't know offhand, though, if we had more time—and I will find out next time we debate this issue because even if we get \$7.25 an hour, we are still failing to meet the needs of working poor. I don't know how many servicemen are in the military serving overseas whose parents are earning the minimum wage, but there are scores of them.

So this is about the values we hold in this country and the values worth protecting by the military of this country. That is what it is talking about. We understand there are important debates going on through noontime, and as far as I am concerned, they can go on through the evening. The idea that we are taking a few moments this morning to talk about an issue that affects some 15 million of our fellow citizens—this Senate could find plenty of time to debate the estate taxes, plenty

of time to debate flag burning. I don't know when the last flag was burned in my State of Massachusetts, but we have plenty of time to deal with that. We have had plenty of time on the Federal marriage amendment. But we don't want to deal with an increase in the minimum wage that affects 15 million people.

There you are. There are the priorities. It could not be clearer. So we know where we stand. We are always asked how we stand on different issues: What do you believe in?

We will have a very good opportunity this morning to indicate what we believe in. That is basically the framework of this issue.

Mr. President, how much time have I used?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ISAKSON). Thirty-four minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 4 more minutes.

Mr. President, this letter is from the heads of 33 major religious groups calling on Congress to do its moral duty to raise the minimum wage. This is the Let Justice Roll, which is an organization of faith and community leaders:

As leaders of our respective faith communities, we call on Congress to raise the Federal minimum wage in the 109th session. For too long, the ranks of the working poor have grown in this country. For too long, low-wage workers have been unable to support themselves and their families, even though they work several jobs, trying to make ends meet. Poverty has become a disease, striking at the very heart of the United States, attacking the most vulnerable, even as the wealthy few continue to accumulate far more than their reasonable share. It is unacceptable that such a state of affairs be allowed to continue, as year after year, Congress fails to pass an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Prophetic voices through the ages have called upon their nations to show justice to the poorest and most vulnerable in society. The Prophet Amos exhorts the people of Israel, "Hate evil and love good, and establish justice. Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream." Then, and now, the assembled people of God are called upon to establish justice for low-wage workers, whose cries are so often heard across our land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the signers be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVING WAGE CAMPAIGN,

November 7, 2005.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As leaders of our respective faith communities, we call on Congress to raise the Federal minimum wage in the 109th session. For too long, the ranks of the working poor have grown in this country. For too long, low-wage workers have been unable to support themselves and their families, even though they work several jobs, trying to make ends meet. Poverty has become a disease, striking at the very heart of the United States, attacking the most vulnerable, even as the wealthy few continue to accumulate far more than their reasonable share. It is unacceptable that such a state of affairs be allowed to continue, as year after year, Congress fails to pass an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Prophetic voices throughout the ages have called upon their nations to show justice to the poorest and most vulnerable in society. The Prophet Amos exhorts the people of Israel, "Hate evil and love good, and establish justice. Let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream." Then, and now, the assembled people of God are called upon to establish justice for low-wage workers, whose cries are so often heard across our land.

The situation among America's minimum wage workers is particularly dire. A minimum wage employee—making \$5.15 an hour, working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, earns \$10,700 a year—\$5,000 below the Federal poverty line for a family of three. The real value of the minimum wage today is nearly \$4.00 less than it was in 1968. Indeed, in order for the minimum wage to have the same purchasing power as it did in 1968, the Federal minimum would have to be raised to more than \$9.00. This situation is unconscionable, as the wealth of our Nation continues to be built on the backs of the working poor.

In his *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?*, our modern-day prophet, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., says, "There is nothing new about poverty. What is new, however, is that we now have the resources to get rid of it." It is time to heed the call of the prophets, both ancient and modern. It is time to recognize that a minimum wage should be a fair, just, and living wage.

Signed,

Kim Bobo, Executive Director of Interfaith Worker Justice; The Reverend Dr. Robert W. Edgar, General Secretary of the National Council of Churches of Christ; The Reverend C. Welton Gaddy, President of The Interfaith Alliance and the Interfaith Alliance Foundation; The Most Reverend Frank T. Griswold, Presiding Bishop and Primate of the Episcopal Church; The Reverend Dr. Stan Hastey, Executive Director of the Alliance of Baptists; James E. Hug, S.J., President of Center of Concern; The Reverend Dr. Clifton Kirkpatrick, Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.); The Reverend Timothy McDonald III and the Reverend Dr. Robert P. Shine, Sr., Chair and Vice-Chair of African American Ministers in Action.

Mary Ellen McNish, General Secretary of the American Friends Service Committee; Bishop William B. Oden, Head of Communion and Ecumenical Officer of the United Methodist Church; Bishop Roy Riley, Chair of the Evangelical Lutheran Church Conference of Bishops; Rabbi David Saperstein, Director and Counsel of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Alexander Sharp, Executive Director of Protestants for the Common Good; The Reverend William G. Sinkford, President of the Unitarian Universalist Association; The Reverend John H. Thomas, General Minister and President of the United Church of Christ; The Reverend Romal J. Tune, CEO of Clergy Strategic Alliances, LLC.

The Reverend Dr. Sharon Watkins, General Minister and President of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); Rabbi Eric Yoffie, President of the Union for Reform Judaism; Scott D. Anderson, Executive Director of the Wisconsin Council of Churches; The Reverend John Boonstra, Executive Minister of the Washington State Association of Churches; The Reverend Albert G. Cohen, Executive Director of the Southern California Ecumenical

Council; The Reverend Stephen Copley, President of the Arkansas Interfaith Conference; The Reverend Dr. Barbara Dua, Executive Director of the New Mexico Conference of Churches; The Reverend Nancy Jo Kemper, Executive Director of the Kentucky Council of Churches.

David Lamarre-Vincent, Executive Director of the New Hampshire Council of Churches; David A. Leslie, Executive Director of Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon; Marilyn P. Mecham, Executive of Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska; The Reverend J. George Reed, Executive Director of the North Carolina Council of Churches; The Reverend Dr. Stephen J. Sidorak, Jr., Executive Director of the Christian Conference of Connecticut; The Reverend C. Douglas Smith, Executive Director of the Virginia Interfaith Center for Public Policy; The Reverend Dennis Sparks, Executive Director of the West Virginia Council of Churches; The Reverend Sandra L. Strauss, Director of Public Advocacy of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches; The Reverend Rebecca Tollefson, Executive Director of the Ohio Council of Churches.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, when we asked people to sign on as citizen cosponsors of the Fair Minimum Wage Act, 1,000 religious leaders answered the call. They took a stand to say that minimum wage is a moral issue that must be addressed. They have come together from all denominations, all walks of life to send this important message.

I will take a couple more moments.

First, I remind my colleagues in the Senate that support for an increase in the minimum wage is going like a wildfire across the country. This chart indicates in red those States which have increased the minimum wage above the Federal Government minimum wage. Look at this: Arkansas and Illinois.

The States in yellow are those States where the minimum wage will likely be on the ballot this fall.

Illinois, Florida, North Carolina—red States—passed an increase in the minimum wage in both houses, but they have not been reconciled. North Carolina, Arkansas, the home of Wal-Mart, increased the minimum wage.

This is happening in the countryside. I remind the Senate again, with the failure to increase the minimum wage, what the impact has been on families and on the poor.

From 2000 to 2004, we failed to increase the minimum wage and 1.4 million more children have fallen into poverty. If we look at what has been happening to families, 5.4 million more Americans are in poverty over the last 4 years. This does not bring it up to 2006. This would continue to grow. It is 5.4 million now. The best estimate is we have 1.4 million more children who are now in poverty.

In terms of the industrialized nations of the world, this is what has happened: We have the highest child poverty rate in the industrialized world, and we haven't increased our minimum wage.

I remind my colleagues what has been happening in other countries.

Tony Blair said 7 years ago that he was going to end poverty in Britain by 2020. There were 4 million children living in poverty, and he said, as a matter of national direction and vision, that he was going to eliminate poverty for children by 2020. This is what they have done. They will have a minimum wage of \$9.80—\$9.80—an hour this October. They have moved 1.8 million children out of poverty over the last 4 years. The United States has refused to increase the minimum wage, and we have put 1.4 million children into poverty. That is completely unacceptable.

This is the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 28 minutes 48 seconds remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask that I be notified when I have consumed 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I didn't expect to hear the Democratic leader talk about the immigration bill this morning and his and Senator KENNEDY's desire to rush it through the House of Representatives, calling for action now. It is a very bad bill, and it impacts directly the issues we are talking about today—wages for working Americans. I am going to talk about that issue and ask our colleagues to give serious thought to the matters I will raise.

With regard to our colleagues who claim they are concerned about poverty among American workers, I ask those Members—Senator REID and Senator KENNEDY—who proposed the immigration bill and tried to rush it through this Senate without any amendments to consider some of the concerns of their own allies, economists and professors, who believe that if passed, it would damage the wages of American workers.

I agree that we have a troubling condition in our country. People have referred to it often as the wage gap, that higher income people seem to be doing well, but there has been a lag in performance among lower income workers. That has caused quite a bit of concern. I am not sure exactly what the economic numbers show on that, but repeatedly, we have been told often from our Democratic colleagues—but not so much lately—that there is a growing gap in income. Why is this occurring? I wish to share some thoughts about it because I believe it is important.

Let me mention this: I don't want the American worker to have a \$7.25-an-hour job; I want them to have a \$15-an-hour job, a \$30-an-hour job. That is what we want in an economy that is growing and prosperous. We want a full-employment economy where people can choose jobs that fulfill their highest aspirations and pay them a good wage, with good retirement and good health care, and we are creating a growing economy that nurtures that. But for some reason, the wages in some job markets have not kept up as well as they should.

I will read from a number of experts on this matter and ask my colleagues to think about it, not what I say but what the experts say. I am looking at a Washington Post article from Jonathan Weisman, March 31, dealing with this precise issue of minimum wage and immigration. It is titled "Immigration Divides Allies, Guest Worker Plan Sets Democratic Supports Against Organized Labor." It starts off saying this:

A growing body of economic research contends that the recent surge of foreign workers has depressed wages for low-skilled workers, especially for high school dropouts, and has even begun displacing native-born workers.

Then the article quotes Professor George Borjas, an economist at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. He has written a definitive book on immigration, "Heaven's Door." He says:

What immigration really does is redistribute wealth away from workers toward employers.

I did mention my good friend Senator KENNEDY. Senator KENNEDY has been a champion for civil rights, and a champion for helping us fight poverty, and he cares about this issue very deeply. He sincerely does. But I suggest he is not always perfectly correct on how to fix it. We can have a legitimate debate about how to improve the wages of working Americans, and that is what we need to be talking about.

The article says:

Kennedy, the Senate's liberal lion and an unflagging ally of organized labor, says the [immigration] legislation he co-wrote would help all low-wage workers by applying minimum-wage laws and other . . . protections.

The AFL-CIO disagrees. According to John Sweeney, the AFL-CIO President:

Guest-worker programs cast [American] workers into a perennial second-class status and unfairly put their fates into their employers' hands, creating a situation ripe for exploitation. . . .

He goes on:

"They encourage employers to turn good jobs into temporary jobs at reduced wages and diminished working conditions and contribute to the growing class of workers laboring in poverty."

That was Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Weisman, the staff writer for the Washington Post, then quotes Professor Borjas:

But some of those macroeconomic gains have come at the expense of low-wage work-

ers, especially the 10 percent of the labor force that dropped out of high school. In recent years, competition from low-skilled immigrant workers has reduced the wages of high school dropouts by as much as 8 percent, Borjas said.

How about another professor, Andrew Sum, director of Northeastern University's Center for Labor Market Studies. The article says quotes him:

Looking at annual earnings, the percentage losses are in the double digits, said Andrew Sum, director of Northeastern University's Center for Labor Market Studies, because jobs that once provided year-round employment are increasingly becoming temporary.

A Northeastern University study found that nearly 86 percent—

Listen to this, I say to my colleagues, this is important for us.

A Northeastern study found that nearly 86 percent of all newly employed workers hired from 2000 to 2005 were immigrants. For men, the statistics were more stark. In that time, the labor market for men rose by 2.66 million while 2.77 million foreign-born men found work.

Listen to that: The Northeastern study found that foreign-born workers filled all of the new jobs created for men between 2000 and 2005, plus some other jobs.

In other words, Sum said, immigrants have begun replacing native-born male workers.

In the immigration bill floor debate, if we not forced the Democratic side to allow us to have some amendments and reduce some of the incredible increases in immigration under the bill as presented, it would have been shocking what the immigration bill would have done to the jobs and wages of American workers. Even after successful amendments that cut the numbers of low-skilled workers allowed to come in the future, the Senate bill will still, over 20 years, virtually triple the number of people coming into our country legally, not counting those who will continue to come illegally. That will undoubtedly impact our economy. That is why the House of Representatives needs to examine this bill very carefully before we go to conference.

How about this one? Professor Sum is quoted again in the Post article: "Young guys are being displaced by immigrants," he said. "Some of my good liberal friends take issue, but if you're a young worker under 25, poorly educated, probably African American, the higher the share of new immigrants in your community, the worse your employment prospects are becoming."

How about Carol Swain, a law professor and political scientist at Vanderbilt University? She is also quoted in the Post article:

"What they're doing is increasing the pool of people eligible to compete for the very limited resources that are available for the people at the bottom. . . .The obligation of the nation should be for the people who have been here for decades."

How about the famous economics professor Robert Samuelson? He wrote an article in May in the Washington Post titled "Still Dodging Immigration's Truths." He quotes approvingly

from the testimony before our Judiciary Committee of Barry Chiswick, University of Illinois, an immigration scholar, most respected, who said the presence of immigrants in the labor market:

Increases competition for low-skilled jobs, reducing the earnings of low-skilled native-born workers. Because of their low earnings, low-skilled immigrants also tend to pay less in taxes than they receive in public benefits. . . . Hardly anyone is discussing these issues candidly. We can be a lawful society and a welcoming society simultaneously [as President Bush has said] but we cannot be a welcoming society for limitless numbers . . . without seriously compromising our own future.

Part of the future he is talking about, is the future of the American worker. Samuelson goes on to say, and I quote the line from Professor Samuelson's article: "Competition among them [low-skilled workers] depresses wages." He is talking about the additional flow of illegal immigrants into our country, or legal immigrants, for that matter. Increasing competition for the American worker by increasing the number of immigrant workers available in the labor market will depress the wages for the American worker.

In another article, Professor Samuelson, says this. He notes that illegal immigrants already here represent only about 4.9 percent of the labor force, and in no major occupation are immigrants a majority. They are 36 percent of insulation workers, 28 percent of drywall installers, and 20 percent of cooks who are drawn here by wage differences, not labor shortages. He writes about how most new illegal immigrants get work by accepting wages below the prevailing rates. What would happen, he asks, if new, illegal immigration stopped and wasn't replaced by guest workers? Well, some employers would raise wages to attract U.S. workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair. He goes on to say: Facing greater labor costs, some would find ways to minimize costs. But he goes on to ask this question, and let me quote Professor Samuelson:

What is wrong with higher wages for the poorest workers? From 1994 to 2004, the wages of high school dropouts rose only 2.3 percent after inflation, compared with 11.9 percent for college graduates. The number of native high school dropouts with jobs declined by 1.3 million from 2000 to 2005. Some lost jobs to immigrants. Unemployment remains high for some groups; 9.3 percent for African Americans.

I know that is true in my State. Although we have a great unemployment rate in Alabama—under 4 percent—we still have a far too high rate among the African-American community. And 12.7 percent for white teenagers, he notes. He says this: Poor immigrant workers hurt the wages of unskilled Americans; the only question is how much. One estimate, he said, was 10 percent.

We discussed these issues in the Judiciary Committee. We had one hearing

on it. We had a number of professors, including Professor Freeman, the Ascherman Professor of Economics at Harvard. He said these things about the jobs and wages of American workers:

One of the concerns when immigrants come in is they may take jobs from some Americans and drive down the wages of some Americans and obviously, if there are a large number of immigrants coming in, if they are coming in at a bad economic time, that is very likely to happen.

Professor Chiswick, University of Illinois at Chicago said the following:

The large increase in low-skilled immigration has had the effect of decreasing the wages and employment opportunities of low-skilled workers who are currently resident in the United States.

He said this:

Over the past two decades, the real earnings of high-skilled workers has risen substantially. The real earnings of low-skilled workers have either stagnated or decreased.

These economists are telling us what other people will not. We are being told by the business community that there is this incredible shortage out there—they can't find workers so they have to have foreign workers—but now we know the earnings of low-skilled workers have stagnated and decreased. Why? If a business wants to find more workers, they will usually increase wages, not decrease them.

He goes on to say—my time is about up, but I have quite a number of others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's additional comments be printed in the RECORD.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will take 2 minutes to respond to my friend from Alabama, and then I see the Senator from Connecticut on the floor.

The Senator from Alabama has made the best case for comprehensive immigration reform because if you are not going to have the comprehensive reform, you are going to have the continuation of the pressure of driving wages down, as we find our employers hiring the undocumented workers. It has been his administration—according to the General Accounting Office, the Republican administration—that has refused to enforce employer sanctions against the employers who are currently doing it. There have been three cases in the last 4 years, \$220,000 in fines. If he is so worried about this, I would say, Why aren't we after the Labor Department to try to do something about it?

Second point: For those who are going to come into the United States—and they ought to be able to come into the United States as workers, if there is a job an American does not take—there is going to be the labor protec-

tions, which do not exist today. There is going to be prevailing wage protections, there are Davis-Bacon protections, if they work in contract, if they work in construction, and service contract employees. None of that has been mentioned by the Senator from Alabama. That is an entirely different current situation. And we are going to have 7,000 inspectors to make sure that it is enforced, which does not exist now and is a principal reason why we have the kinds of results the Senator from Alabama refers to.

Mr. President, he has made the best case possible for passing a comprehensive program so that those conditions would not exist.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 26 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. DODD. If I could have 10 or 12 minutes, if that is appropriate.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why don't we start with 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alabama want 30 seconds? I will be glad to take this at another time when we have the time. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I would note we wrestled before Y2K as to how many high-skilled foreign workers the U.S. needed to let in for that period—you and I both discussed that in the Judiciary Committee and whether it would adversely impact the wages of high-skilled American workers. I would say that the current rate of immigration, legal and illegal—and I believe there is a growing consensus that supports this view—has depressed the wages of low-skilled American workers. I would ask the Senator if he would dispute the fact that the immigration bill he introduced would have greatly increased the number of immigrants into the country and wouldn't that have further adversely impacted the wages of low-skilled American workers?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 15 seconds in response. The legislation we have introduced would require that there be a job that an American worker has not been interested in and refused to accept. Those are the jobs individuals would be eligible for under the guest worker program. I look forward to continuing this debate with my friend from Alabama.

I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking, again, my colleague from Massachusetts and others who have fought so long and hard over the last decade to have an increase in the minimum wage in our country, from the \$5.15 that was adopted about a decade ago, to the suggestion today that

we raise it by \$2.10. To many, \$2.10 is nothing more than a cup of coffee at a high-priced coffee shop today or a few sodas or a sandwich along the way, but it makes a difference, Mr. President.

An increase in the minimum wage of \$2.10, after nearly a decade, will add some \$4,400 to the incomes of people who are depending upon the minimum wage to provide for themselves and their families. Remember whom we are talking about. The overwhelming majority of minimum wage workers are not teenagers, but are adults—working people trying to raise families, 60 percent of whom are women, many of whom are raising children on their own. So this \$2.10 increase after nearly a decade, an additional \$4,400 per year, means a great deal.

We are told by those who do the math on all of this that the increase could buy as much as 15 months of groceries for that families, 8 months of rent, 20 months of childcare—an issue that I worked with our colleague on many years ago—the importance of having a decent childcare program. As you are saying to these people, you have to stay at work and you have young children, where do the children go? The average cost of childcare rises all the time for people in this country. How do you expect someone making a minimum wage of \$5.15 per hour who has two or three young children to keep them in a safe place with that kind of an income level? That \$4,400 would be a tremendous help at that income level. That is the kind of difference we are talking about.

A group called America's Second Harvest has recently reported that they provide emergency hunger relief services to more than 25.3 million low-income people in the United States each year. That is an 18-percent increase since 1997. No other organization in our country does as much on a national level as Second Harvest does.

The numbers are quite clear. Over the last 4 or 5 years, we have watched an increase in children living in poverty in the United States climb by 1.4 million. What we are talking about is some 13 million children today who are living in poverty. Of the 37 million in our country, 13 million children who, through no fault of their own, through the accident of birth, are born into difficult circumstances. Those poverty numbers are going up. They are not going down.

What do we do about these children? How do we guarantee this child will get a good education? How do you learn anything in a school today if you are going to that school hungry? Talk to any grade school teacher in America in any community you wish and ask them the simple question: What is the difference between a child who has a decent meal in the morning and one who doesn't, in terms of their ability to learn, and they will tell you categorically that a child who is hungry doesn't learn.

We talk all the time about making sure America is going to be strong and

vital and economically competitive in the global marketplace of the 21st century. If we continue increasing child poverty at the rate it is increasing now, this country will have a very difficult time, in my view, of meeting the competitive challenges it will face in this century.

So this proposal does make a difference—a huge difference—in the lives of people who struggle every day, good Americans out there who are trying to keep their families together. How does anyone expect a family today, particularly a family with two or three children, to live on a full-time salary of \$10,700 a year? That is what you get with \$5.15—\$10,700 per year. I don't know of anyone who believes that you can meet your obligations of housing and food, of medical care you may need. You have to make terrible choices at that level.

I am not suggesting that \$7.25 is going to solve all of those problems. But the cost of living has gone up. Everyone knows that. What has happened to gasoline prices and energy prices over the last number of months?

We have increased our salaries as Members of Congress by over \$31,000 since 1997. Again, I have supported a number of those increases. How do we look in the mirror and say: A \$31,000 increase for a Senator, a Congressman. Yet we can't provide a \$2.10 per hour increase for someone making the minimum wage? How do we answer that question? We know the cost of living has gone up. We see it every single day. Minimum wage workers see it in a more painful way.

So I hope my colleagues, in the next 45 minutes when we have a chance to vote on this issue, vote for the Kennedy amendment. Raise the minimum wage that \$2.10 and give these people a chance. Let's bring these poverty numbers down. All of us, regardless of party, ideology or anything else, ought to be committed to see to it in the United States of America that child poverty doesn't go up, it goes down. These are innocents. They didn't do anything except be born into a circumstance not of their choosing. We owe them and we owe the future of this country a lot better than they are getting. After one long decade of increasing prices, \$2.10 is very little to ask. Democrats and Republicans ought to be able to come together around that request.

I hope that we can make that kind of difference. My colleague from Massachusetts and others want to be heard on this issue. I have great respect for my colleague from Wyoming who chairs our committee and does a terrific job, and we work together on many issues. But my hope is we accept the Kennedy amendment.

I didn't go into the problems of the alternative proposal, but it would mean that millions of children will get a lot less than they will if you adopt the Kennedy proposal of \$2.10. This is a time when we ought to be doing what

we can to strengthen those in our country who need some help now. That is all we are asking.

I have some 350,000 people in my State who show up at food shelters to get some assistance. That is in the most affluent State of the country on a per-capita basis, and even the State of Connecticut faces difficulties on this issue.

I know my colleagues from less affluent States see the problem in a far more dramatic way. It is not lost on me that States that have the lowest minimum wage at the State level have the highest levels of child poverty. With all the money we spend here, this is little to ask.

Small business is interested. A poll conducted among small businesses found that 86 percent of small businesses responded that an increase like this in the minimum wage is acceptable to them. In fact, studies in other countries have pointed out that their economies have not been adversely affected by this.

If small businesses said an increase is warranted, we as Members of the Congress ought not be holding back. If people who pay this wage believe it is the right thing to do, Members of Congress ought to join with them.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kennedy amendment—\$2.10 to make life a little easier for people out there struggling every day to make ends meet. This is the United States of America. These children deserve better. Their families deserve at least an opportunity to get out from under the tremendous burdens they are facing every day. I urge adoption of the amendment when the vote occurs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator for his proposal which I think is a very thoughtful and effective way of addressing many issues, which especially single women in the workplace, especially single moms in the workplace have today. These are issues which are not addressed by the Kennedy amendment.

Whether it is \$1.10 or \$2.05, that is an important debate because it will have an important effect on how many jobs are created, and the impact on job creation and jobs is what we are talking about here. If you start losing jobs because you raise the minimum wage too quickly, so fast that small employers can't afford it, that is going to have an effect on people's opportunity to work.

I think the Senator from Wyoming has put forth a much more balanced approach as to what number the minimum wage should be raised by, but that is not what is going to make the workplace a more tolerable event and a

more acceptable event for the single mother who has kids at home. What would help a lot in this area is additional language in the Enzi proposal which is called "family time." It is resisted aggressively by the other side of the aisle, and I don't understand it.

We just heard an impassioned plea from the Senator from Connecticut about working moms, single mothers—especially single mothers in low-paying jobs who have a very difficult time maintaining the quality of their household and taking care of their kids. Yet they resist a proposal which all Federal employees have had the right to since 1978, which is called "family time." They stiff-arm the working mother in this country.

This may have been acceptable because the unions demanded that they do this back in the 1950s and 1960s, when there were not that many single mothers working in the workplace. But today there is a huge participation in the workplace from single mothers. Back in 1940, only 28 percent of the workplace were women. Today, 60 percent of the workplace are women. You have almost 7.3 million single mothers in the workplace, raising a family and trying to take care of their kids' needs at home. The Enzi proposal says to those mothers, if you want to, you can work out an agreement with an employer—the employer can't demand that you do it, it is entirely up to you to sign on to that agreement; it is at your discretion; you can't be compelled to participate in this—where 1 week you can work up to 10 extra hours and the next week you work 10 less hours.

Why is that important, especially to a single mother? Because they may have a child who is going to have to have some sort of operation, they may have a child who has some sporting event that goes on for a period of days, or has a rehearsal, or just a period in their life where that child needs their mother at home for a greater period of time. This doesn't just apply to single mothers, it applies to working families, husbands and wives, but it is a really important right a single mother should have in the workplace. It is so important, in fact, that we gave it to Federal employees back in 1978. Yet year in and year out the concept of family time has been resisted by the other side of the aisle.

They come forward with these statements of compassion, which are very compelling and which are well delivered—especially by the Senator from Connecticut for whom I have great regard—but if they truly believed in that they would have incorporated in their bill the flextime proposal which Senator ENZI has put in his proposal. That is where real compassion is. That is going to affect a lot of people. Literally millions of working parents will be positively impacted if the Enzi bill passes.

Sure, the minimum wage is important. But there are a lot more people who are going to be affected by the

family time language in this bill and improve their quality of life and their ability to raise their children well than by the increase in the minimum wage. The family time will apply to everybody who works in the workplace, especially—well, everybody who works on a fixed, 40-hour week.

If you want to look at the essence of what will really help an American family, and especially an American family with a single breadwinner in it—not a single breadwinner but a single person working, single mother specifically—if you want to look at what will really help that family, you have to look at the Enzi bill and the family time language.

Let me again explain what it does. It says, over a 2-week period, at the discretion of the working mother or the working father—or if they are both working, if they are together and they are both working—they can reach an agreement with their employer which says, 1 week I can work an extra 10 hours and, in exchange, the next week—or up to an extra 10 hours—I can work less 10 hours.

The impact of that is just huge on a family. It is not necessary they do it. They can continue their 40-hour week if they wish. But there are a lot of events that occur in the raising of children where you do need those extra hours to be at home, where you do need those extra hours to take your child on something that is really important to them—a trip or an event that maybe involves a number of days, a 3-day basketball tournament or a 3-day recital event, or maybe just a situation where you need that extra day to be at home and make sure your children have you there.

This opportunity, this benefit which we make available to all Federal employees, should clearly be available to people who are not in the Federal Government. Senator ENZI has, in a very reasonable way, put this language in his bill. I actually think this is much more important than the issue of this fight between the \$1.10 and the \$2 or \$2.05 or whatever, because it is going to impact so many more people. Just on this issue alone you should vote for the Enzi bill because if you really want to improve the quality of the workplace, especially for the single mother, this bill will do it through the family time language he has put in here.

I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming for bringing this package forward. I think this package, just because this language is in there, is dramatically better, dramatically more compassionate. We hear a lot of language about compassion. It is dramatically more attentive to the needs of children in this country and proper parenting of children in this country than the package that has been brought forward from the other side. Why don't we include this on the other side? We know why they don't: Because labor unions are against it. It is a knee-jerk reaction on the part of orga-

nized big labor to this language. But we should not allow that sort of knee-jerk reaction to control our ability to give working mothers and families the opportunity to have this sort of benefit, which will clearly improve the ability of those people to take care of their children and to raise their children and to be good parents and do what they want to do, in order to make sure they are available when their kids need them.

I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming. I think he has put together an excellent package. I hope everyone will support it.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Wyoming.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator has 16 minutes and 14 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 4 minutes.

I listened very carefully to the Senator from New Hampshire talk about flextime. Flextime is something that those of us on this side of the aisle support. But that is not what is in the bill. That is not what is in the bill. The Federal Government has what they call core time—core agency hours. That means that they have to work from 11 to 2 or 11 to 3, and then the other hours they can make the judgment whether they want to use that, in terms of flextime. That is the kind of proposal that makes some sense. That is what we would support. But that is not in this legislation.

The person who decides whether Mrs. Smith is going to get the time off to go to see her child's play or to see the ballgame is going to be the employer—period. Make no mistake about it. That is the way it is written here on page 4 of their legislation. If we are talking about providing a degree of flextime—we have been through this; we understand what it is—flextime is not the time that is allocated just by the employer when the employer makes the sole judgment and decision, as they do under the Enzi proposal—No. 1.

No. 2, the Senator from New Hampshire says, let's let that person work 50 hours a week this week and maybe 30 hours a week the next week. Here it is on page 4, which says:

in which more than 40 hours of the work requirement may occur in a week of the period, except that no more than 10 hours may be shifted between the 2 weeks involved.

That means you can work 50 hours 1 week and 30 hours at the present time. What is the current law? The current law is, if you work 50 hours 1 week and then 30 hours the second week, you get the overtime for the 10 hours here. Do you think that is in the Enzi proposal? No. It is not there. They have eliminated it. You work the extra hours and you don't get the extra pay. Some deal—some deal for someone. That is called flextime. If you can sell that, you can sell the Brooklyn Bridge.

This is what you are doing. Instead of giving the person the overtime, as has

gone on under the Federal Labor Standards Act, that has been eliminated.

There is something else that the women of the country who are concerned about equal pay for equal work ought to understand. In the legislation under the Enzi amendment, because of the fact that you raise the exemption for companies that will be covered from \$500,000 to \$1 million, and because you eliminate the Federal Labor Standards Act protection for those who are involved in interstate commerce—that is all spelled out on page 13—that means 10 million workers will not have the protections of the minimum wage or the Federal Labor Standards Act, which means that the equal pay for equal work protections that are there for 4 to 5 million women will not be there.

Does America understand the difficulty we have had in this Chamber trying to get equal pay for equal work, let alone equal pay for comparable work? We have been able to get it under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and that is being eliminated for 4 to 5 million women.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield on that point?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. DODD. The Senator has spent a lot of time on this issue over the years. We have modified the Fair Labor Standards Act several times over the last 40 years. In each of those cases, as I recall, we modified the law to expand the number of people who would be covered by the minimum wage and the overtime pay and equal pay for equal work. This would be the first time, as I understand it, that we would be taking the opposite direction; the very first time that we are going to shrink the number of people who would have the right to overtime pay, thus, excluding some 10 million people who would otherwise be covered by the minimum wage.

Am I correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

For those who are even thinking about voting for the Enzi proposal, you are eliminating the protections, and you are getting the serious cutbacks. That is why the \$1.10 increase would impact 1.8 million. Ours would be 6.6 million directly and 8 million on top of that.

The Senator makes a very good point.

This is not a base increase for the minimum wage.

This would be gutting the minimum wage protections for millions of Americans.

That is a fine "how do you do."

Mr. DODD. Every time we have modified the Fair Labor Standards Act, we were expanding the opportunity for workers. I believe this would be the first time in the history of our country that we actually go in the opposite direction. Those in poverty would be excluded from getting the overtime pay

and protections for equal pay for equal work.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator stated it correctly. We are having a discussion and debate about the fact that we haven't increased the minimum wage in 9 years.

As the Senator pointed out and as I have pointed out, we have had this explosion of poverty with children, an explosion of poverty with minimum wage workers, and an explosion of hunger. What we do have as an alternative is an increase in reduction of protection, unlike the historical debate for an increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 9 minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and my colleague, the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, this is an extremely important issue before us. The last time the minimum wage was raised was in September of 1997. If we fail to increase the minimum wage before the end of the year, we will have gone the longest time without adjusting it since it was first enacted in 1938. That is a dismal performance on the part of the Congress.

Since 1997, inflation has drastically reduced the purchasing power of the minimum wage. It is now the lowest it has been in more than 40 years. To match the last increase, in terms of purchasing power, the minimum wage would have to be increased 25 percent above what it is now. And as we fail to act, the purchasing power of the current minimum wage continues to be eroded by the steady march of inflation—contributing to two serious problems in our society, rising poverty and increased inequality.

Thirty years ago, a worker paid the minimum wage who worked 40 hours a week for 52 weeks made enough to keep a family of three out of poverty. Now that worker is 35 percent below the poverty level.

People at the bottom of the wage scale have been falling further and further behind the rest of the workforce. In the 1950s and 1960s, the minimum wage averaged about 50 percent of the average wage. Today, at \$5.15 an hour, the current minimum wage is only 31 percent of the average hourly wage. If we fail to act, minimum wage earners will continue to fall further behind.

Nearly 15 million Americans would benefit from raising the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour. 6.6 million would benefit directly because they make less than \$7.25 an hour. Based on past experience with minimum wage hikes, another 8 million who make a little more than \$7.25 an hour should enjoy a wage increase as well.

There are those who say only teenagers benefit from an increase in the

minimum wage. However, eighty percent of the workers who would benefit from raising the minimum wage—12 million of those 15 million workers—are adults.

As Congress fails to act, States are raising the minimum wage themselves. My own State did that last January. And various studies indicate that job growth has been faster in the States that have raised the minimum wage than in those that have not raised the minimum wage. Economic studies by leading economists found that increases such as the proposed minimum wage hike would not reduce employment, which is an argument that is made against this amendment.

A hike in the minimum wage, in fact, has been found to reduce turnover of employees which has several advantages. You get a more experienced and productive workforce, lower costs for recruiting new workers, and lower costs for training new workers.

In fact, a letter in support of raising the minimum wage was signed by over 500 economists, including four Nobel laureate winners.

Last week, the House Appropriations Committee accepted an amendment offered in the committee by my able colleague, Congressman HOYER, to raise the minimum wage to \$7.25. It was accepted by the committee on a bipartisan basis. The bill had been scheduled to come to the House floor this week, but it has been pulled from consideration. News reports suggest—I hope wrongly—that the House leadership wants to avoid a debate on the minimum wage until after the November elections.

Mr. President, we should pass the Kennedy amendment to raise the minimum wage. It will lower poverty, reduce inequality, and provide vital income gains to 15 million workers and their families.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate one more time. I want to make a couple of points as clearly as I can.

First of all, the debate we have heard this morning is a classic debate about two very different philosophies—one that believes in the marketplace, the competitive system we have in the United States of America of competition and entrepreneurship, and the second is the argument that says Government knows better in the top-down mandates work.

In 1970, Republicans tried wage and price controls to control inflation. They worked miserably. Democrats have tried, time and again, for wage controls, and they failed to have the intended consequences. They have because you are interjecting yourself into

the marketplace but only in one segment.

Second, the Senator from Massachusetts yesterday held up Europe as an example of how higher minimum wages work.

I have just returned from two of those European countries—Germany and France.

I would like to make the clear point as to why the Senator from Wyoming is right and, with all due respect, the Senator from Massachusetts is wrong.

High minimum wage laws in the countries of France and Germany have caused the following:

France's unemployment is 10 percent more, or two times that of the United States of America. Unemployment for youth in France is over 20 percent.

We have seen on the nightly news—and I saw firsthand when I was there—the tremendous economic problems the Government of France is having in driving its own economy. And it has declared itself its own worst enemy but could not get concessions to pull back some of these mandates. Therefore, the French economy is growing at 1.6 percent a year this year, a rate less than half that of the United States, with a minimum wage rate that is compounded over that of the United States.

Our great trading partner and great friend, Germany, has an unemployment rate of 11 percent.

Those are the two countries that were cited yesterday as the example as to why the higher minimum wage works.

In fact, they are an example of it not working.

Second, with regard to State minimum wages going up, that is precisely where our Constitution, our country, and our Founding Fathers believed these decisions should be made; that is, at the State level.

In fact, the Senator from Connecticut talked about raising the Federal minimum wage to a level less than the minimum wage in the State of Connecticut today and much less than what it goes to next year. It is right for the States to control those minimum wages.

Lastly, I have heard three times about the survey of small businesses where 86 percent say this is not an issue that is being quoted as a reason why we shouldn't even be debating this.

I ran a small business. I understand small business. The reason it wasn't an issue for 86 percent of them is mostly because people pay more than the Federal minimum wage anyway.

That is the name of the game in this country—for the marketplace to dictate.

But go find out who those 14 percent are. I will tell you. They are the people affected by the unintended consequence of a raise in the minimum wage. The 68 percent are either independent contractors or higher skilled workers, where the Federal minimum wage rate is not in effect in the first

place. But those 14 percent are in the tourism industry, in the construction industry, in the maintenance industry, in the short-order cook industry or in the fast food industry. They are the ones who are getting their foot on the ladder.

Go interview those 14 percent, and you will find that the economic study I quoted yesterday is, in fact, correct. Every increase in the minimum wage will cost some of them their jobs.

In our free enterprise system, there are three components to the price of a product. One is the cost of goods, the second one is the cost to sell the goods, and third is the profit. If you raise the cost of goods sold, which you do by raising the wage rate, you either have to lower the marketing, lower your profits or increase your productivity.

What will every business do? First, they will increase their productivity. They will try to ask more of their workers so the mandated increase in their wages is neutralized by employing less people.

I commend the Senator from Wyoming on his legislation. It is a 21st century approach to the American workforce and the free enterprise system. And I respectfully oppose the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I have listened patiently through 4 hours yesterday and quite a bit of time this morning. There are some things that need to be said.

I appreciate the comments from our side of the aisle and from everybody who has gone before me. I particularly appreciate the comments of the Senator from Georgia because some of those things have been grating on us a little bit as we have listened to what has been said. We have seen the charts which show that small businesses in this country are in favor of that kind of a tax increase.

I spoke to the Federation of Independent Businesses yesterday morning. They do the most complete job of surveying their members than any association that I know of. They do not back anything unless there is a strong consensus by their members.

They are opposed, by their vote, to the minimum wage increase that Senator KENNEDY is suggesting.

I do not know where they find that 86 percent. But I have seen surveys before that are able to manufacture the kinds of numbers that people want to have.

From the manufacturing members, I suggest that it sounds reasonable to people.

I saw a chart over here last night that showed the average CEO in America is making \$11.8 million compared to what a minimum wage person is making.

That is an average CEO. What do you suppose the good ones are making? Eleven million eight hundred thousand

dollars a year for the average CEO in this country? I think that must be the average CEO in the top 100 companies in the world. But that is apples and oranges when you are talking about the minimum wage.

We have heard some pretty big numbers about how many people are in poverty and under the minimum wage.

The purpose is to take the 1.9 million people who are at the minimum wage and get them higher wages. We all agree on that. What we don't agree on is how to do that.

The Senator from Massachusetts earlier today said minimum wage jobs don't get you out of poverty; that they keep you in poverty.

That was his quote this morning. I absolutely agree with that. What we need to do is get higher skills in this country. We need to reduce the number of dropouts in this country. It is dropouts who are working at the minimum wage. It is people who have made some choices that put them in a position where they have to take the lower paying jobs. We need to change that.

When I first came to Washington, welfare reform was going into effect. The newspapers were full of stories that on the day that went into effect, people were going to drop through the cracks. It was going to be this tragedy for American people. After it happened, there were not many stories on that. That is because the tragedies did not happen. People improved their lot in life with jobs.

I happened to be in an ice cream shop where they shared the tables fairly closely. This was fine, but it made it impossible for me not to hear the conversation at the table abutted up to my table. It was a woman and her husband talking to a sister who had a child with her. She was talking about the change that welfare reform had made in her life because she had gotten some additional training, she had gotten a good job, and she was so pleased with her job she was going to shift some hours so she could be at work when her sister was in training. She would take care of that child who was sitting there so her sister could have the same kind of benefit she had.

That is the way we change America. We get people better jobs. We take care of things so people can get better training.

Better training reminds me of the Workforce Investment Act. I have been trying to get the Workforce Investment Act through this process for 3 years now. That is a bill that would train 900,000 people a year to higher paying jobs. That is what we want, higher paying jobs. Do you think we have been able to get it through the process? No. For 2 years we were not able to get a conference committee. Now we are being blocked from having it brought to the Senate for debate. That would solve a lot of the problems.

We talk about the difference in wages between men and women. We had a great hearing in our Committee on

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. I liked one of the people whom Senator KENNEDY selected to give testimony, a lady from New York City. She was talking about the value of taking nontraditional jobs. She happened to be a stone mason, a person who works with bricks, rock, and marble. She makes things beautiful. She started with basic construction, and she worked her way up to where she was hanging marble on skyscrapers. She shared with us the progression in pay she had gotten. She is making more than I am. She made that progression rather rapidly, but she had to take a job that was nontraditional for women. She wears a hard hat and safety toes and goes up skyscrapers. You do not necessarily have to do that to make more money.

I always point out in Wyoming we have a shortage of people to work. That shortage is providing power for this country. Over a third of the coal that is mined in this country is mined in Campbell County, WY, which is where Gillette is. That is where I am from. Their problem now is getting people to drive haul trucks. They are big trucks. Two of them would not fit in this Chamber. They would be as high as the ceiling. They are big equipment. They have power steering, power brakes, enclosed cabs with air conditioning. They drive almost like a car. If a person can drive and pass a drug test, they can start at \$60,000 a year and get the training to work on that truck. That is way above minimum wage, folks. That is \$60,000 a year. If they want to put in some overtime—they would not be allowed flextime at the present time—they can make more than that.

We need to have people look at some of the nontraditional jobs and look at some of the other areas of the country. If they are in an area with a lot of people and not many jobs, they will have lower paying jobs. We need to get more job training. We need to have the people be where the good-paying jobs are. They would find pretty good quality of life, too.

I need to correct a couple of other things. First of all, we make some of these charts sound as if everyone working at minimum wage is a single mom with lots of kids. That does not fit with the statistics. There are 1.9 million people at the minimum wage. Fully 85 percent of the minimum wage earners live with their parents—I would think most of the parents hope that means they are teenagers—or they have a working spouse or are living alone without children. So 41 percent live with a parent or relative, 23 percent are single or are the sole breadwinner in a household with no children, and 21 percent live with another wage earner. A lot of those are teenagers. Yes, they are in poverty if that is all they are making.

I have had some minimum wage jobs. I don't know how many in this Chamber have had minimum wage jobs. I

worked in the summers and while I was going to college, even when I was considerably younger than that. One of the things I discovered was if I was interested in what I was doing and I learned as much as I could about it, I was not at the minimum wage very long. I got a promotion. I got more pay. But of course the reason I got more pay is because I was able to do more things. I was more skilled. Minimum wage equals minimum skills.

McDonald's takes a real rap for starting people at minimum wage, and I have a friend named Jack Preiss who owns several McDonald's. He pointed out to me he has three of his employees who started at minimum wage who now own 20 McDonald's.

That is the way we want America to work. We do not want minimum wage jobs that don't get you out of poverty. They keep you in poverty. Yes, we want higher skills, better jobs, and the opportunity for people to have higher wages. If people are locked into the fact they are going to have a minimum wage job their whole life, they are going to have a minimum wage job their whole life. But there are options. There are opportunities out there. And there could be more if we could do the Workforce Investment Act.

Flextime is one of six provisions in this bill that make a difference to small business.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of Senator KENNEDY's amendment to increase the minimum wage. Not only is it the right thing to do for working families, but my State has shown that a living wage is compatible with a growing economy.

The facts speak for themselves, and they speak loudly. Let's just take three numbers: 9, 37, and 50.

Nine is the number of years since the minimum wage was last increased. This is the longest time the Nation has gone without raising the minimum wage since it was implemented in 1938. The real value of the current minimum wage is already \$4 below what it was in 1968.

Thirty-seven is the millions of Americans—37 million—who are currently living in poverty, including 13 million children.

Fifty is the percent by which poverty has increased in the past generation—freezing out an ever larger portion of our working citizens from the advantages of a higher standard of living that most of us enjoy.

I believe these numbers are a very strong signal that we are long past the time for the Nation, as a whole, to raise the level of the Federal minimum wage. I am proud that my home State of Washington has the highest minimum wage in the country, and it is indexed yearly to ensure that our workers are properly compensated for their hard work.

We in Washington State offer direct proof that a living minimum wage is compatible with a growing economy.

May marked our 34th consecutive month of job growth. Our unemployment rate, even with the highest minimum wage in the country, is essentially at the national average. Our poverty rate stands at 11 percent, which is significantly below the national average of 12.5 percent. Our median household income stands at \$48,000, much higher than the national average of \$43,000. Good labor policies make for good labor productivity and a healthy state economy.

Ever since the Fair Minimum Wage Act was passed in 1938, opponents have kept raising the same baseless arguments. Even 68 years ago, opponents tried to paint a bleak picture of disastrous effects, like "factories closed," "industries forced into bankruptcy," and "people who will be thrown out of employment." It wasn't true then. It is not true today. The fact is that this wage provides more economic opportunities for people to support their families and contribute to their communities.

Opponents often cite a negative impact on jobs as their prime argument to oppose an increase in the minimum wage. This tired argument is simply not true. In fact, the 4 years following our last minimum wage increase marked the strongest economic growth in three decades, creating almost 12 million new jobs. In contrast, during the past 4 years we have only seen the creation of about 4.7 million new jobs.

As elected representatives, it is our job not only to represent the people in our States, but also to stand up for the millions of Americans whose voices cannot be heard. Just since 2000, the number of Americans living in poverty has increased by a stunning 5.4 million people. A minimum wage employee, working 52 weeks a year for 40 hours a week, makes almost \$6,000 below the Federal poverty guidelines for a family of three. At this rate, it will be a long time before we see significant progress against the scourge of poverty for America's families.

By raising the minimum wage to \$7.25, we can put an extra \$4,400 a year into the pockets of these workers, enabling them to better support their families. This meager amount can make a world of difference to the poor among us. It could mean 19 months of utilities, 15 months of groceries, 8 months of rent or tuition for a community college degree. These are the basics, not the luxuries, of life today.

It is important to continually remind ourselves who is going to benefit from an increase. Here are some numbers to help set the record straight. This amendment will benefit nearly 15 million Americans, 80 percent of whom are adults, not teenagers trying to earn some extra spending money. In fact, more than one-third of these adults are the sole source of income for their families. And let's not forget the 7 million children of those minimum wage workers who will benefit from this increase.

This Congress has substantially cut the tax rates for the wealthiest people

in this country, saving them millions of dollars over the last 5 years. But so far, this Congress has been unwilling to spend a few cents more to help the poorest of our working citizens.

I have carefully considered all aspects of this amendment and have come to the conclusion that we have no acceptable alternative. I see the growth of the job market and the strong economy in my State. I see how we have worked in Washington State to ensure that low-wage workers share in this success. I know that this is what our Nation needs. We should follow the lead of my State and the other 20 that have already increased their minimum wages and allow all Americans to share in these benefits.

Overall, this slight increase in the minimum wage would allow a significant portion of our Nation, people who are working hard and playing by the rules, to have an increased opportunity to share in the American dream. They will be able to better support their families and will not have to make unacceptable decisions like whether to buy groceries or pay the rent.

If any of my colleagues oppose this amendment, I would like them to consider living on \$10,700 a year—and not just living on it, but rather, trying to raise a family of 4 on that low income. That would mean having about \$7 a day per person, not adding in all the bills. Now just think about how much you spent on your last meal. If we think of the debate that we are having in these terms, it is clear that raising the minimum wage is the right thing to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment to increase the minimum wage. Let's show them that we have got our priorities straight, and let's finally give low-income workers the raise that they are long overdue. It is the right thing to do for workers and the right thing to do for our economy.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, this is a very important week in the Senate. For much of the week our focus has been on the war in Iraq—a necessary debate that is long overdue. But, today our focus is on a different kind of war: the war on poverty.

Since President Bush took office, the number of Americans living in poverty has increased by 5.4 million, and today 37 million Americans live in poverty, 13 million of whom are children. What is even more disturbing is that over 70 percent of children in poverty live in a home where at least one parent works. So we have a situation in which today in America, millions of children are living in poverty despite the fact that they are in homes with a working adult. In fact the reality is that among full-time, year-round workers, poverty has increased by 50 percent since the late 1970s.

This may be surprising, but if you take a minute to look at what is going on, it is not hard to understand. Consider a single mother of two working a minimum wage job 40 hours a week for

52 weeks a year. Without taking any time off for illness or vacation—she earns just \$10,700 a year—nearly \$6,000 below the Federal poverty line for a family of three.

This is an outrage. And it is not how things should be in America. No American working a full time job should live below the poverty line. If you work hard and play by the rules, you should be able to make a good life for yourself and be able to get ahead. That is the American dream.

Unfortunately, instead of helping people achieve the American dream, our leadership in Washington has repeatedly turned its back on them. Congress has failed to give minimum wage earners a raise in almost a decade. In fact, the real value of the minimum wage—taking into account the impact of inflation—has dropped. Since 1997 when we last raised the minimum wage, the real value of the minimum wage has fallen by 20 percent—effectively reversing all the gains made by the last increase. Never before in the history of the minimum wage have we let so much time lapse before adjusting the minimum wage.

Members of Congress understand the concept of real value. After all, even though Congress has failed to increase the minimum wage since 1997, it has given itself eight annual pay raises. This is indefensible. No Member of the House or Senate should have the gumption to argue in support of a pay raise for themselves and against a pay raise for hardworking Americans.

The Congress should follow the lead of the 12 States that have raised their minimum wages since January 2004. In fact, 17 States and the District of Columbia—representing 45 percent of the U.S. population—have set minimums above the Federal rate of \$5.15. The State of Washington has the highest minimum wage in the country at \$7.63 as of January 1, 2006. Oregon's is \$7.50. My own State of Massachusetts is considering a minimum wage of \$8.25. And the city of Santa Fe, NM has a minimum wage of \$9.50.

Of course, not all States have taken the minimum wage so seriously. Thirty-three States have a minimum wage at or even below the Federal level. That is why we need a Federal minimum wage. The value of an hour of the same work should not vary State to State. We have a national poverty crisis, and we need a national solution.

It is time for Congress to get its priorities straight.

America's minimum wage isn't rising, but other basic costs for families are. Since President Bush took office, the cost of family health insurance has risen more than 70 percent, or an average of \$4,500 per family. Six million more Americans are uninsured because they cannot afford coverage.

Since President Bush took office, gas prices have more than doubled. In many places the price of gas exceeds \$3.00 per gallon—something many working Americans have to buy just to

get to work. In my home State of Massachusetts working families have faced gas price increases of \$1.41 a gallon—a 94 percent increase. Yet rather than rewarding work, the Republican leadership would rather reward oil and gas companies with sweetheart deals.

Since President Bush took office, the cost of a 4-year college education has increased by nearly \$3,000, or 57 percent, at public universities and nearly \$21,000, 32 percent, at private universities. Yet instead of working to ensure that American families can afford to send their kids to college, our Republican leadership is more interested in working to cut \$12 billion from college student aid, increasing the costs of loans; and freezing Pell grants for higher education.

These are the wrong priorities. Raising the minimum wage is not just an economic issue; it is a moral issue. It is a question of values. And this is a values debate I think we need to have. The question is whether we value those who work hard and play by the rules and whether we will fight to ensure they receive a livable wage.

Don't be fooled by the side-by-side amendment that my colleague from Wyoming has introduced. It does not value those who work hard and play by the rules. Yes, it increases the minimum wage by \$1.10, but it is loaded with poison pills that actually decrease the number of people who are eligible for the minimum wage. It cuts overtime pay, and would deny more than 10 million workers the minimum wage, overtime pay, and equal pay rights they currently receive. Rather than giving hard-working Americans a step up, it would force many more further into poverty. That is hardly the American way.

Before I end, I would like to take a moment to dispel a common myth about the minimum wage. Some argue that increasing the minimum wage will hurt small businesses. That is simply not the case. A new study from the Center for American Progress and Policy Matters in Ohio found that the "11 States with a minimum wage above the Federal minimum wage . . . had higher rates of small business growth between 1997 and 2003." That is right—more growth. Small business employment in those States grew by 9.4 percent while small business employment in States with the Federal minimum wage grew by only 6.6 percent. What this report reveals is that having a higher minimum wage does not impair the growth of small businesses.

This is not new news. In 1999, a Levy Institute survey of small businesses revealed that more than three-quarters of the firms surveyed said their employment practices would not be affected by an increase in the minimum wage. In fact, jobless rates fell after the last minimum-wage increase.

Mr. President, it is time for us to give the working people of America the respect they deserve. It is time for Congress to give working Americans a pay

raise. It is time for us to get our priorities straight. I am proud to cosponsor my colleague, Senator KENNEDY's, amendment to increase the minimum wage. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in its favor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in support of giving 56,000 Nevadans a raise by increasing the Federal minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour.

My colleagues have done an excellent job of making the case for this raise. My side has pointed out it has been nearly 10 years since the minimum wage was last increased. We have communicated that the current wage is woefully inadequate, that someone who works full-time and makes the minimum wage lives below the poverty line. We have also talked about how minimum wage workers don't make enough to provide their families adequate housing, food, and essentials like clothing. We have talked about all the facts. So what I wish to do now is appeal to the Senate's sense of fairness.

All of us in the Senate, don't we believe that someone working full time should be able to live a life out of poverty? I believe the answer is yes, and I believe that is reason enough for us all to vote yes to increasing this wage. Three times in the last Congress the Republican leadership brought down a minimum wage bill rather than have an up-or-down vote. We can't wait any longer. There are only a few weeks left in this Congress, and those 56,000 Nevadans deserve a raise.

I know the majority has a proposal to raise the minimum wage by about a dollar an hour but it is not enough. It doesn't impact nearly enough Americans and won't make a big enough difference. Whereas an increase to \$7.25 will help over 5 million Americans, the majority amendment will help only 2. Moreover, our amendment will mean an additional \$4,370 a year to help minimum wage earners support their families. An increase of this size can help offset the cost of high gas prices, not to mention the costs of health care, food, and other needs.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to pass a graduated increase of the minimum wage to \$7.25 per hour.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I speak today in support of efforts to increase the Federal minimum wage and urge my colleagues to vote in support of Senator KENNEDY's amendment to increase the Federal minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour over the next 2 years. This much-needed increase would benefit over 7 million Americans directly and approximately 8 million Americans indirectly. The Federal minimum wage has not been increased in almost 9 years and action by Congress is long overdue. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities notes that after adjusting for inflation, the value of the minimum wage is at its lowest level since 1955. As the costs of housing, health care, energy, and education continue to skyrocket, we must raise the minimum wage to provide millions of

hard-working Americans the respect and dignity their work demands.

I think it is unconscionable that in the almost 9 years that we have not raised the minimum wage, Congress has voted to increase its own pay by \$31,600. Most recently, last November we allowed the \$3,100 pay raise to go through for Members of Congress. People will find it hard to understand why Members of Congress received substantial pay raises at a time when the real value of the minimum wage has eroded by 20 percent since 1997. As my colleagues know, I have long fought against automatic congressional pay increases and will continue to do so. I have introduced legislation that would put an end to automatic cost-of-living adjustments for congressional pay. We have Americans who are working full time, 52 weeks a year and they cannot afford health care, housing, and child care. They don't have the power to automatically raise their pay—they are dependent on Congress to raise the Federal minimum wage. But instead of working to raise the minimum wage, we in Congress have worked to protect our automatic pay raises.

Over 20 States and the District of Columbia have responded to congressional inaction and have passed or are in the process of passing State minimum wage increases above the Federal level. I am proud to report that my State of Wisconsin is one of these States that have passed a minimum wage increase. Last June, Wisconsin raised its minimum wage to \$5.70 an hour and earlier this month, raised its minimum wage again to \$6.50 an hour. The State Department of Workforce Development estimates that this modest two-step increase will benefit an estimated 200,000 low wage workers in Wisconsin.

While this increase is a step in the right direction, it is still not enough to even ensure that minimum wage employees can pay for affordable housing in Wisconsin. The National Low Income Housing Coalition estimates that the fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Wisconsin is \$647 a month and calculates that a full-time minimum wage employee needs to work 77 hours a week, 52 weeks a year to afford a two-bedroom apartment. Mr. President, 77 hours a week is almost the equivalent of two full-time minimum wage workers and the number of hours of work required to cover the costs of an apartment are even higher in States with higher housing costs. It is a disgrace that in many cases, minimum wage workers cannot afford adequate housing or are forced to pay a huge share of their income to cover housing costs.

Housing costs are not the only necessity of life that minimum wage workers have to provide for themselves and their families. They also have to purchase groceries, provide health care, pay for higher education, pay for increasingly expensive gas and electric costs, and provide child care for their

children. Some Americans may think that the majority of minimum wage workers are teenagers in the first job; that perception is incorrect. The Economic Policy Institute notes that over 70 percent of minimum wage workers are adults and in Wisconsin, over 80 percent of minimum wage workers are adults. Moreover, of these adult minimum wage workers, over 30 percent are the sole breadwinners of their families.

More and more of these working Americans find themselves mired in poverty or living on the cusp of poverty. Currently, there are 37 million Americans living in poverty, including 13 million children. Among full-time, year-round workers, poverty has increased by 50 percent in the late 1970s. Minimum wage workers who work full time earn \$10,700 a year, which is almost \$6,000 below the Federal poverty guidelines for a family of three. No American should work full-time, year-round and still live in poverty. This modest increase in the Federal minimum wage will not eliminate poverty, but it will provide hard-working Americans with a much-needed increase in their wages. This increase would provide more money for workers to purchase prescription drugs, to pay utilities and rent, to provide child care for their children, and to invest in higher education opportunities. This increase is needed because the majority of the poor people in our country are working and are holding down low-paying jobs with stagnant wages that do not allow them to finally break free from poverty.

Opponents of this amendment argue that it hurts the economy and job growth. In the 4 years after the last minimum wage increase, nearly 12 million new jobs were created. In the last 4 years, only 4.7 million jobs have been created and the real value minimum wage continues to erode. A 1998 Economic Policy Institute study did not find significant job loss associated with the 1997 minimum wage increase. Additionally, the Center on Wisconsin Strategy examined job growth after the June 2005 increase in Wisconsin's minimum wage and found that Wisconsin had an average growth of 30,000 more jobs, not a job loss. History shows that minimum wage increases have not had a negative impact on unemployment.

I was proud to vote for the 1996-1997 increase bringing the minimum wage to its current level of \$5.15 an hour and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment by Senator KENNEDY to increase the minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour. When the minimum wage was established in 1938, its purpose was to ensure that American workers were fairly compensated for a day's work. But today, the minimum wage isn't living up to that promise. Far more work needs to be done to support hard-working American families, and Congress can start by increasing the minimum wage.

Mr. KENNEDY. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes 38 seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, Senator ENZI says this debate is grating on the Republican side of the aisle. Sorry, that is how it is when you are on the wrong side of the truth. It is grating to have to hear the truth as Senator KENNEDY and others have spoken of.

It has been 9 long years since there has been an increase in the minimum wage. It is a disgrace. While we see our friends on the other side fight for the CEOs of oil companies, in the Committee on Commerce, they would not even swear them in. They are all on that side. When it comes to working families, forget about it.

Then Senator ENZI implies this does not have anything to do with women. Women make up 59 percent of the workers who would be affected as a result of raising the minimum wage; 1.4 million working mothers would benefit directly, 760,000 single moms would get an immediate raise, and over 3 million kids have parents who would get an immediate raise.

What has happened to family values on the other side of the aisle? It seems to me it is just so many empty words.

Then they scare you and say the economy will suffer. All you have to do, again, is look at the facts and look at the truth. In the 4 years after the last minimum wage increase passed, the economy experienced its strongest growth in over three decades. All the talk about how had a minimum wage increase is for the economy is not true.

I say to my Republican friends, support the Kennedy increase in the minimum wage. The truth shall set you free.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

The Senator from Massachusetts has said: Let's have an up-or-down vote. There are a lot of things around here that we talk about having an up-or-down vote on. We have not been able to have up-or-down votes, and it is always because there are some other amendments that might make the bill better. Sometimes they are even germane to the bill we are talking about.

The one we are talking about, the amendment we are putting this on now is Department of Defense. Yes, you can make some arguments about how this is defense related, I guess, but what we would normally do, if we were serious on an issue such as this, is bring it up as a separate issue and allow amendments to it. But that is not going to happen because there are a few things in my bill that the other side of the aisle would not like to have.

One of those is flextime. They show that chart where the person could make 50 hours this one week and get overtime and then make 30 hours in the next week. That is not how the real

world works either. They would earn 40 hours in one week, which would not be overtime, and 40 hours in the next week, which would not be overtime. That is still the same 80 hours. With the agreement of the person asking for the flextime, they could put the 50 hours in one week, the 30 hours in the other week, have the extra day to do whatever they want with their kids.

If flextime is a bad idea, why did we let the Federal employees do it? The problem in my State is with the person who works for a private industry in Wyoming who is married to someone who works for the Federal Government because the Federal Government lets them do the flextime that the Senator from Massachusetts says steals overtime. If it stole overtime, does anyone think our Federal employees would be interested in it? No; they have other values.

When we did flextime for the Federal Government, Senator KENNEDY voted to ensure that the Federal employees would have access to flextime, to have the scheduling options necessary to balance work and family life. Senator KENNEDY, along with 11 other Democrats, cosponsored the Nickles bill that extended flextime and comp time to State and local employees. If it is a bad idea, why would they do it for Federal employees and State and local employees? And why don't we do it for the private employees? The argument is, nasty employers would never let them have the time.

That is a terrible rap for business. Small business understands the needs of their people better than big business because they work with them every day, they go to church with them every weekend, they are in civic organizations with them, their kids go to the same schools, and they are the ones who have to deliver the bad news that they are not going to be allowed to do that flextime, and they cannot afford to do it a different way.

Sometimes the employees in small business make more than the employers in small business. Those are some of the CEOs whom I am worried about, the ones who have to wake up in the middle of the night and say, How am I going to make payroll this week? I would like to be paying my people more, but I don't know how I am going to pay them at all.

That is a reality in small business. I know small businessmen across the country who are hearing me say that are saying: He's got it. He understands our problem. What can you do to help us?

So we put together some provisions that in a normal situation we would be able to debate one of those at a time and decide on some of them and reject some of them. That is how it ought to work. But it is not just as simple as saying we can get everybody and all the kids out of poverty if we were just to raise the minimum wage.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand, I have 2 minutes 50 seconds left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there are going to be two votes, and the first vote will be on my increase in the minimum wage; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in just about 5 minutes from now the Senate will have an opportunity to make a judgment as to whether we are going to offer a helping hand to some 15 million Americans who are at the lower end of the economic ladder who are earning the minimum wage and just above.

These workers are men and women of dignity. They take pride in their work. They are overwhelmingly women. If you care, this is a women's issue, having an increase in the minimum wage. It is a children's issue because a great majority of the women have children.

So many of these mothers look in the eyes of their child, and they wonder if they are going to be able to feed that child. They are worried whether that child is \$80 sick, when they hear that child cry in the night because they know they have to pay \$80 to go to an emergency room.

They know they cannot afford a birthday present for their child, to be able to go to a neighbor's house, to be able to enjoy the things every child who is a son or a daughter of a Member of Congress can enjoy.

That is what is happening out across America. It is a women's issue, a children's issue; it is a civil rights issue because so many of those workers are men and women of color. It is a family issue. It is a values issue. Don't talk to us on the other side of the aisle about family values. This is it.

This is an issue of decency and fairness. Americans understand decency. Americans understand fairness. Americans understand that if you work hard, 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, you should not live in poverty. And that is what is happening. Nine years they have waited. Nine years they have waited—but not the Members of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, \$30,000 we have increased our salary, and in 9 years we have refused to provide an increase for the men and women who are working on the lowest rung of the economic ladder. That is obscene.

We have a right to alter that and change that now when the roll is called. Let's say that we stand for those workers who are working hard, trying to make a difference for their families, playing by the rules. I hear from my friend from Wyoming they should not be on the Defense authorization bill. How many soldiers who are over there fighting in Iraq, mothers or fathers, might have been earning the minimum wage? What are they fighting for? They are fighting for American values.

American values are to treat people fairly and with respect. Increase the minimum wage, and we will have taken a very important step down that road.

Mr. President, I understand my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I would quote the Senator from Massachusetts again who said: Minimum wage jobs don't get you out of poverty, they keep you in poverty. Until we get a Workforce Investment Act passed around here that increases job training for 900,000 people a year so they can get higher-skilled jobs so they can get the jobs of the future, not the jobs of the past, we are going to have problems with the minimum wage and poverty.

We need to be able to give people more choices, not less choices. There is a definite difference in philosophy. We think that free enterprise can work and that it is working and that it does work, and also that States rights work. States are changing the minimum wage to match the economy of their State. Although, if they have really good jobs, they will attract people, I hope. We are having a little problem attracting people to Wyoming, and those are not for the minimum wage jobs, those are for outstanding jobs.

So people need to think a little bit about more training or moving a little bit to get better jobs and get out of the minimum wage rut that will cause a spiral. As we increase the minimum wage, we also cause an upward spiral that eliminates the value of that minimum wage.

I ask you to vote against the Kennedy amendment and to vote for my amendment.

Something that has been overlooked is my amendment includes a \$1.10 increase in the minimum wage over 18 months.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 13, 2006, to Senator KENNEDY.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS, OFFICE OF THE RESIDENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, June 13, 2006.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: I understand that you have offered an amendment to the Department of Defense bill that would raise the minimum wage in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). While I am a proponent for an increase in our minimum wage as a step in creating opportunities for our young indigenous people to find jobs in the CNMI, I want this done in a rational and democratic manner. I object to the manner in which your amendment was offered, and find it rather arbitrary and capricious.

The Northern Marianas joined this great country because of the principles of democ-

racy that are at the heart of almost everything that is done. I will assume that your effort was prompted out of the same frustration that has fueled your colleague Congressman George Miller's desire for a quick fix to a complex problem. I had hoped those days were behind us. It is my desire that we enter into a new era of CNMI/Federal relations, an era which includes open discussion, dialogue, and a shared commitment to reform and to promote sustainable development in the CNMI.

You may not be aware that the CNMI's economy is on the verge of collapse. Unemployment is at 14%, the economy is down 23%, and this downward trend is showing no sign of reversing in the near future. An increase in our minimum wage implemented without economic considerations will surely destroy what is left of our fragile economy. I strongly believe that an appropriate increase must be a component in our economic recovery, but done in isolation will insure that recovery is impossible. Please don't take out your frustration with former CNMI and Congressional leaders on the CNMI as a whole. Your amendment may help a few, but will surely further increase unemployment and the number of business failures. Where is the American commitment to compassion and fairness?

I invite you to come to the CNMI and hold discussions with employers, employees, and the CNMI Enterprise Group, an NGO formed to promote sane and sustainable economic relief. I ask that you support my request for a sound and responsible study of the CNMI economy, and help us, not punish us.

The CNMI is without a Delegate in the House of Representatives. This fact alone prevents us from experiencing the democracy that our people have chosen. The rights of the people of the CNMI are unrepresented in the halls of Congress, and we must rely on members like yourself to see that they are treated with the same respect and integrity that the citizens of your state enjoy. I hope that we have the opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

PEDRO A. TENORIO, Resident Representative.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Bingaman	Carper
Baucus	Boxer	Chafee
Bayh	Byrd	Clinton
Biden	Cantwell	Coleman

Collins	Kerry	Obama
Conrad	Kohl	Pryor
Dayton	Landrieu	Reed
DeWine	Lautenberg	Reid
Dodd	Leahy	Salazar
Dorgan	Levin	Sarbanes
Durbin	Lieberman	Schumer
Feingold	Lincoln	Snowe
Feinstein	Lugar	Specter
Harkin	Menendez	Stabenow
Inouye	Mikulski	Warner
Jeffords	Murray	Wyden
Johnson	Nelson (FL)	
Kennedy	Nelson (NE)	

NAYS—46

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Murkowski
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Frist	Santorum
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burns	Gregg	Stevens
Burr	Hagel	Sununu
Chambliss	Hatch	Talent
Coburn	Hutchison	Thomas
Cochran	Inhofe	Thune
Cornyn	Isakson	Vitter
Craig	Kyl	Voinovich
Crapo	Lott	
DeMint	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller Shelby

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is automatically withdrawn.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DODD. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4376

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the Enzi amendment.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander	Ensign	McConnell
Allen	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennett	Frist	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Smith
Coburn	Hagel	Snowe
Cochran	Hatch	Specter
Coleman	Hutchison	Stevens
Collins	Isakson	Sununu
Craig	Kyl	Talent
Crapo	Lott	Thomas
DeWine	Lugar	Thune
Dole	Martinez	Voinovich
Domenici	McCain	Warner

NAYS—53

Akaka	DeMint	Lieberman
Allard	Dodd	Lincoln
Baucus	Dorgan	Menendez
Bayh	Durbin	Mikulski
Biden	Feingold	Murray
Bingaman	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Inhofe	Obama
Burr	Inouye	Pryor
Byrd	Jeffords	Reed
Cantwell	Johnson	Reid
Carper	Kennedy	Salazar
Chafee	Kerry	Sarbanes
Chambliss	Kohl	Schumer
Clinton	Landrieu	Stabenow
Conrad	Lautenberg	Vitter
Cornyn	Leahy	Wyden
Dayton	Levin	

NOT VOTING—2

Rockefeller	Shelby
-------------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is automatically withdrawn.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SCHUMER be granted 5 minutes to speak as in morning business, and the 5 minutes would come off our time on this side from the Iraq amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I simply wish to acquaint Senators with the fact that we are beginning a 5-hour debate on the Levin amendment; is that correct?

Mr. LEVIN. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. And within that period of time, speaking for my time, I will manage the time, but I would be anxious to have those colleagues who wish to participate to indicate to me the periods which would be most convenient for them, and I will do my very best to accommodate all of the speakers.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I would make the same statement on behalf of our side, that Senators who do wish to speak in support of my amendment let us know, and we will try to work in as many as possible. There is a great demand for time, but it would help us a great deal to know who it is who seeks to speak, and we will try to sequence people to the best of our ability for the convenience of everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING SHORTAGES FOR
NEW YORK

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to thank my colleagues from Michigan and Virginia for their graciousness. I am about to speak at a hearing that is occurring across the hall in the House on homeland security funds.

As you know, Madam President, homeland security funds were struck a cruel blow against the city and State of New York. Despite the fact that we are the epicenter of terrorism, despite

the fact that every day the New York Police and Fire Departments have to go all out to protect us, our funding was cut by 40 percent in the city funding and 36 percent in New York State funding. It came as a total shock and surprise to all of us, particularly since Secretary Chertoff had promised that he was going to rectify the funding inadequacies and restore New York to full funding. He did that for 1 year, but then we went right back to receiving an inadequate amount.

Just recently we learned from Mr. Suskind's book that New York subways were targeted with cyanide by al-Qaida. The bottom line is very simple. There are threats against New York regularly, and every week and every day the brave police officers and firefighters and others in New York are on vigilance to make sure we are not struck by terror. All of a sudden the funding is cut—a slap in the face to this Nation's promise for New York.

At today's hearing, there is a gentleman who is missing: Secretary Chertoff. He should be testifying and answering questions, not sending a subaltern to answer those questions, but he should be there himself because he made commitments to New York, commitments that have not been lived up to by the Department of Homeland Security.

There are so many questions about why funding was cut. Just take the rationale that they want to fund systems more than they want to fund personnel. First, against cyanide, there are no systems to be funded. Cyanide can be made easily. We don't have any kind of detector. The only way to guard against the threat that occurred in 2003 is better training and more personnel on the subways. That is what New York City did.

Second, New York did apply for funding in terms of equipment. The so-called ring of steel, which would have protected downtown, was part of New York's grant. Yet the funding was cut. Secretary Chertoff bounces from rationale to rationale as to why our funding was cut, but none of them are satisfactory.

Unfortunately, there is terrorism in the world. Unfortunately, New York City has always been, is today, and will continue to be the No. 1 target of terrorists. And for this Department of Homeland Security and this Government to abdicate its responsibility and not provide New York with the funding that it needs is an absolute disgrace. The funding cut, the percentage that we went down is just unpardonable.

I am urging Secretary Chertoff to come clean and to testify before the House and the Senate and to answer the questions that New Yorkers and all Americans of goodwill have. He is not there today. He should be. But make no mistake about it. As a united delegation, Democrats and Republicans together, we will press the issue to both try and get the kind of funding we deserve this year out of other pots of

money and change the formula for next year so that this kind of poor treatment of the No. 1 target of terrorists in America—New York—will not continue.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their graciousness, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

AMENDMENT NO. 4320

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 4320 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 4320.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4320

(Purpose: To state the sense of Congress on United States policy on Iraq)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "United States Policy on Iraq Act of 2006".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Global terrorist networks, including those that attacked the United States on September 11, 2001, continue to threaten the national security of the United States and are recruiting, planning, and developing capabilities to attack the United States and its allies throughout the world.

(2) Winning the fight against terrorist networks requires an integrated, comprehensive effort that uses all facets of power of the United States and the members of the international community who value democracy, freedom, and the rule of law.

(3) The United States Armed Forces, particularly the Army and Marine Corps, are stretched thin, and many soldiers and Marines have experienced three or more deployments to combat zones.

(4) Sectarian violence has surpassed the insurgency and terrorism as the main security threat in Iraq, increasing the prospects of a broader civil war which could draw in Iraq's neighbors.

(5) United States and coalition forces have trained and equipped more than 116,000 Iraqi soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and more than 148,000 Iraqi police, highway patrol, and other Ministry of Interior forces.

(6) Of the 102 operational Iraqi Army combat battalions, 69 are either in the lead or operating independently, according to the May 2006 report of the Administration to Congress entitled "Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq";

(7) Congress expressed its sense in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (119 Stat. 3466) that "calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq".

(8) Iraq's security forces are heavily infiltrated by sectarian militia, which has greatly increased sectarian tensions and impeded the development of effective security services loyal to the Iraq Government.

(9) With the approval by the Iraqi Council of Representatives of the ministers of defense, national security, and the interior on June 7, 2006, the entire cabinet of Prime Minister Maliki is now in place.

(10) Pursuant to the Iraq Constitution, the Council of Representatives is to appoint a Panel which will have 4 months to recommend changes to the Iraq Constitution.

(11) Despite pledges of more than \$8,000,000,000 in assistance for Iraq by foreign governments other than the United States at the Madrid International Donors' Conference in October 2003, only \$3,500,000,000 of such assistance has been forthcoming.

(12) The current open-ended commitment of United States forces in Iraq is unsustainable and a deterrent to the Iraqis making the political compromises and personnel and resource commitments that are needed for the stability and security of Iraq.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in order to change course from an open-ended commitment and to promote the assumption of security responsibilities by the Iraqis, thus advancing the chances for success in Iraq—

(1) the following actions need to be taken to help achieve the broad-based and sustainable political settlement so essential for defeating the insurgency and preventing all-out civil war—

(A) there must be a fair sharing of political power and economic resources among all the Iraqi groups so as to invest them in the formation of an Iraqi nation by either amendments to the Iraq Constitution or by legislation or other means, within the timeframe provided for in the Iraq Constitution;

(B) the President should convene an international conference so as to more actively involve the international community and Iraq's neighbors, promote a durable political settlement among Iraqis, reduce regional interference in Iraq's internal affairs, encourage more countries to contribute to Iraq's extensive needs, and ensure that pledged funds are forthcoming;

(C) the Iraq Government should promptly and decisively disarm the militias and remove those members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the Iraq Government is in doubt; and

(D) the President should—

(i) expedite the transition of United States forces in Iraq to a limited presence and mission of training Iraqi security forces, providing logistic support of Iraqi security forces, protecting United States infrastructure and personnel, and participating in targeted counterterrorism activities;

(ii) after consultation with the Government of Iraq, begin the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq this year; and

(iii) submit to Congress a plan by the end of 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq, with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise;

(2) during and after the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq, the United States will need to sustain a non-military effort to actively support reconstruction, governance, and a durable political solution in Iraq; and

(3) the President should carefully assess the impact that ongoing United States military operations in Iraq are having on the capability of the United States Government to conduct an effective counterterrorism campaign to defeat the broader global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, the current open-ended commitment of U.S. forces in Iraq is unsustainable and counterproductive, contributing as much to Iraqi instability as it does to Iraqi security.

Our troops have performed magnificently in Iraq. We are all deeply grateful for their professionalism and their sacrifices. But, ultimately, as our military commanders have repeatedly said, stability in Iraq can only come through a political settlement by the Iraqis, and the best way to bring about that political settlement is to make it clear, in words not yet spoken by the administration, that our commitment is not open-ended, and that a phased redeployment of our forces from Iraq will begin by the end of this year.

The administration's refrain that we are in Iraq as long as the Iraqis need us is creating a dependency of unlimited duration and gives the Iraqis the impression that their security is more in our hands than in theirs.

The hallmarks of the administration's open-ended policy are the President's extraordinarily broad and vague description of our mission—nothing less than “complete victory,” as he put it, along with the President's explicit commitment to stay until the Iraqis can “govern themselves, sustain themselves, and defend themselves.” The President's statement that American force levels in Iraq “will be decided by future Presidents” reinforced that unlimited commitment, as did Secretary Rice's statement that we will stay in Iraq “as long as we are needed.”

The President of Iraq, Mr. Talabani, reflected the Iraqi perception of the administration's policy when he said that U.S. forces are “ready to stay as long as we ask them no matter what the period is.” That is what the President of Iraq says he understands our policy to be, that U.S. forces are “ready to stay as long as we,” the Iraqis, “ask them, no matter what the period is.” We must change that Iraqi perception and the open-ended commitment which led to it, and that is what our amendment would do.

Our amendment urges the President to begin the phased redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq by the end of 2006—to begin the phased redeployment of U.S. troops by the end of 2006. Our amendment also calls for a number of actions to help achieve the broad-based and sustainable political settlement so essential for defeating the insurgency and preventing all-out civil war.

It calls for adoption by the Iraqis of a fair sharing of political power and economic resources among all the Iraqi groups so as to invest them in the formation of an Iraqi Nation. That can be done by amendment to the Iraq Constitution or by legislation or other means, but it needs to be done within the timeframe provided for in the Iraqi Constitution; namely, 4 months from the beginning of the functioning of their parliament.

An international conference needs to be convened so as to more actively in-

volve the international community and Iraq's neighbors in promoting a durable political settlement among Iraqis and by reducing regional interference in Iraq's internal affairs. It is also important to encourage more countries to contribute to Iraq's extensive needs and to ensure that pledged funds are forthcoming.

Our amendment also points out that it is critically important for the Government of Iraq to promptly and decisively disarm the militias and remove those members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the Iraqi Government is in doubt.

Now, what does our amendment urge the President to do relative to our troops in Iraq?

First, after consultation with the Government of Iraq, begin a phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq by the end of this year.

Second, submit to Congress a plan by the end of 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq, with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise.

Third, expedite the transition of U.S. forces in Iraq to a limited presence and mission of training, providing logistical support, protecting U.S. infrastructure and personnel, and participating in targeted counterterrorism activities.

Our amendment does not establish a fixed ending date for redeployment. It doesn't set out fixed milestones once the phased redeployment has begun. So while it does not establish a timetable, it does establish a fixed, but not precipitous, time for the beginning of a phased redeployment—by the end of this year.

Beginning the phased redeployment of American troops in 2006 would send a very clear message to the Iraqis: We have been in Iraq over 3 years. We have lost 2,500 brave Americans and suffered more than seven times that number of casualties to make it possible for Iraq to become a free Nation. You, the Iraqis, must now decide whether you want a civil war or a nation.

Madam President, sending that message to the Iraqis and ending the open-ended U.S. policy towards Iraq will prod the Iraqis to take the necessary steps to end the dominance of the militias; will reduce the Iraqi dependence on the U.S. security blanket which deters tough choices by the Iraqis; will change the perception that we are permanently occupying Iraq, a perception which plays into the hands of terrorists; will reduce the number of U.S. targets for terrorists and insurgents; and will reduce the strain on U.S. forces.

Supporters of our amendment are just as determined to maximize prospects for success in Iraq as are the opponents of our amendment. We do not accuse opponents of our amendment of wanting failure or of advocating surrender to chaos and terror. We do believe that maintaining the status quo

and the open-ended commitment, which is the hallmark of that status quo and that open-ended commitment, and adhering to a bumper sticker slogan of “stay the course” is a recipe for continuing instability and failure.

Success isn't assured in any event, but letting the Iraqis know that we are not there for as long as they want us is key to avoiding a culture of dependency. The bottom line is that our open-ended policy and presence has become a deterrent to the very success that we want to bring about. Although the administration policy is aimed at providing security, it is a major contributor to instability.

The Iraqi leaders themselves have set a 6-month goal for making major progress in assuming their security responsibility. Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki said on May 22 that his government could take over security for 16 of Iraq's 18 provinces by the end of this year.

On June 11, the Iraqi National Security Adviser, Mr. Rubaie said:

I believe by the end of this year the number of the multinational forces will be probably less than 100,000 in this country.

That amounts to a reduction of at least 30,000 U.S. forces by the end of this year. Mr. Rubaie repeated that position in an op-ed in yesterday's Washington Post. He, again, is the National Security Adviser to the Prime Minister. Our amendment's call for the beginning of a phased redeployment by the end of this year fits the very goals Iraq's leaders have set for themselves.

Listen to what Mr. Rubaie wrote about the many benefits of Iraq reducing the number of coalition forces. This is benefits to Iraq of our reducing the number of coalition forces in Iraq:

It will remove psychological barriers and the reason that many Iraqis joined the so-called resistance in the first place. The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors that have to date been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance because of what they call the coalition occupation.

“Moreover,” Mr. Rubaie said:

the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people . . . the drawdown of foreign troops will strengthen our fledgling government to last the full four years it is supposed to.

Mr. Rubaie's words are similar to those of General George Casey, the commander of the U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq, who told Congress last fall:

Increased coalition presence feeds the notion of occupation, contributes to the dependency of Iraqi forces on the coalition, extends the time it will take Iraqi security forces to become self-reliant, and exposes more coalition forces to attack at a time when Iraqi security forces are increasingly available and capable.

That is our commander talking about the disadvantages of having a large number of troops remain in Iraq.

Regardless of one's views on whether it was wise to attack Iraq—and I for one thought it was unwise, and so voted—and regardless of one's views on

whether the war has been well managed—and I have been critical of the administration's management—all of us want to maximize the chances for success in Iraq. To maximize the chances for success in Iraq, the Iraqis must take control of their country. Our approach, our amendment, maximizes the chance for success.

Last year, by a bipartisan vote of 79 to 16, the Senate adopted an amendment stating that:

[C]alendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty.

The Senate language remained in the bill and was signed into law. Our amendment implements that policy direction. The Iraqis are standing up. U.S. and coalition forces have trained and equipped more than 250,000 Iraq security forces. More than two-thirds of Iraq's Army combat battalions are either in the lead or operating independently, according to the administration's May 2006 report to Congress. It is now time for the United States to set a date for the beginning—the beginning of a standdown.

Last fall, General Casey said that our presence in Iraq “fuels the insurgency” and that “beginning to reduce our presence in Iraq” as conditions warrant would result in “taking away one of the elements that fuels the insurgency.” That is our commander speaking. Conditions not only warrant the beginning of a reduction of our presence, conditions are such that only a phased, orderly redeployment beginning by the end of this year will maximize the chances of succeeding in Iraq.

By making clear that a phased redeployment of our forces from Iraq needs to begin this year, we will send a clear message to the Iraqis that our presence is not an open-ended security blanket and that they need to assume responsibility for their own future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARR). Who yields time?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I see the principal cosponsor, the Senator from Rhode Island, a member of our committee, is waiting to speak. I would just like to inquire the following of my colleague.

I have found in our many years in this body that the most effective means to convey a message, the most effective way for the persons beyond this Chamber to follow proceedings on the floor, is often through a colloquy where we not just read speeches but we begin to exchange interpretations of what is before this body by virtue of your amendment and get the responses.

Might I inquire of my colleague of his willingness to permit the Senator from Virginia, at such time as the Senator from Rhode Island has completed, to get up and propound questions chargeable to my side and responses that you wish to make, to the extent you wish to make them, chargeable to your side? Is that a procedure about which I can be persuasive to my colleague, which I

find to be a very effective way to deal with this?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, am I responding on the time of the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, you are.

Mr. LEVIN. I am perfectly happy to engage in a colloquy at the instigation of the Senator from Virginia. Indeed, I will probably have some questions which I would want to propound to the Senator from Virginia.

On the other hand, I cannot agree that a colloquy which he instigates would be divided in terms of the time consumption. The usual policy around here is the persons who begin a colloquy have that colloquy charged to their time. I have more speakers than I have the time to allocate. It would be unfair to them for me to say that the time consumed in my answering the questions of the Senator from Virginia would come off the time for their remarks.

I am not only happy to engage in a colloquy, I look forward to it, but I would want to follow the usual procedure, which is that those persons who wish to ask questions of somebody have that colloquy taken from their time rather than from the time of the person of whom they are asking the questions.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would have to respectfully disagree with what is usual. Time and time again, Senators get up and allocate between themselves the question and answer. I have to take it we are confined primarily, I imagine, to the reading of speeches by individuals and limiting the ability to have a colloquy.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will allow a comment on that, we are not confined to that at all. I expect, when I ask questions of the Senator from Virginia or others who oppose this amendment, that their answers would come from my time and not from their time. I would apply the same rule to me as I suggest would be applied to the questions of the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. The Senator has made clear his statement. I yield the floor as a courtesy to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I join with my colleague, Senator LEVIN, and Senators FEINSTEIN and SALAZAR, to offer this amendment. Too often, the Bush administration deals simply in slogans. We have heard them so often, so many times: mission accomplished; stay the course; don't cut and run; we will stand down when they stand up; complete victory. But a military operation such as this requires much more than slogans. It requires sufficient personnel and adequate equipment. It requires coherent strategic policy, and it requires detailed plans.

At critical junctures in this effort in Iraq, this administration has been extraordinarily insufficient in all of this. We had insufficient personnel on the ground with the collapse of the government of Saddam Hussein. We opened up regions of Iraq so that insurgents could begin to form and begin to conduct this attack against their own people and against our people. Too often we went out to Iraq, visited the country, and were confronted by our own soldiers who complained that they didn't have armored humvees and body armor.

I believe there has never been a really coherent strategic policy here. We heard the initial defenses of the approach to Iraq as we were going after weapons of mass destruction. They were not there. We are going to go after the heart of terrorism, when in fact the terrorists' connection to Saddam Hussein was tangential at most. Then, we are going to build an oasis of freedom and transform the Middle East. It is not an oasis today in Iraq.

Certainly there were not detailed plans. We entered into this occupation without sufficient planning, without sufficient resources in so many different ways. The faults continue to plague us today. Insufficient resources to run detention facilities contributed in a significant way to Abu Ghraib, and that, as even the President admits, has been an extraordinary blot on our record and inhibits us today in our ability to achieve a stable Iraq.

There is something else that you need to conduct military operations, and that is public support. Today, a majority of Americans would like to see a deadline to withdraw our forces from Iraq. They are not unpatriotic. They are not without grit and determination. They are terribly concerned, and they are looking for leadership.

But I believe this leadership comes in not adopting some type of arbitrary timetable or deadline; it comes from adopting what is the most coherent and realistic policy we can today to stabilize the country of Iraq, to assist them in this stability, and to begin the phased redeployment of our forces from Iraq to begin this year. To begin, not with an arbitrary timetable or deadline, but to begin with the notion that these decisions will be based upon the advice of military commanders and based upon the conditions on the ground. But we must begin. We must begin because we have to send a strong signal to the Government of Iraq that they must take their future in their own hands, that they must make difficult choices about their constitution, about sharing political power, about eliminating sectarian elements from their security forces, and a host of other difficult problems. This rests upon the fundamental reality of the situation. Ultimately, it will be the Iraqis who stabilize their country and reform their country. We can help. We have helped. But it is up to them, and it must begin now.

Also, this approach which we are proposing recognizes another reality. Our

military forces, our Army and our Marine Corps, have been under tremendous pressure. They have done a magnificent job. The young men and women who wear the uniform of the United States have performed in an extraordinary fashion. But for some of them, it will be their third deployment to Iraq. Others have gone to both Iraq and Afghanistan. The wear and tear on these young Americans and their families is significant. The wear and tear on our equipment is significant. There is a \$50 billion pricetag just to repair the equipment that has accumulated over the last several years in Iraq. So we have to recognize also that our forces need a signal that their mission will be coming to a conclusion, not in the next Presidency but, based upon a careful deliberation by the commanders, we hope in the near future.

We also have to recognize that our threats are not confined to Iraq alone. Today we are all waiting anxiously to see what the North Koreans might do with respect to a scheduled—or at least a tentative launch of an intercontinental missile. We are today engaged in serious negotiations with our European colleagues with respect to the situation in Iran. We have seen in the last few weeks an Islamic government takeover on the streets of Mogadishu and Somalia. We have seen other areas of concern and conflict. Our commitment in Iraq, frankly, constrains our flexibility to deal with all these issues.

Senator LEVIN and I have come forward today with a proposal that we believe will be an approach that begins a policy that we can achieve, that it is necessary for us to achieve, so we can move forward to begin to transition the burden from American military shoulders to those of the Iraqis. It begins with a phased redeployment which we believe should commence this year. Let me hasten to add again: There is no specific timetable. There is no deadline. This is based upon the advice of our military officers in the field. This is not cut and run or cut and jog or cut and anything else. It is an attempt to articulate a policy based upon the reality of Iraq, the reality of our present military forces, and the reality of a world which is engaged in conflicts in many different places.

In the past weeks, we have seen some progress in Iraq—the installation of a government, the naming of a Prime Minister of Interior, and the naming of a Prime Minister of Defense. We have seen the death of Zarqawi. But still we recognize how turbulent and uncertain and how hostile the environment remains for our soldiers and the Iraqi security forces.

We have about 127,000 forces there in the last 3 years, or more. We have seen more than 2,500 of these young Americans killed and more than 18,000 wounded. Their sacrifices have to be respected and honored—not simply with force but with wisdom and with a policy that will work, a policy that is attuned with what is happening in Iraq

and around the globe and not a policy based upon bumper stickers that have been trotted out at a moment's notice.

We recognize that we have an interest certainly in Iraq in terms of succeeding. And this plan we hope and we believe will be a success. We are putting together a plan—more of a policy than a plan—because the planning is the province of the President, as it should be, as Commander in Chief. But a policy of redeployment beginning now is the right direction. It will require the President to begin to outline those steps. It will also require the Government of Iraq to begin to take responsibility for their own situation. It will require them to begin deliberations for constitutional changes. These changes are necessary to ensure that this is an inclusive Government in Iraq, that the Sunni community feels that they can have a future in the new Iraq.

It also recognizes that we have to have a sharing of political power in Iraq so that Iraq will succeed.

In addition, the Iraqis must address the issue of sectarian militias, and the infiltration of security forces by sectarian elements have to be dealt with and dealt with decisively.

We also have to recognize that ultimately these decisions will be made and must be made by the Iraqis.

In this proposal there is a clear signal to the Iraqis that they must make these decisions beginning now for their future and, we hope, for a stable region and a much more stable world.

We also understand that we have to bring together the international community.

Since October of 2002, I have argued that this unilateral approach to Iraq is not destined for success; that we have to have a multinational approach to be successful. We have carried the burden both militarily and in many other ways. It is time that the administration engage and energize the regional neighbors and the broader international community to help address the issues that are presented to us all throughout the world by Iraq.

We understand, on a financial basis, that this is an expensive undertaking.

Originally, the administration suggested that this would be \$50 billion or \$60 billion. We understand now that we have already spent \$320 billion, and the end is not in sight.

In a recent study by Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel prize economist, if you added all the costs, all the costs of rehabilitating our equipment when comes home, all of the cost of veterans' benefits and caring for those who have served so well, the price will reach perhaps \$1 trillion, if our commitment extends until 2010.

Also, the international community has to do much more. The international community has pledged \$8 billion, and only \$3.5 billion of that money has been forthcoming. They need to do more, and we need to make them do more.

This approach of going it alone has to end. And part of our amendment is to request that we engage in a much more multilateral approach to Iraq.

We have trained 116,000 Iraqi soldiers, sailors, 148,000 Iraqi police and highway patrol and other Ministry of Interior forces. There are 102 operational Iraqi combat battalions in their Army, and 69 are either in the lead or operating independently.

We have made progress. We hope that they are ready, but we think that we have made enough progress to begin our redeployment. Again, the pace of that redeployment will be set by our military commanders.

As General Casey pointed out:

As we are able to draw down our forces, we will receive additional benefits. A reduction in American forces will essentially push more Iraqi troops to the front lines. This is about the dependency.

Those are General Casey's words.

As long as we are there to do the heavy lifting, we will do the heavy lifting. That is an important point to be made and emphasized again and again.

The Government of Iraq was formed. Their National Security Adviser, Mr. Rubaie, stated this week in an editorial that Iraq's position is that it have full control of the country by the end of 2008, and this will mean a significant foreign troop reduction. We envision U.S. troop presence by the year's end to be under 100,000 with the most of remaining troops to return home by 2007. The eventual removal of coalition troops will help the Iraqis who now see foreign troops occupying rather than as liberators. Moreover, the removal of foreign troops will legitimize the Iraqi Government in the eyes of its people.

I do not know if my colleagues will come and accuse the Iraqi National Security Adviser of cutting and running on its own country. Perhaps they will, but they will be wrong.

That is what a leading figure in the Government of Iraq is suggesting. A phased redeployment beginning this year, hopefully concluding by the end of 2007—but again we will leave that up to our military commanders. The benefits will be that the Iraqis will step forward, and also this notion of occupiers will be diminished substantially.

From many different perspectives, this is the right policy at the right time. I hope that our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, will embrace this policy.

I retain the remainder of any time I have and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, I remember so well last year when we debated an amendment of great importance, and our colleague from Michigan laid down an amendment. Then I took that amendment and rewrote certain portions of it. A great majority of the Senate—I can't remember exactly how many but a vast majority of the Senate—supported that.

I have waited patiently for this amendment. It was given to me yesterday. I have studied it ever so carefully. I didn't denounce the amendment. I said it was a serious amendment. It is a serious amendment. It deserves serious thought.

But, regrettably, there is no way in which I can truthfully say to my side of the aisle and others that this amendment can be revised or modified such that we could hope to get what we achieved last year—a large majority of the Senate supporting the amendment.

That is unfortunate because we start out on a basis of where we could well end up today along strong partisan lines. That comes at a time when our Nation—indeed, the world and, most importantly, the men and women of the Armed Forces—would like to see the Senate and, indeed, hopefully, the Congress standing behind them with strong bipartisanship. But I fear that it is going to be lost with this amendment.

First, I carefully point out to those who are following this debate that this amendment in effect is nonbinding. It is the sense of the Senate, or Congress, as the case may be. But nevertheless it sends signals. It sort of states what this body feels should be done by the President of the United States as he continues to exercise his constitutional powers—I underline “constitutional powers.” He is the Commander in Chief, not Members of the Senate—constitutional powers in carrying forward the actions of our Armed Forces, and the actions of our Government as we try to support the newly elected unified Government of Iraq.

As the nature of this free advice may be, my burden—and those of us on this side—is to point out how this can be misconstrued as the message crosses the ocean and as the Congress is trying to order the President to do certain things. That is not going to be the case.

I have had recently the opportunity to have some private conversations with the President of the United States. My gray hair indicates that I have been privileged to serve in this institution now in my 28th year and before that for a number of years in the Department of Defense. I have worked with, I say with a sense of humility, many Presidents through many chapters of American history. But I must say I have yet to find any President with a stronger resolve, a stronger conviction to do what he believes is in the best interests of the American people, employing the forces of our men and women of the Armed Forces, employing every means this Government has to bring about solutions which he has outlined time and time again in Iraq and, indeed, Afghanistan. It is remarkable, unwavering, listening to advice, taking into consideration the views of others but clearly looking into the future, a future that generations long after we are gone will look back on this chapter of American history and I believe will

decide that we pursued the correct course. Hopefully, those generations will be enjoying the measure of freedom that we have today. But that will only come to pass if the Congress of the United States provides this President the support that he needs.

Therefore, it may be in the nature of free advice, but I want to clearly indicate to all following that there is much to be done to try and explain where I see there is fault in this amendment.

Last week, the Senate overwhelmingly rejected a proposal to establish an arbitrary deadline of a timetable for withdrawal of United States forces from Iraq. An arbitrary deadline of a timetable would have been a serious strategic error, and a historic mistake of withdrawing our forces prior to the Iraqis being able to defend themselves. It would encourage terrorism, embolden al-Qaida, and threaten American security.

Regrettably, the various courses of action that spring forth from the Democratic side of this aisle concern me greatly. They may not say it is a timetable.

It is interesting that in the course of the presentation of this amendment in the media, I have watched my colleagues from that side of the aisle explain what it is they are going to put before the Senate today. Time and time again, they keep saying it is not a timetable; it is not a timetable.

Why must they keep saying that the language is clear, that it is not a timetable?

But let us start with the key paragraph in the amendment of my good friend and long-time colleague.

I repeat it. It is on page 6.

Submit to the Congress a plan by the end of 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.

Folks, I don't mean to demean this, but that is the English language. It reads very clearly. It is a timetable, no matter how many times people protest it is not a timetable. It is the English language written with clarity.

We cannot accept that.

Our colleagues today on this side of the aisle will vigorously give their views as to why we cannot accept that.

Foremost in my mind is the loss of our men and women of the Armed Forces, now 2,500 in number, that have given the ultimate that any human being, any soldier, any sailor, any marine, any airman can give and that of their families.

I wonder how these individuals would look at this clause and find any other conclusion to draw but that this is a timetable—a timetable that could well cripple the ability of this new government created by the courageous actions of the Iraqi people time and time again in elections, after a hard fought political situation, in which emerges, hopefully, a strong Prime Minister.

They are just beginning to take full seizure of the reins of sovereignty, something this Nation has not had for

a very long time. As they are seizing those reins, we are asked to stand in the Senate and to lay out in writing for all those who want to destabilize this new government the timetable on which we will remove our Armed Forces.

Of course, there is a collateral question that is not addressed in this amendment. Maybe my colleague will address it. The United States, albeit, is the principal force of military. Great Britain, commensurate with the size of their armed forces and their nation and their population, has made a very significant contribution, as has Poland, and I could enumerate the other nations; modest though they may be, they are there. How are they to respond to this amendment? Are they to go on and pursue the missions they have laid out or are they to devise a timetable? That is one of the many unanswered questions I find in this amendment. Perhaps my colleagues will be forthcoming.

The major events certainly of the last 10 days—the elimination of al-Zarqawi, a terrorist without parallel in the contemporary times of all mankind, his elimination, the formation of this new government—has given a momentum forward. It has spawned a measure of hope among the Iraqi people. It has spawned a measure of hope within our Armed Forces that there is clear proof our many sacrifices to date are beginning to produce concrete, visible results that cannot be challenged.

We are moving toward establishing a secure and prosperous nation that will be an inspiration for the entire region of that world, and it is hard to think at this time we would take any action in this Senate to set back that momentum. The only way we are going to see our troops come home is if they seize that sovereignty, exercise that sovereignty, produce their own security and begin to reestablish their infrastructure.

I do not see this amendment in any way helping. I see this amendment as impeding the progress.

Give this new government a timetable. I ask my colleague, give them a timetable if you have to give a timetable to establish their goals, seize the reins of sovereignty. Do not broadcast through this amendment a timetable with regard to our forces.

We all know there have been some very difficult days, tragic hours, the most recent of which is the loss of our two brave soldiers seized, and although not fully confirmed, certainly the probability is they were badly abused, not treated as prisoners of war but badly abused by someone in Iraq. Who knows who they may have been? Obviously, the insurgents, presumably al-Qaida.

Our President, Secretaries of State and Defense, and our military commanders have all stood and said forthrightly, these are painful losses. Each one of these individuals I know and have worked with personally. They feel the loss of life. They feel for the in-

jured. They feel for their families. But to attain the freedom, not just for the Iraqis but for this country, from terrorism, that pain has to be endured, those losses are likely to continue. I commend all for being forthright that the days ahead pose challenges and further losses.

Any amendment requiring phased redeployment as our policy on a timetable to begin in 2006 sends that signal that begins to set back the progress we have achieved to date. That phrase about the timetable of redeployment will be examined with utmost care by those who are trying to destabilize this government—be they al-Qaida, insurgents, or, unfortunately, the sectarian violence. They are likely to say, we will wait out the timetable and then we will resume the violence and with every means we can to destabilize this government. That will be the result of this amendment.

This is an inopportune time because in the last 10 days we witnessed the death of the most prominent terrorist in Iraq, the complete formation of the Iraqi Government, a historic meeting in Baghdad between President Bush and Prime Minister Maliki, more raids against al-Qaida cells in Iraq, and a plan for the way ahead for this new democratically elected government in Iraq. We have the momentum. We must take advantage of this moment and this opportunity and move forward.

I know other colleagues are anxious to speak. I want to share this time.

I pose a question to my distinguished colleague from Michigan about another paragraph in his amendment. This one I find particularly puzzling. It is written, again, in very clear language, so I feel the meaning of it is written explicitly on page 5.

It says that the President of the United States should do the following:

(i) expedite the transition of United States forces in Iraq to a limited presence . . .

What do you mean by “limited presence”?

. . . limited presence and mission of training Iraqi security forces . . .

That we are doing with every bit of vigor we can possibly muster.

. . . providing logistic support of Iraqi security forces . . .

We are doing that as best we can.

. . . protecting United States infrastructure and personnel, and participating in targeted counterterrorism activities;

Does that mean we limit our force structure to the special ops forces? What is it that the balance of our forces do? Do they begin to rotate back under this timetable?

I hope at some point in this debate those questions can be fully answered because the President is the Commander in Chief. He makes the decisions with regard to how our Armed Forces are employed utilizing the advice of the professional military commanders to direct specifically the actions to carry out the missions to achieve our goals.

I say to my good friend, this paragraph D, the President should expedite the transition, what is the nature of the transition of United States forces in Iraq to a limited presence?

I see no contingency phrase in this as there is elsewhere in this amendment. If they were to have a tremendous insurrection, what do we do if we have transitioned our forces? Does that mean they are moved somewhere? Does that mean they stay in their bases?

This paragraph, in effect, is usurping the rights under the Constitution of the Commander in Chief to direct the day-by-day operations and deployment and disposition of our Armed Forces. I hope in the course of this debate they will find time to explain with greater clarity what is meant by that paragraph.

After consultation, No. 2, “with the Government of Iraq, begin the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq this year,” to me, again, lays down a marker that something is in the hip pocket regarding a timetable.

Yes, we start with the government, and the Senator from Michigan cited some of the current government officials and some of the statements they have made. I freely say some of those statements do raise questions in my mind, but this government has only been in business a bare month. We have to give them time. We have to give the new Congress of the Iraqi Government an opportunity to voice its views in conjunction with those of the government officials.

This word “after consultation . . . begin the phased redeployment,” how about if the government said we did not want a phased redeployment at this time? What would be the purpose of the consultation if they said, We do not want it at this time?

That statement, in effect, has been stated time and time again while there have been remarks that, yes, we hope you will lure your forces away, the bottom line is, they know they cannot survive with this new government if we begin any major withdrawal of forces in the coming 2 or 3 months while this government is taking root.

That is clear. No one disputes that.

But you say “consultation,” then “begin the phased redeployment . . . from Iraq.” That is not my idea of consultation. My idea of consultation is to take into consideration the viewpoints of both sides.

So we come back to submit to Congress a plan by the end of the year 2006 with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise.

That is fortunate to have that in there, but that is sort of lost because of the prominence of the first sentence. That is what is going to be read and interpreted by the insurgents, all those who want to bring down this new government. That signal must not be sent by the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor at this time and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me inquire of colleagues on this side who wish to speak. We started this morning by according the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Rhode Island their opportunities. I have spoken on this side. I know Senator MCCAIN has just arrived, and Senator CORNYN.

So I say to Senator MCCAIN, I think you were the first on the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. I think Senator CORNYN was.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I yield to Senator MCCAIN and ask to be recognized following him.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask that Senator MCCAIN follow me, and then we will rotate to this side and back to Senator CORNYN.

So at this time, I yield the floor and ask unanimous consent that recognition be given to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am wondering if we could sequence speakers.

Mr. WARNER. Why don't you designate someone?

Mr. LEVIN. After Senator MCCAIN is done, we would then seek to sequence the Senator from New York immediately after the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WARNER. Following that, Senator CORNYN will speak.

Mr. LEVIN. And then Senator SALAZAR is here.

Mr. WARNER. He would follow Senator MCCAIN and the distinguished Senator from New York and the Senator from Texas.

Mr. LEVIN. Let's leave it at that—

Mr. WARNER. Then the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LEVIN. Because Senator FEINSTEIN is now on the floor.

Mr. WARNER. You designate that Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank you. And I express my appreciation for the courtesy of the Senator from Texas who was on the floor before I was, and I appreciate his courtesy very much. I intend to take about 12 minutes, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we grant 12 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by the Senators from Michigan and Rhode Island and the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. These amendments share the same problem: calling for a withdrawal of American troops tied to arbitrary timetables rather than conditions in-country.

The amendment we are debating now states the sense of Congress that the

President should begin the phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq this year and that he should submit to Congress a plan with dates for this redeployment. I believe such a move would be a significant step on the road to disaster.

There is an understandable desire, 3 years after our invasion, to seek a quick and easy end to our intervention in Iraq. We face real difficulties there, we have made serious mistakes, and the costs have been very high. But these would pale in comparison to what is likely to unfold should we follow the course advocated by this resolution.

The violence we see on Iraqi streets today illustrates one fundamental fact: Iraqi forces are not yet capable of securing the country on their own. On the contrary, even with current troop levels, a level of violence in Iraq remains unacceptably high. To withdraw our forces would have one, all-too-predictable outcome—the violence currently constrained by our security operations around the country would rise commensurately. If the main enforcer of Government authority—coalition troops—draws down prematurely, the only questions will be the degree to which the increased violence engulfs the country and whether full-scale civil war erupts.

Much has been said about the effect of an American withdrawal on the Iraqi Government, and the sponsors of this amendment argue that a withdrawal would somehow force the Government to take on responsibilities it currently evades. But consider for a moment the effect of a withdrawal timetable on individual Iraqis outside the Government. An Iraqi Shi'a living in Baghdad or perhaps a Sunni living in Kirkuk learns that the Congress has called on our President to begin withdrawing troops this year and to present a timetable by which they will all return home. This knowledge changes the calculation made by individuals like these, decisions critical to the eventual security of Iraq. It makes joining the police forces or the Iraqi Government look like an increasingly bad bet. Participation in a militia appears better by comparison. And by changing these calculations across the country, we have made the goal of stability in Iraq more difficult to achieve. By signaling that an end to the American intervention is near, we will alienate our friends, who fear an insurgent victory, and tempt undecideds to join the antigovernment ranks.

Not every Member of this body agreed with the decision to topple Saddam Hussein, but when our country went to war, we incurred a moral duty to not abandon the people of Iraq to terrorists and killers. If we withdraw prematurely, risking all-out civil war, we will have done precisely that. I can hardly imagine that any U.S. Senator would want our Nation to suffer that moral stain.

But the implications of premature withdrawal from Iraq are not moral

alone; they directly involve our national security. Greater instability in Iraq would invite further Syrian and Iranian interference, bolstering the influence of two terror-sponsoring states firmly opposed to America's policy. Iraq's neighbors—from Saudi Arabia to Israel to Turkey—would feel their own security eroding and might be induced to act. This uncertain swirl of events would have a damaging impact on our ability to promote positive change in the Middle East, to say the least.

Withdrawing before Iraqis can bring stability to the country on their own would turn that land into a failed state in the heart of the Middle East. We have seen once before a failed state emerge after U.S. disengagement, and it cost us terribly. In pre-9/11 Afghanistan, terrorists found sanctuary to train and plan attacks with impunity. We know that there are today in Iraq terrorists who are planning attacks against Americans. We cannot make this fatal mistake twice.

Whether or not Members of this body believe that Iraq was part of the war on terror in 2003, it is simply incontrovertible that the war on terror is being fought there today. Al-Qaida is present in Iraq. Jihadists continue to cross the borders. Suicide bombers target American troops, Government personnel, and civilians. If we leave Iraq prematurely, the jihadists will interpret the withdrawal as a triumph of their brutal tactics against our power. And I do not believe they will stop with Iraq.

The letter released last year from Ayman al-Zawahiri, bin Laden's lieutenant, to Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi draws out the implications. The Zawahiri letter is predicated on the assumption that the United States will leave Iraq and that al-Qaida's real game begins as soon as we abandon the country. In his missive, Zawahiri lays out a four-stage plan—establish a caliphate in Iraq, extend the "jihad wave" to the secular countries neighboring Iraq, clash with Israel—none of which shall commence until the completion of stage one: expel the Americans from Iraq. Zawahiri observes that the collapse of American power in Vietnam, "and how they ran and left their agents," suggests that "we must be ready starting now." We cannot let them start, now or ever. We must stay in Iraq until the Government there has fully functioning security forces that can keep the insurgents at bay and ultimately defeat them.

Some argue that it is our very presence in Iraq that has created the insurgency and that if we end the occupation, we end the insurgency. But, in fact, by ending military operations, we are likely to empower the insurgency. The fighting is not simply against coalition forces; rather, the insurgents target the Iraqi Government, opposing militias, and various sects and ethnicities. There is no reason to think that an American drawdown would discourage these fights.

Those who support a withdrawal might wish to examine the assumptions that lie behind their suggestion. What if we withdraw and the violence actually worsens, full-scale civil war ensues, or terrorists enjoy safe-haven to plan attacks against America and our friends? Do we then face the options only of tolerating this situation in perpetuity or reinvading the country?

A few observers have argued that the United States has an option of somehow pulling our troops from Iraq but still managing things from afar. This is nonsense. The United States will have no leverage to manage things once we have left the country. The battle in Iraq, which is likely to remain counterinsurgency in character, is ill-suited to the extensive use of air power, which would be the foremost instrument available to us from outside. We could no more prevail in Iraq from outside than we could win the war in Vietnam by continuing to bomb the North. As tempting as it is to seek a solution that would let us both draw down our troops and preserve our military options in Iraq, that solution does not exist. The options on the table have been there from the beginning: withdraw and fail or commit and succeed.

Don't take my word for it. Ask those whose security is at stake every day. The Iraqi Government does not want us to set an arbitrary timeline for withdrawal. As the Iraqi Minister for National Security wrote in yesterday's Washington Post, more important than some series of dates is the achievement of set objectives for restoring security. Similarly, our friends in the neighborhood fear a precipitous American withdrawal. Allies in Europe and Asia encourage us to see this war through to its end.

Because we cannot pull out and hope for the best, because we cannot withdraw and manage things from afar, because morality and our security compel it, we have to see this mission through to completion. Drawdowns must be based on conditions in-country, not an arbitrary deadline rooted in our domestic politics.

Our domestic politics do have an effect on the war in Iraq, and again I fear that this amendment would have a deleterious effect. Anyone reading it gets the sense that the Senate's foremost objective is the drawdown of American troops. The sense they should get is that America's first goal in Iraq is to win the war—that is what they should get—and that all other policy decisions support and are subordinate to the successful completion of our mission. Like the sponsors of this legislation, I hope we bring home American troops as soon as possible. But suggesting to the American people that withdrawal is at hand, we risk once again raising unrealistic expectations that can only cost domestic support for America's role in this conflict, a war we must win.

None of this is to say that success in Iraq will be quick or easy. On the con-

trary, this war is long and it is hard and it is tough. We will see significant achievements, like the killing of Zarqawi and the completion of the Iraqi Cabinet, but we will see steps backward as well, like the continuing violence in Baghdad and the insurgency in Ramadi. No one should have any illusions about the costs of this conflict as it has been waged thus far or as it will be waged as we move ahead, but neither should anyone have illusions about the role of Iraq in the war on terror today. It has become a central battleground in our fight against those who wish us grave harm, and we cannot wish away this fundamental truth. We cannot fall prey to wishful thinking that we can put the costs and the difficulties and the frustrations aside by ignoring our challenges and responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROCKEFELLER be added as a cosponsor of our amendment.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, for the information of Senators—if I could get Senator WARNER's attention—the order on our side will be Senators CLINTON, FEINSTEIN, and SALAZAR.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the same order with the addition of SALAZAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Levin amendment of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor. At a moment when 130,000 soldiers, sailors, Marines, airmen, active duty, Guard and Reserve are serving bravely in Iraq and when the debate in Congress over our Nation's Iraq policy has grown particularly divisive and heated, I believe it is time for the Members of this body to put politics aside and choose between success and the status quo.

By playing politics and blindly following the President, too many are deaf to the hue and cry about the failures of this administration in the execution of its policies. And too often, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in both Chambers are asking politically motivated questions, not engaging in the kinds of fruitful discussion that asks the tough national security questions we need to address and answer.

I think it is time to choose whether we believe we have the right roadmap for success in Iraq. While our troops are serving bravely and with our na-

tional security in the balance, it is time to choose what is more important—a strategy to win in Iraq or a strategy for Republicans to win elections here at home.

There are no easy answers as to how we solve the problems created by this administration. There are no easy answers as to how we work to enable the Iraqis to hold their country together and to keep it from becoming a terrorist refuge and launching pad.

I simply do not believe it is a strategy or a solution for the President to continue declaring an open-ended and unconditional commitment, nor do I believe it is a solution or a strategy to set a date certain for withdrawal without regard to the consequences. Instead, I support this responsible way forward, a roadmap for success that will more quickly and effectively take advantage of Iraqi oil revenues, build up Iraqi infrastructure, foster Iraqi civil society, challenge Iraq's neighbors to do more to ensure stability in Iraq, and allow our troops to begin coming home.

We all know that our troops are in harm's way right now in a volatile region of the world for which America has significant interests at stake. We are at a profound turning point for our Nation. We are entrusted by our constituents, both those who serve and those who do not, to do what we think is right for them, for our States, and our country.

Let's be clear about what this debate is about. My friends on the other side of the aisle believe that the status quo is working in Iraq. They do not believe we need a fundamental change in policy. They choose to continue blindly following the President.

We Democrats disagree. We believe we need a new direction in Iraq that will increase the chances for success on the ground. I may disagree with those who call for a date certain for withdrawal, but I do not doubt their patriotism. I may disagree with those who believe in an unconditional commitment without end, but I do not doubt their patriotism either.

Sadly, however, there are those who do doubt the patriotism of many who raise serious questions about this war. They choose to tar all who disagree with an open-ended, unconditional commitment as unpatriotic, as waving the white flag of surrender.

They may not have a war strategy, but they do have an election strategy. This is the road they took America down in 2002. It was a dead end for our country then; it is a dead end now.

The politically motivated resolutions put forth by leading Republicans to gain tactical partisan advantage are a disgrace. In so doing, they have broken faith with those who serve and those of us who support our troops and who work for the success of this mission.

It is wrong, plain and simple, to turn this serious debate about our policies and national security into a partisan squabble designed to mislead voters.

This is politics at its worst, played over war. And that is no way to honor the service and sacrifices of our troops and their families or to find a better way forward in Iraq.

Like many in this Chamber, I have traveled to Iraq and to Afghanistan. I have met there and here with tough, smart, patriotic men and women who fill me with tremendous pride. They have been performing magnificently under difficult conditions. They have paid a heavy price since the war began in 2003.

Last week we had a moment of silence to mark the day that the number of American servicemembers killed in Iraq reached 2,500. And more than 18,000 others have been wounded. As of June 17, New York has lost 116 soldiers. The combined number of New York soldiers killed and wounded is 1,038.

I have spent time with wounded soldiers and Marines. I spent time on Saturday with grieving families, mourning lost loved ones. I have tried to answer the questions they ask. I have shared the grief they feel. Those who have not lost a loved one or seen him or her return injured still are anxious every day while a parent or a child or a spouse serves far from home. Not a day goes by that I do not pray for the safe return of every man and woman now stationed in dangerous places around the world—not a single day.

This is not a time for partisanship. It is past time for this administration to level with the American people, for this Congress to find its voice and fulfill its constitutional duties to check and balance the executive branch, and for the Iraqis to chart a clear and responsible path to stability and peace.

I call on our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to fairly and honestly consider the Levin amendment as an alternative to the status quo, when we know that the status quo has not, is not, and will not create the conditions needed for the Iraqis to achieve the stability and security they seek and for us to bring home our troops.

The conflict in Iraq has now gone on longer than U.S. fighting in the Korean war before the armistice. We ought not to attack one another for asking the tough questions and presenting alternatives about how to achieve success, limit the loss and sacrifice of our young men and women.

As we debate our next steps in Iraq, it is critical that we recognize and fix, as best we can, the mistakes that have already been made and not repeat them. The Bush administration misused the authority granted to it, choosing to act without allowing the inspectors to finish the job in order to rush to war, without a plan for securing the country, without an understanding of the insurgency or the true human, financial, and strategic cost of this war, all the while viewing the dangerous and unstable conditions in Iraq through rose-colored glasses and the prism of electoral politics here at home.

It is time to put policy ahead of politics and success ahead of the status quo. It is time for a new strategy to produce what we need, a stable Iraq Government that takes over for its own people so our troops can finish their job.

That is what the Levin amendment does. It calls for a comprehensive roadmap to achieve peace and stability. It also sets into motion the steps that should be taken for Iraq to move itself forward and become more capable of defending its territory, ending the sectarian violence, and purging the insurgency.

The Levin amendment does put us on a responsible path by calling for stronger nonmilitary actions, such as a conference of neighboring nations, greater rebuilding efforts, and better internal political reconciliation, by requiring the Iraqis to disarm road militias and take over more of their own security.

The only way the new Iraqi Government can gain credibility is by proving they can handle an increasing share of the security of the country with fewer, not more, U.S. troops.

It is clear in the Levin amendment that we recognize the President's role as Commander in Chief. It is the President who will make these decisions. What the amendment attempts to do is to provide a different roadmap, to set some conditions in contrast to the unconditional, open-ended commitment that we have had for the last 3 years and 3 months.

In yesterday's Washington Post, one expert laid out such a roadmap which described the importance of reducing our military presence in Iraq so as to enhance the legitimacy of the Iraqi Government in the eyes of both Iraqis and Iraq's neighbors. That expert was Iraq's own national security adviser.

I commend the entire article to be read because as the national security adviser sets forth a roadmap for the way out of Iraq, he makes very clear that the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people. That is not an American. That is not a Democrat. That is an Iraqi in this new government who recognizes what some, apparently, in this Chamber refuse to, which is, yes, we need conditions. The current policy has no conditions. It is unconditional.

The Levin amendment sets forth conditions, sets forth the kind of steps and benchmarks that we as Americans in positions of responsibility have every right to expect that the Iraqis will step up and meet. Clearly, that is also the position of the new Iraqi Government. In fact, one can read this statement and find much in the Levin amendment that supports the position put forth by the Iraqi national security adviser.

No war since Vietnam has stirred the emotion to the extent of our people as this one. I hear it all the time as I travel from one end of New York to the other. People stop and ask if there will be an end to the loss of American lives.

They wonder what the goal is; how do we define success? The rhetoric on the other side is all about symbols and slogans, but how do we define success?

They believe that we in Congress should not be wasting this country's time with partisan political slogans while we have troops in the field. They grieve over the mistakes that have been committed by an administration that failed at every turn to see the difficulties ahead of it or the benefits of using all the nonmilitary means available to it.

Of course, there are always unexpected events in war that can change the best plan or put some detours into the roadmap. The Levin amendment takes that into account. But I believe we must end the current open-ended, unconditional policy and focus on clear goals on all fronts and to make that absolutely clear to the Iraqi Government.

If we do that, we can begin to bring our troops home this year. That is why I fervently believe members of both parties should support this resolution.

How much time do I have left, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 15½ minutes.

Mrs. CLINTON. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks this afternoon by recognizing the ultimate sacrifice paid by one of our soldiers, one of my fellow Texans, who gave his life this week in Iraq.

PFC Kristian Menchaca, age 23, of Houston, joined the military last year and was soon deployed to Iraq as part of the 1st Battalion, 502nd Infantry, 2nd Brigade, of the 101st Airborne based in Fort Campbell, KY.

According to military reports, Menchaca and his fellow soldier, PFC Thomas Tucker of Oregon, were part of a unit checking vehicles near the Euphrates River south of Baghdad. They were taken when their checkpoint was attacked and, as we now know, they died in service to their Nation, and their bodies have since been recovered.

Private First Class Menchaca is described by his family in various reports as a man who loved basketball and Mexican food. His cousin, Sylvia Grice, is quoted as saying:

He talked about how happy he was that he was serving his country. Everyone he met liked him. He had that kind of personality. He liked to help people. He was just the kind of person that you enjoyed being with.

Private First Class Menchaca was married in September of last year, and he often talked of joining the Border Patrol when he finished his military service.

Mr. President, I know I speak for a grateful Nation when I say I am thankful for the service of good men and women like Private First Class Menchaca who serve our country day in and day out and who place themselves in harm's way in the service of

freedom. I am glad there are people like Private First Class Menchaca, who was happy to serve his country, not knowing perhaps that that service to his country would end in the ultimate sacrifice for the cause of freedom.

Mr. President, I have been listening to the debate so far on the amendments on the floor. I cannot help but be struck by those who would cast the only options available to America, when it comes to what is now the central front in the global war on terror in Iraq, as open-ended, unconditional commitment versus arbitrary deadlines. We have more choices than that, and it is indeed the policy of our Government at the present time not to offer open-ended, unconditional commitments, or to set arbitrary deadlines that serve as an encouragement to the enemy, knowing that if they hunker down long enough and wait us out long enough, the American people will lose their resolve and simply give up.

Mr. President, our policy is one based on conditions on the ground, and based on the sound advice of our professional military experts, people such as GEN John Abizaid, head of Central Command, and General Casey, head of the coalition forces in Iraq. These are the professional generals—those with knowledge of the facts on the ground—who are making the judgments and recommendations to the President and the Secretary of Defense and to this Congress about what our policy should be, and that policy is based on conditions on the ground.

Those who suggest that our only choice is between open-ended, unconditional commitments and arbitrary deadlines are presenting us with a false choice, one that, in the end, simply looks a lot like giving up. I speak in opposition to any proposal to impose an arbitrary deadline for the removal of our troops from Iraq and to speak about what I believe and know others of my colleagues believe is our need to win the war on terror and, while doing so, to stand beside the Iraqi people as they work to build their fledgling democracy and work to expand their growing ability to secure themselves.

The fundamental question we have before us today is: Are we going to base our military strategy in Iraq on an arbitrary timetable for withdrawal based upon defeatism, a policy of retreat, a policy of appeasement, a policy of surrender, or are we going to rely upon the military judgment of those who are currently leading us to victory in Iraq?

It is clear, as in all wars, that our Nation is being tested. This is not so much a test for our professional military, which is the preeminent fighting force in the world today and no doubt the premier fighting force that the world has ever known—there is no military force that can defeat the United States of America—the only thing that can defeat the United States of America, when it comes to the global war on terror, is America itself, if we lose the courage of our convictions, if we simply give up.

On October 11, 2002, 77 Members of this body voted to authorize the use of force to remove Saddam Hussein in Iraq. I will be interested to see, when we vote on these various amendments, how many of our colleagues have simply lost the courage or conviction they displayed then, in saying it was important to remove a terrible, bloodthirsty tyrant from Iraq. I have stood on the mass burial grave sites in Iraq where at least 400,000 Iraqis lie who were victims of that bloodthirsty dictator.

We know that Abu Musab al-Zarqawi was in Iraq more than a year before American forces went in. We all know that Saddam Hussein, with his fantasies of developing weapons of mass destruction, teamed up with terrorists and presented a clear and imminent threat to the safety and security of the United States.

We have much unfinished work to do. But we must not forget to honor the sacrifices of those 2,500 people, like Private First Class Menchaca of Texas, who have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. Are we going to tell those brave patriots and their families that they have sacrificed in vain, that we were not really serious about our commitments both to the American people, to preserve their safety and security, as well as to our allies, the Iraqi people? I hope not.

There is no victory in arbitrary withdrawal from Iraq, and victory must remain our sole resolve. Any suggestion that a withdrawal from Iraq would somehow accelerate or pressure the Iraqi Government, and Iraqis themselves, into supporting democracy more fervently is simply inconsistent with the facts. The people who are probably most anxious for the American and coalition forces to leave Iraq—second only to the American people's desire to have their sons and daughters come home—the people most eager to see them come home, beyond their family members, are probably the Iraqi people themselves. But they understand that they are not yet prepared to defend themselves against the terrorists, against the insurgents, against the sectarian strife that is currently racking that country. Yet we find that the armchair generals in Washington, DC, are hardly in a position to determine the best military strategy. How could it be any other way? Who is in a better position to determine what that strategy should be, based on conditions on the ground, than those professional military men and women who study this issue daily, who live with it daily, and who have tremendous experience? Surely, they have a better idea about how we can win the war in Iraq than the armchair generals in Washington who are resigned to defeat and simply giving up.

The Senator from New York quoted from a Washington Post article of yesterday and suggested that the National Security Adviser in Iraq had somehow endorsed the provisions of the Levin amendment. But I want to quote one

sentence that clearly refutes that suggestion. The National Security Adviser said:

This roadmap on foreign troop withdrawals is based not just on a series of dates but, most important, on achievement of set objectives for restoring security in Iraq.

In other words, Iraq's National Security Adviser understands the foolishness of setting arbitrary deadlines that have no relationship to achievement of set objectives for restoring security in Iraq. Do we all wish that our troops could come home sooner rather than later? Of course we do. But it is simply foolishness and folly to impose an arbitrary timetable on our forces, requiring them to withdraw from Iraq before the job is done and while the going gets tough.

I have in my hands a report from the U.S. Department of State that is 19 pages long. Anybody with access to the Internet could copy this or view it online. It is called "Significant Terrorist Incidents, 1961 to 2003; A Brief Chronology." It is 19 pages long. I ask our colleagues who counsel retreat, who counsel self-defeatism, what do they think is going to happen if we leave Iraq prematurely, before the Iraqi security forces can defend themselves in that new democracy? What do they expect will happen? I think what we know will happen is that power void would be filled by those who are currently fighting and killing innocent people in Iraq and who, given the opportunity, would use that failed state, if we were to retreat prematurely, as a platform to plot, plan, finance, and export terrorist acts to the United States and elsewhere around the world.

It is pure folly to think that the terrorists somehow would simply give up if we decided to come home prematurely, or that Iraq could stand on its own to fight and defend itself and have any chance of nursing this fledgling democracy into full maturity.

Just yesterday I heard some of the Members on the other side of the aisle say that they, too, thought that troop withdrawal should be based upon the judgment of military commanders. But they added: As long as the generals agree with them, that withdrawal will take place within 6 months.

Another one of our colleagues who has a resolution that has been much discussed announced he would extend his initial proposal of a 6-month deadline to a 1-year deadline. I wonder what sort of wisdom he acquired over the course of a weekend that told him, no, the arbitrary deadline should not be 6 months but should now be a year. What sort of new information did he acquire that led him to the conclusion that a withdrawal in 1 year was better than a withdrawal 6 months from now?

It is clear that such arbitrary decisions have no basis in military strategy. According to one news story last week, there were colleagues of ours on the other side of the aisle who were up all hours searching for a troop withdrawal position on the war on terror that would unite their political party.

My question is: Can they really be serious? Can they really be serious that they are still searching for some unifying position? It appears that they have no unifying position, and they have no plan to lead the victory in Iraq, or to lead the American people during one of the toughest fights that our Nation has ever endured.

It is indeed a time of testing for our Nation, and we must pass the test, not just for the safety and security of the Iraqi people, but for our own safety and security, and for the safety and security of our children and our children's children.

So far, it appears that the only thing the critics can agree on is their willingness to criticize the efforts in the global war on terror, to harp on those things in a way that is not productive and certainly not helpful. And it has the consequence, unintended or not, of undermining public support and confidence for our efforts in Iraq and in the global war on terror.

So it makes me wonder—and I am sure the American people must be wondering—are they more interested in the upcoming elections not in Iraq, but in America in November, or are they more interested in winning the global war on terror without regard to politics or elections?

It is important that we put the situation in Iraq in perspective. We are moving forward. Every single day we are making progress. The Iraqi people and their military forces are reaching out and taking responsibility in their own country and the hope we are extending to them for democracy and freedom.

Just over 3 years ago, Saddam Hussein ruled that country. We all know he killed hundreds of thousands of his own people whose only crime was to oppose his tyranny. Our military performed flawlessly in their march to Baghdad and overthrew Saddam Hussein. Then, in January 2005, the Iraqis held elections for a transitional national assembly to begin the drafting of the Iraqi Constitution. They overwhelmingly approved that Constitution in October of 2005. And then in December of 2005, they held elections for a permanent national assembly.

The Iraqi Parliament then approved the Cabinet, including the most controversial post of Defense and Interior Ministers. I remind my colleagues that the Iraqi voter turnout during last year's elections for their national assembly and referendum on their Constitution was respectively 58 percent, 77 percent, and 63 percent. It is clear that the Iraqi people are participating in their political process and building their own institutions that will eventually allow them to govern themselves and determine their own future.

On the security side, we have trained more than 260,000 Iraqi security forces and these forces are daily becoming more and more competent. They are now leading daily operations against insurgents and al-Qaida and the sectarian strife in Iraq.

We know there is a price to be paid, and I guess in the end, the difference between those who would retreat prematurely and simply give up and those of us who believe the fight is worth fighting for and the sacrifices that this Nation has made in the cause of freedom are unfortunate but worth it, the differences between those who believe war is bad and must never be fought and those who believe that war is bad but sometimes must be fought for the right reasons.

It is dispiriting that some politicians reading the polls in Iraq want us to set an arbitrary timetable for withdrawal, and this despite they have no plan for success for winning the war or what to do in the vacuum that will be created once we give up.

We know that terrorists remain on the attack and, given our willingness to retreat, will simply take advantage of that vulnerability and attack America and other innocent people again.

In conclusion, I think the policy of retreat and defeatism and simply giving up is not one that serves our Nation well. It does not serve the interests of the Iraqi people, and it would simply be the wrong decision for this Senate to make at this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to thank our colleague from Texas for his powerful message and also for his work on the Senate Armed Services Committee where he has labored long and hard and well into the future, I hope. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, as has been said, more than 2,500 brave men and women of America's fighting forces have now been killed in Iraq. Another 18,500 have been wounded. The victims of this violence include two American soldiers captured in an ambush at a checkpoint south of Baghdad who were brutally tortured, killed, and left surrounded by roadside bombs. I join with all of my colleagues in offering our deepest sympathies.

Yet with American troops now caught in the middle of raging sectarian violence, it is all too likely that such heinous acts will go on and on. This war, originally projected to last but a few months, has gone on for 39 months with no end in sight.

Our Nation is spending \$2.5 billion a week on the conflict, and the violence has worsened.

Iraqis have suffered greatly. More than 30,000 civilians have been killed, including 4,000 in the past 3 months alone. And another 90,000 Iraqis have had to flee their homes and their country to avoid the bloodshed.

In the past 5 days alone, according to news reports, nearly 100 civilians have been murdered in car bombings, shootings and other attacks, despite a new security crackdown by Iraqi and American forces.

For example, on Friday, 16 people were killed and 28 wounded when a shoe bomber blew himself up inside the Buratha mosque during religious services.

Saturday, one of the bloodiest days yet in recent months, over 40 civilians died in a series of car bombs and mortar attacks around Baghdad.

Day after day and month after month, we see that an open-ended commitment of United States forces neither controls nor abates the insurgency but, rather, it appears to inflame it.

What is becoming very apparent is that the murderous conflicts that bloody Baghdad and other cities daily can only be reduced by Iraqis—Iraqis who are willing and able to come together and stop this brutal and ruthless violence.

So I rise today to say that the time has come for the United States to recognize that United States troops cannot abate this kind of sectarian violence; only Iraqis can.

Late last year, Congress approved and President Bush signed into law an amendment that was in this very Defense authorization bill. That amendment pointed out that:

Calendar year 2006—

That this year—

should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.

Mr. President, 79 Senators from both sides of the aisle voted for this amendment, and I believe the amendment presented today that we are debating right now is the right way to follow up on this earlier Senate initiative. It is not cut-and-run by any stretch of the imagination.

When President Bush staged his brief visit to Baghdad last week, he told Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki that he came to look him "in the eye." Now it is time for the President of the United States to look the American people in the eye.

As a nation, we have had enough repetition of slogans and reassurances that have become increasingly hollow in the continuing blast of roadside bombs and the rattle of automatic gunfire. No longer will "we stand down when they stand up" suffice for policy. No, Mr. President, we want you to recognize this.

Three years ago, the United States may have been misguided into war in Iraq, but now most certainly the country must not be misguided about the realities in Iraq today and the need to change our mission.

What is victory in a land torn by its own warring factions? Is it quite possibly allowing Iraqis to solve Iraqi problems and to remove the shibboleth of an ongoing occupying army making decisions that should be left to Iraqis?

Despite what may have been said these past few days, our amendment is not about cutting and running. Rather,

our amendment acknowledges that staying the course is a strategy that shows no promise of success, and it is time to change that strategy.

There remains a thunderstorm of conflicting forces over much of Iraq. Questing for dominance are al-Qaida, nationalistic Baathists left over from the days of Saddam's tyranny, and an array of rival religious armies.

The battle lines are as uncertain and diverse as are the competing objectives of the various combatants. True, there have been some other positive developments. Iraq finally put a constitutional government in place last month, 5 months after the December 15 election.

After extensive deliberation and debate, the Iraqi Government is finally functioning, but much work remains to be done by the Iraqi people and their elected leaders, for only they can ultimately defeat the forces that have left the Iraqi nation on the brink of civil war. There are now over 260,000 Iraqi military and police personnel who have been trained and equipped, well over three-quarters of the way to reaching the Pentagon's stated goal of establishing an Iraqi force of 325,000 troops. Of the 102 operational Iraqi Army combat battalions, 69 are either in the lead or operating independently. That is over 60,000 soldiers.

Now that Iraqis have assumed the reins of control, it is critical that the United States not be caught in the middle of the ongoing carnage, sectarian violence, and civil strife.

I believe strongly that our mission in Iraq needs to change—train police and military, provide necessary infrastructure assistance, advise when asked—but now that the entire Iraqi leadership is in place, it is time for the phased redeployment promised last year in this bill to begin.

Our amendment calls on the administration to prepare and present to Congress and the American people by the end of this year a plan outlining the steps needed to proceed with the redeployment of our troops, either back to the United States or to other critical areas of potential terrorist conflict around the globe.

This amendment would place the Senate on record asking that the President expedite the transition of U.S. forces in Iraq to a limited presence and confine the mission to training and providing logistical support to Iraqi security forces.

We request the President to begin the phased redeployment of forces this year. It would ask that the President submit a plan to the Congress by the end of 2006 with estimated—estimated—days for the continued phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq. Is this too much to ask 3 years and 3 months into the most costly conflict the United States has yet entered into?

It would also ask the President to convene an international conference to bring together the international community to discuss and implement a strategy to assisting Iraq's development and infrastructure.

This amendment also calls on the Iraqi Government to, one, achieve a broad-based and sustainable political settlement within its own groups of people; two, share political power and economic resources among all Iraqi groups; three, develop a unifying constitution; and, four, disarm the militias and remove members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the new government is in doubt.

Moreover, and most importantly, it is increasingly clear that the Iraqis themselves wish to see a structured downsizing of American troops in their country. Why don't we listen?

Senator CLINTON eloquently pointed this out, and it bears repeating. The new Iraqi National Security Adviser first said a week ago, and then more recently in a Washington Post op-ed just yesterday, that the Iraqi Government hopes that by year's end, United States troop levels will be under 100,000, and that most of the remaining troops will return home by the end of 2007.

We don't make accusations of the Iraqi National Security Adviser. I have a hard time understanding why the opposite side makes accusations of us when we simply say we agree with the Iraqis, whose business it is to know this, chart this, advise this, and carry this out.

He states unequivocally that Iraq's ambition is to have full control of his country by the end of 2008. He says: The removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help the Iraqis, who now see our troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be.

Members, this is the Iraqi National Security Adviser saying that the Iraqi people now see our troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were once meant to be. This is a point worthy of serious consideration by this body.

Al-Rubaie goes on to suggest that such a drawdown: "Will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people" and "strengthen it to last the full 4 years it is supposed to." A drawdown, he says, will legitimize Iraq's Government in the eyes of its people and strengthen it to last the 4 years it is supposed to. Why don't we listen?

And he concludes yesterday's op-ed by stating—and I find this eloquent:

Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems, with the knowledge that our friends and allies are standing by with support and help should we need it.

This is exactly what this legislation would do. If the Iraqi National Security Adviser is willing to put forward goals and timetables for the downsizing of the American troop presence in Iraq, why shouldn't the President of the United States?

I hope this body will join together in a bipartisan fashion, as we did last year, and call for the redeployment and transition of the United States mission

in Iraq beginning this year. Three years and 3 months. This hasn't been 30 days, it hasn't been 60 days or 90 days. It has been 3 years and 3 months with "stay the course," and things get worse and worse. Now we have the National Security Adviser in Iraq saying essentially exactly what the amendment before us today says. Are we going to listen to him or do we think we know better?

I believe this is the right thing to do for our troops who have sacrificed so much. It is the right thing to do for their families who wait anxiously for them to return home. It is the right thing to do for the overwhelming majority of the American people who have stated clearly their desire for a change of course in Iraq.

I believe it is the right thing to do for the Iraqi people. They are prepared to stand up. They are prepared to handle their own destiny. I believe Iraq should be for Iraqis.

Thank you, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield myself just a minute or two. I listened carefully, as I do to all the comments made by my colleagues, and I believe I heard my distinguished colleague from California say that the most costly war ever is the one we are engaged in.

I would like to remind my colleague and all those listening and all in America—we deeply grieve the 2,500 lives we have lost thus far and the 18,000 wounded—but I remember so well when I was but 17 or just turned 18. I was in the Navy during the last battle of World War II; just one of those battles in World War II. I was in the training command at that time awaiting my orders to go to the Pacific. It began on Easter Sunday morning, and it ended 81 days later. One battle, 81 days, in 1945. Let me tell my colleague what America suffered. Twelve thousand men, and I expect some women, were killed or missing and never accounted for; 38,000 were wounded, 763 aircraft were lost, 368 U.S. naval ships either sunk or were severely damaged.

We have to be cautious and put this conflict in context with the sacrifices that Americans have made. That was just one battle in World War II. The casualties eventually went over a half a million. That was only one battle.

As we look at this conflict, yes, we grieve the losses, but we have to maintain this steadfast commitment, as we did in World War II, to put an end to this tyranny of terrorism. If not, we will not see casualties like Okinawa in any military conflict in the years to come between soldiers, sailors, airmen, and their counterparts, but we could see those casualties here at home if these terrorists acquire weapons of mass destruction or are given places in the world to have their training camps, and if they perceive that this Nation is in any way wavering its commitment to fight terrorism in every aspect we can.

So I would say to my dear colleague, I don't think this is the most costly

war ever, as I believe the record will reflect.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, may I respond to that?

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I would respond just for a brief moment. I believe the total cost of World War II was \$210 billion in real dollars. The cost thus far of just Iraq has been \$320 billion; and if we include Afghanistan, my understanding is it is about \$370 billion. So I did not mean it in terms of lives lost; I meant it in terms of dollars spent.

Mr. WARNER. Well, that was not clear in the statement that you made. You used the word "cost." I did not put down the cost of all the military equipment of the wars. But I think when we look at cost, we should think of lives expended. And we are here today exercising that freedom from that generation of World War II, the generation that fought in Korea, the generation that fought in Vietnam, and the generation that is fighting today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks in opposition to this resolution by sharing the story of Marine First Lieutenant David Lewis from Spring, TX. Following participation in the Corps of Cadets at Texas A&M University, he was commissioned on August 10, 2001. He wanted to serve his country, and he found very quickly after he graduated that he would have that opportunity.

Lieutenant Lewis has served two terms in Iraq, two tours in Operation Iraqi Freedom I and II. During his second tour, on August 5, 2004, Lieutenant Lewis was badly wounded in Najaf, while leading his platoon of 35 Marines into conflict against a group of insurgents. A rocket-propelled grenade grazed off his helmet and exploded, leaving him blinded and severely wounded. He survived the blast, and following numerous surgeries after returning home, he has regained partial vision in one eye. He was awarded the Purple Heart, and the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal with V for his service.

But he still wanted to serve his country. He was frustrated by the negative image of the war portrayed by the media. So Lieutenant Lewis came to Washington and applied for a job on my staff. And I am very pleased to report that he is sitting with me on the floor today, a valuable member of my staff.

Lieutenant Lewis, like so many of his brothers and sisters in the Armed Forces, has sacrificed for our country, none more than the three who were ambushed just last week and have given the ultimate sacrifice for our country. Private First Class Menchaca from Houston, TX, Private First Class Tucker from Madras, OR, and Specialist David Babineau from Springfield, MA. We are horrified by what we have heard of the deaths of Private First Class Menchaca and Private First

Class Tucker. My thoughts and prayers go out to them and their families. But I cannot imagine anything worse than what has already happened to those two people and their families, along with Specialist Babineau and Lieutenant Lewis, I cannot imagine anything worse than for us to pass a resolution that says we are going to stop our commitment because we just can't take it anymore. It is like saying, the cause for which they have paid such a price really wasn't worth sticking with it.

This war on terror must be won at all costs. If we step back and say we are willing to walk away because times are too tough, we have jeopardized the 2,502 who have given the ultimate sacrifice in this war on terror. Furthermore, we are giving away the security of future generations. We are saying that we are not going to protect freedom because it might be too tough.

If we did this, the terrorists would surely be emboldened. They attacked us, according to Osama bin Laden, on 9/11 because of our reaction to previous attacks: The USS *Cole*, the bombings of our embassies in East Africa, Somalia, the bombing of Khobar Towers, and the first attacks on the World Trade Center. We treated it like this was going to be a criminal case, and we had to have justice in court. The terrorists got the message that America's attention span wouldn't last very long, not long enough certainly to see through an entire war on these people who would take away the freedom of our children.

I cannot imagine telling the terrorists that if times get too tough, if you are too horrible, if you do things that we cannot even imagine because we are a civilized society, we are going to turn around and run away. I cannot imagine saying that America will not have the stamina to stand up and fight and win a war at all costs for the freedom of future generations.

That is the message we would send to our enemies. What about the message we would send to our allies? You know, this resolution and previous resolutions have called on President Bush to get more international involvement in the war on terror. I know President Bush has tried to get international involvement, and we have international involvement. But what country would ever step up to the plate and be by the side of the United States of America in the future if we say: We are going to set a timetable, and if it gets too tough we are going to leave, but we sure appreciate your coming and being with us, until it gets too hard? That cannot be the role of the greatest country on Earth. If we show that kind of weakness, we will no longer have allies, and we will certainly have plenty of enemies.

If we establish a timetable for redeploying our troops from Iraq by the end of the year or by July of next year, we are handing the enemy our playbook. We would be saying that in 194 days our commitment is going to end. Why they picked 194 days to say that our atten-

tion span would last, I don't know. But it would be 194 days for the Government of Iraq to get up and going, for the security forces to be trained, 194 days to root out the insurgency, and 194 days to stand beside our allies and by the Government that is forming in Iraq. That is not the role of the United States of America.

It has been mentioned on the floor that there is an opinion piece in the Washington Post yesterday from an Iraqi adviser saying Iraq needs to learn from its mistakes and Iraq needs to stand on its own. No one wants Iraq to be able to stand on its own more than the United States of America. We have shown that. But does anyone in this body believe that Iraq is totally in control of Iraqis today? Does anyone believe there are not insurgents and agitators from other parts of the world? Al-Qaida? Iran? Other terrorist organizations that have come into Iraq for the specific purpose of destabilizing that country?

If you do believe it is just Iraqis who are there and if everyone else leaves they will be able to settle their differences, then this resolution would be just fine. But that is just a fantasy. Of course there are insurgents from other parts of the world. Of course there is al-Qaida right in the middle of Iraq. The last thing the terrorists want is a stabilized Iraq. That is why they are fighting so hard. So we would say to this fledgling Government that has just been able to get on its feet but is still struggling, that has trained soldiers but not nearly enough because the insurgents continue to bomb their police headquarters and recruiting headquarters, we would say to them: We are going to leave you on your own and hope for the best.

Can you imagine what would happen in Iraq if America says we are leaving at the end of this year, we are going to start to pull out troops, and then we are going to finish by July of next year or whatever date would be determined by the authors of this amendment? Who would be in control of Iraq? Anybody who believes that it would be Iraqis, with the condition they are in, is just not looking at the reality. So I cannot think of anything worse that I could say to the family of Private Menchaca, from Houston, TX, or his 18-year-old wife who is with her family, than—the very week that this young man paid a terrible price for a cause he believed in—that we are not really committed to the cause. I cannot imagine anything more disheartening to Lieutenant Lewis, who has already served twice in Iraq and wanted to come and do more for his country, than to say: I am glad you are committed, but the Senate just isn't there with you.

No. No. The United States of America and the Senate representing the 50 States of this Nation must not pass a resolution that would walk away from our commitment to the cause of freedom for the citizens of the United

States, because that is what is at stake here. It is not the Iraqi people alone in this fight. We are fighting terrorists on their turf. We have not had an attack in the United States of America because we have been vigilant in keeping them on their turf, containing them on their turf, and building up our homeland security at the same time. We must keep the word and the commitment of the greatest Nation on Earth, and we must keep the trust of the people that we are going to keep the will to fight for freedom for their children and their children's children. That is what is at stake in this resolution.

I urge my colleagues to think of the consequences of cutting and running from a fight that is much bigger than the stabilization of Iraq. It is for the freedom and the way of life of Americans and our allies throughout the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, would you advise the managers as to the allocation of time still remaining under the control of each?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 1 hour 14 minutes; the minority has 1 hour 26 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 10 minutes to Senator SALAZAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Levin-Reed amendment on our Iraq policy.

The United States of America has already invested mightily in helping the Iraqi people. It is now time for the United States to make a clear and specific statement that the Iraqi people must assume the responsibility for finding Iraqi solutions to the challenges they face.

Indeed, that is exactly what the Iraqi government has said it wants. Just a few days ago, the new Iraqi National Security Advisor, Mowaffak al-Rubaie, stated that the Iraqi government anticipates some drawdown in U.S. troop numbers by the end of this year and continuing in 2007. He also said:

The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors that have to date been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance because of what they call the "coalition occupation."

Finally, he made the statement:

The removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people.

The security adviser continued and essentially said that there would be a gradual transition from the American troop presence there in Iraq. So our amendment builds on what the Iraqi Government is telling us that they want.

America has invested life, blood, and treasure in Iraq over the past 3½ years.

Mr. President, 2,506 U.S. servicemen and women have been killed; Over 18,500 servicemen and women have been wounded; and some \$320 billion taxpayer dollars have been appropriated.

We all recognize that U.S. forces cannot and should not remain in Iraq indefinitely. Yesterday the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly to retain language indicating that the U.S. will not construct permanent bases in Iraq precisely because they wanted to send a signal to Americans and to Iraqis—we don't plan on staying forever.

Last year the Senate joined together in calling for 2006 to be the year of transition in Iraq. That was a positive step, one that helped bring unity and cohesion to a debate too often marked by partisan rancor. Now we can take another constructive step together by supporting this well-thought-out amendment.

The Levin-Reed amendment affirms the statement that the Senate made last year: 2006 should be a year of transition in Iraq. It asks the President to present a flexible plan for that ongoing transition—one that can give some shape and direction to the oft-repeated mantra that "as the Iraqis stand up, we will stand down."

Let me just outline what this amendment does.

It states that an open-ended commitment in Iraq is unsustainable, and urges the following actions be undertaken to help the American people and the Iraqi people achieve success.

The Iraqis should take steps to promote more power sharing in Iraq, including through Constitutional changes, to avert civil conflict.

The President of the United States should convene an international summit on Iraq to increase burden-sharing in efforts to stabilize the country.

The government of Iraq should disarm militias and insist on integrity in the Iraqi armed forces and police.

The U.S. President should begin the transition of U.S. forces to a limited, three-fold mission. That mission would involve continued training of Iraqi forces, protecting U.S. assets and personnel, and targeted counter-terrorism activities, and by the end of 2006, the President should submit a plan to Congress for continuing the phased redeployment.

The U.S. should continue heavy diplomatic engagement in Iraq for the foreseeable future.

The President should assess the impact that our operations in Iraq are having on the overall US campaign against terrorism worldwide.

One thing that has become apparent in recent months is that many Americans are losing confidence in our Iraq policy—not in our servicemen and women, but in our policy. I know that history tells us that the U.S. is most successful in undertakings of this magnitude and difficulty when the American people are wholeheartedly behind the effort. It is my sincere hope that

this amendment, and the plan for phased redeployment appropriate to conditions on the ground that it calls for, will help contribute to success in Iraq by giving the American people new confidence that we are moving toward a clear destination, along a distinct path.

It is precisely because I recognize that stability in Iraq is important, and because I want this mission to succeed, that I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment. The only path to sustainable stability in Iraq requires Iraqis assuming responsibility for their own security and making the political accommodations necessary to avert civil war. The U.S. cannot do this for them. An open-ended policy in Iraq is not helping matters—it is letting extremist and divisive elements hide behind the cloak of nationalism, and it is providing a rationale for postponing tough choices which must be made by the Iraqi people.

And so those who would rather engage in mudslinging, those who would rather politicize this vital national security issue than deal with the reality that the only choices before us are tough choices, need to think again. We all in this Chamber, I believe, want success in Iraq. We need to work with the democratically-elected Iraqi government to get there. This amendment is in step with their vision.

I want to succeed in Iraq, and I also want our broader foreign policy goal to succeed—the goal of defeating the terrorist networks that wish to do us harm. It is precisely because I am concerned about the consequences for our national security of an open-ended commitment to keep large numbers of American troops deployed in Iraq that I support the Levin-Reed amendment. The fight against terrorism is a global endeavor, and for years Iraq has been sucking up most the resources, the troops, and the political will and capital in this room. This amendment calls on the administration to responsibly assess and adjust our policies so that we don't strain our military to the breaking point even as a global struggle rages on for years and perhaps decades to come.

The very fact that this amendment is likely to be criticized from both sides in the Iraq debate is, in my view, an endorsement of its language. This amendment rejects any call for an immediate withdrawal, because that would be irresponsible and would not serve our national interests. A failed Iraqi state would further destabilize an already volatile region, creating a lasting haven for terrorists. Our national security imperatives mandate our commitment to Iraq's success. There is no cutting, there is no running in this language. There is no deadline. There is no arbitrary timeframe.

But it also rejects the fingers-crossed, stay the meandering-course approach favored by those whose strategy seems to involve little more than hoping for the best. Optimism is a terrific attitude, but it's not a policy.

Success in Iraq is dependent on several factors: controlling violence, creating a stable government of national unity, delivering basic services and the promise of economic development to the Iraqi people, and establishing strong and supportive relations between Iraq and its neighbors in the region. If any of these pillars are missing, Iraq's future becomes uncertain and unstable. America can help, but ultimately the Iraqis must achieve these goals on their own.

This amendment calls for us to begin shifting that responsibility, even as we work to shore up international cooperation and support and reaffirm our commitment to intense ongoing engagement.

Since I became a United States Senator, I have twice traveled to Iraq to get a better sense of the status of our mission. Each time, I have been overwhelmed with admiration for our servicemen and women who are serving so honorably, and who, along with their families, are sacrificing so much.

I am so proud of our troops and we must do right by them. Sitting on our hands while policy drifts from one goal and mission to another with no end in sight just isn't good enough. By the end of this year, we will have been in Iraq nearly as long as we were engaged in World War II, but as sectarian violence is on the rise, the picture is getting murkier and murkier. Congress needs to get into the mix—but to get in responsibly. I hope that my colleagues, both those who support this amendment and those who find fault with it, will engage in this debate in that spirit. Our men and women in uniform, and the American people, deserve nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, since the conflict in Afghanistan and Iraq, 2,808 American men and women have paid the ultimate sacrifice. Of that number, 63 are Oregonians, or those who have Oregon ties. There are 63 patriots among that total.

I rise today to honor them, but I also feel compelled to come here this afternoon to pay particular honor to Tom Tucker who recently lost his life and to do what I can through my words to assuage in some possible way, if possible, the grief of his parents, Wes and Meg Tucker of Madras, OR. Army PVT Thomas Tucker was born in Pineville, OR, in central Oregon, in the beautiful rimrock country of that part of our State. He grew up in Madras and graduated from Madras High School in 1999. He worked in a variety of jobs before feeling the call to serve his country and enlisted in the U.S. Army in July of 2005. He was attached to the First

Battalion of the 502nd Infantry Regiment of the Second Brigade, 101st Airborne Division. He has been in Iraq since February of 2006.

When word came through that he had been taken hostage by al-Qaida fighters in Iraq, I called his father Wes. I wasn't very far into the conversation when it was clear to me that I was talking to a dad who was also a patriot, was proud of his son and fearful for the consequences that may befall him.

The worst-of-all news came out when the whole country, and particularly my State, learned not only that Thomas had given his life but that he had been tortured, that his body had been defiled and had been booby-trapped to take the lives of other American soldiers.

I have no words sufficient to tell the Tucker family how truly sorry I am for the extent of their loss. Yet I stand in awe and amazement that this morning on the NBC "Today" program there came Wes Tucker's face. And he said: "Our son, as far as we are concerned, has died for the freedom of everyone in the United States."

I could not agree with him more.

Wes and Meg Tucker are made of sterner stuff. They did not blame the President. They did not blame the military. They simply acknowledged that their son was in the service of his country knowing the risk and willing to sacrifice it all.

I salute them, and I will never forget them or their son.

I am told by news accounts that Madras, OR, a town of 6,000 people, has now become a family of 6,000 people, gathering around the Tucker family, to offer whatever consolation they can and the support that is required, to let the Tucker family know that their son is an American hero now and forever.

Many wonder, what did Tom die for? I believe, as his father said, that he died for his country, that he died for freedom's sake, and the cause of freedom is one that comes with a very high price. It has hit home hard in Oregon today.

Al-Qaida is a serpent with many heads. It found Tom, and in finding him revealed the ugliness, the barbarity, the brutality of the enemy that we face.

Understand, al-Qaida's words in this war, their purposes, their intentions, their objectives are to create—these are not George Bush's words, these are their words—a new caliphate in the Middle East such as existed for several centuries, ranging from Spain as far as Pakistan, to establish sharia law.

If you want to know what sharia law is, look at the governments of the Taliban and the brutality that attended their government. It is for the extermination of the state of Israel, and it is for the holding hostage of western civilization. I believe Tom Tucker died in opposition to these hideous aims of our enemies on Earth today.

Anyone who believes that America does not have a stake in this is deeply mistaking themselves.

During my first term in the U.S. Senate I served on the Foreign Relations Committee. I wasn't on that committee long until I was simply amazed and overwhelmed in terms of my schedule by the number of foreign leaders who sought out an audience in my office seeking trade, aid, and military alliance with the United States.

I used to wonder, why do they come to us? Why must we solve their problems? It was evident because they knew America had values for which it was willing to pay a high price.

So I have to ask, why us? And history's answer is, why not us?

In the 20th century, the United States of America and a number of our stalwart friends—the British come quickly to mind—have filled the void to stop tyranny when our defense, first, our interests, our values and our allies required our help. It is no different now in 21st century.

We all want our kids to come home. I pray for that daily. And I am thankful that their numbers are declining and that they are coming home.

What this debate is about and the difference we share with our friends on the other side of the aisle is simply the wisdom of announcing a date for withdrawal.

As I have studied history, I have never found an instance whereby victory is won by announcing retreat. Wisdom counsels, I believe, that we hold our cards closer to our vest.

Al-Qaida is counting on us to go home just as they cite in their Web sites our retreat from Beirut, our inaction in the face of innumerable, outrageous terrorist attacks during the 1990s—and they took it all for weakness.

I want our kids to come home. But I want us to see the ugly face of al-Qaida and understand the deadliness and earnestness of their purposes and how antithetical they are to the future of this Nation and to the future of our children and to the civilization that we enjoy in such abundance in this blessed land.

Al-Qaida is counting on us to set a date. It is for that reason that I will vote against any amendment that sets a date.

I want to express to my colleagues on the other side that the rhetoric is too heated. When I hear things like "Bush lied, kids died," or even on our side, "retreat"—and whatever the mantra is—my soul cries out for something more dignified.

I don't believe their dissent is unpatriotic. I simply believe it to be unwise. It is a tactical mistake of monumental proportions.

I do not know how long the war on terror will go. But I do know that we have an interest in it. We learned that interest on 9/11. We learn that interest with the death of every soldier.

I yield the floor with a plea that we keep our tactics to ourselves and that we understand that America will not be defeated but that we can defeat ourselves.

I urge opposition to the Levin amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my colleague, what a truly heartfelt, remarkable set of comments. I thank the Senator for contributing to this important debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as I begin my remarks, by coincidence, I am following my good friend from Oregon, GORDON SMITH. It is purely by coincidence that we are lined up to address our thoughts on this important and most critical issue facing our country. I say to my colleague from Oregon, my opening comments are exactly the Senator's closing comments.

I plead with my colleagues during the remaining hours of this debate to try to stay away from the personal attacks and the mindless use of labels that we are tempted to gravitate to in order to impassion our constituencies. Such approaches do little to contribute to an understanding of the important subject before the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon eloquently described the loss of Thomas Tucker and of Kristian Menchaca from Houston, TX, the insane and hideous loss of life, and how it occurred. These young men and the 2,500 others who have lost their lives, along with the 18,000 who have been permanently injured, deserve better than some of the rhetoric and some of the discussion I have heard over the last number of days in talking about this issue.

I believe all 100 Senators in this Chamber care deeply about what happens to our men and women in uniform. I don't question for a single minute the patriotism of a single colleague. While we may disagree about how to successfully conduct our policies with respect to Iraq, we all deserve to give to our constituencies an intelligent discussion of these matters rather than resort to language of "cut and run" or "lie and die" or other such talk. It is that kind of rhetoric which causes most of our constituents to become disgusted with Congress.

I may disagree with my colleague from Oregon over the Levin amendment. In fact, I am a cosponsor of this amendment, and I believe CARL LEVIN and JACK REED have put us on the right track, which I am going to explain. I can fully respect those with a different point of view in all of this, while disagreeing with them. I do not question for a minute any Senator's goals or patriotism. I hope the rest of my colleagues over the remaining hours will conduct themselves accordingly. Before giving your speech, read the speech of GORDON SMITH and then de-

cide whether you are going to engage in the kind of talk you may have prepared in your remarks in this Senate.

I thank CARL LEVIN, JACK REED, and others who put this amendment together, which I have asked to be a supporter of. It is a major step in getting our Iraq policy headed in the right direction. I also thank our colleagues who met on numerous occasions over the last several weeks, to have discussions about how best to frame this amendment. They were thoughtful discussions which I was pleased to participate in with Senators CARL LEVIN, JOE BIDEN, HARRY REID, JACK REED, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, DICK DURBIN, JOHN KERRY, and RUSS FEINGOLD. The Levin amendment is a consensus product of those conversations. Any one of us developing an amendment on this subject might have done it somewhat differently, emphasized some ideas more than others, included more specificity in the information we are seeking from the President with respect to benchmarks and a timeframe for the significant redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq. But I believe that the amendment that emerged from that process is useful for a serious and important debate on the need to begin the process of re-deploying our forces this year from Iraq and turning over full responsibility for governing that country to Iraq's democratically elected leaders.

I believe very strongly that it is very appropriate we begin any discussion about Iraq by first commending our men and women in uniform who have served so nobly there. Whatever else your views may be, it is critically important that they know this great Senate respects and honors their service. Our men and women in uniform have performed with honor, bravery, and skill in attempting to bring order and stability into the post-Saddam Iraq. They have put themselves in harm's way, as I said a moment ago. More than 2,500 of our sons and daughters have given their lives serving our Nation. Thousands more have suffered life-altering injuries. The American people and the Iraqi people owe them, more than any other group, in my view, a great debt of gratitude for their service.

We in Congress must continue to provide them with every resource to ensure they return home safely and as expeditiously as possible. Whatever disagreements may arise during the course of our debate about the administration's Iraq policy, those disagreements should in no way be interpreted as criticisms of our troops. Every one of my colleagues, as I said a moment ago, cares deeply and respects deeply the service of these men and women in uniform.

Our disagreement with the President and his administration is that we believed we were misled in 2002 about the rationale for going to war in Iraq. There was hyped intelligence, cherry-picking of intelligence data to paint a picture of a threat, in my view, that

did not exist at the time. That is and was unconscionable.

After the war began, the President continued to mislead America about the course of the war, the adequacy of planning, the postwar reconstruction, and the bill the American people would be asked to pay for the cost of U.S. involvement. Key members of the administration played critical roles in disseminating information that was inaccurate.

I have said on a number of occasions that if I had known then what I know now—namely, that Saddam Hussein possessed no weapons of mass destruction—I would not have given the President my vote for a resolution to use force in Iraq. I doubt there would have been a vote had all Members been aware of the information we now know exists.

Having said all of that, it is not possible to turn back the clock. We are where we are with respect to our involvement in Iraq. Sectarian violence has now outpaced that of foreign jihadists and ex-Baathists and insurgents as the greatest threat confronting American and Iraqi forces and Iraqi civilians. Ethnic mistrust, according to a recent cable from our Ambassador in Iraq to Secretary of State Rice, is increasingly ripping that country apart at the seams. That is from our Ambassador in Baghdad.

According to that same cable from our Ambassador—and I am not quoting, but this is the substance—the Iraqi people largely blame, unfortunately, the United States for the current situation, seeing their own Government as a puppet of the United States and believing that much of the violence in Iraq is being allowed by the United States as a type of retribution for the problems we faced in our mission to Iraq. Those are not my views but the views expressed by the American Ambassador in Baghdad writing to the Secretary of State saying this is how we are perceived. I strongly object to that kind of conclusion, but that is the conclusion of our Ambassador.

Iraq's economy is also in a shambles. Three years after major combat operations ended, the Iraqi infrastructure remains inadequate by every measure. Oil production, electricity generation, and the availability of clean water are all below prewar levels. Schools and hospitals lack adequate supplies and personnel. No matter how the administration tries to paint the picture, the reality which we all accept and know is that the chaos in Iraq is transparent and it is growing.

Most importantly, Iraq's elected Government is now poised to function, but only after 5 months of political haggling over key Cabinet and sub-Cabinet posts. That is the reality, colleagues, that the U.S. policy must now address in Iraq.

To be fair, there has been some good news. Over the last 10 days, particularly with the announcement that U.S. forces were able to detect and eliminate the Jordanian terrorist Abu

Mus'ab Al-Zarqawi, al-Qaida's henchman in Iraq and the architect of the brutal attacks against U.S. military personnel and Iraqi civilians alike. We can be justifiably proud, and should be, of how the United States and Iraqi forces, together, carried out this extremely dangerous and important mission. It is also a positive development that the Iraqi Government is now at its full capacity, with all Cabinet positions filled, particularly the critical national security posts. That is the good news. It is important to cite that as well.

Now that this Government of Iraq is a reality, it is also an important and appropriate moment for U.S. policymakers to take stock of our policy in Iraq and consider the next steps to turning over full responsibility to Iraq's democratically elected government.

Let me remind our colleagues, last year, President Bush signed into law as part of the fiscal year 2006 Defense Authorization Act a provision that states:

Calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces taking the lead for the security of a free and sovereign Iraq, thereby creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq.

I commend, as I should have at the outset, the chairman of the committee, my good friend from Virginia, JOHN WARNER. He has done a wonderful job allowing debate in the committee, bringing witnesses forward, allowing dissent to occur where appropriate, and authoring this language last year in that Defense authorization bill which the President signed into law calling for this year to be a year of transition. Those words were important. They were not crafted in a cavalier fashion; they were put together carefully in a bipartisan fashion as a message to the American people and to the Iraqi people and their Government. This year—2006—would be a year of transition for Iraq's leaders to assume greater responsibility over security matters and other challenges facing their country.

There have now been national elections in Iraq. A permanent broad-based government has been formed. It is important that the Iraqis now take on a significant role in establishing domestic security. Ultimately, a solution in Iraq will not be achieved through U.S. military action alone but, rather, through the political will and substantive action on the part of the new Iraqi Government to bring various factions in their country together.

In short, the future of Iraq ultimately rests with the Iraqi people, not with U.S. military might, not with the size of our treasury, but on the resolve of the Iraqi people and their leaders. That is where their future rests. Let's be clear however about our role in that process.

We should continue to assist this nascent Government in Iraq during these difficult times. But at the same

time, we must also refocus the nature of that assistance if we are going to succeed and if Iraq is going to succeed. Iraq's problems are essentially political problems that call out for political solutions. It is becoming increasingly evident, I think to all of us, that a continuing substantial U.S. troop presence in and around Iraqi cities is not the answer at all. In fact, the road to any success in Iraq will be contingent on a lessening of U.S. military presence, if, in fact, the U.S. Ambassador is right in his message to our Secretary of State. And having visited Iraq on two occasions I believe he is right.

We have won the larger war against Iraq's dictator but at no small cost. It has been a successful effort in that regard. Saddam has been toppled and is on trial. A new democratically elected Iraqi Government is now in place. Al-Zarqawi has been killed. Those are successes.

The remaining mission, however, of stabilizing Iraq and bringing factions together is something that can only be done by Iraq's new Government and its citizens. An indefinite and prolonged U.S. troop presence in that country is quickly reaching a point of diminishing returns.

I am a realist and an optimist. I recognize American involvement in Iraq and the gulf region will be required for years to come. It is a very important neighborhood in which we have very important interests. It is a dangerous neighborhood, as well. And we have vital national interests at stake there. But we have other important global interests, as well; among these combating the threat of global terrorism and terrorist organizations. Global terrorism is and remains our greatest threat.

In that context, I don't think it is unpatriotic or otherwise inappropriate for the supporters of the pending amendment to ask President Bush to tell the American people, tell the U.S. Congress, when and how he plans to successfully conclude the U.S. military presence in Iraq so that U.S. forces can be redeployed to more effectively combat global terrorism and protect our vital national interests.

Why was it reasonable and appropriate for the administration to set deadlines for Iraqis and unreasonable to set deadlines for itself? The Bush administration set a deadline for the establishment of an interim government, a deadline for writing a Constitution and for holding a referendum to approve it, and a deadline for holding elections for a permanent Iraqi government. Guess what. It worked. The Iraqi political leadership met the challenges. It wasn't always easy and the process wasn't perfect, but it produced results because we insisted upon those deadlines. In fact, I would argue had we not set deadlines, I believe we would be facing a very different picture in Iraq today.

I believe U.S. interests in Iraq can be advanced by developing benchmarks

and a timeframe for getting done what needs to be done to produce the success we all need and want in Iraq. I don't mean to suggest that U.S. forces should in any way be precipitously redeployed from Iraq next week or next month—that would be a mistake, in my view—but I do believe it is imperative for planning purposes to think about benchmarks and a realistic timeframe within which U.S. force levels can be significantly reduced below the current level of 130,000.

The benchmarks are fairly obvious: a unity government that equitably represents the interests of and distributes resources to all sectors of Iraq; professionalism of Iraq's security and police forces; disbanding of sectarian militias; the creation of a gulf regional security umbrella to enhance stability and deter unwanted interference by Iraqi's neighbors; and greater international participation and resources in Iraq's reconstruction agenda.

These are all obvious and necessary benchmarks. The more quickly the benchmarks are realized, the more hopeful we can be for Iraq's future.

It is both realistic and, in my view, possible to achieve these benchmarks within the next 12 to 18 months. Whether we achieve them depends on the determination of the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people to assume responsibility for their shared future—not on the military might of the United States.

And in conjunction with such progress, I think it is also realistic and possible to undertake the phased strategic redeployment of our forces from Iraq to other nations in the gulf and to other regions posing significant terrorist threats to our country. The details of any redeployment should appropriately be left to our military commanders on the ground to work out, in consultation with Iraqi leaders. This is a very critical and central point. Let me repeat it. The details of any redeployment should be appropriately left to our military commanders on the ground to work out, in consultation with Iraqi leaders. But we must no longer remain in an open-ended commitment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

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

Mr. DODD. The Iraqis are going to have to take responsibility for their future. This, in my view, is a strategy for success in Iraq. This is a reasoned and responsible approach. It is realistic. This is not cut-and-run. The alternative is for more of the same, in my view—endless occupation, violence, instability, and the erosion of America's global leadership and national security.

I do not underestimate the challenges facing the Iraqi people. They

will need to make an extraordinary effort in the coming months and years to secure their future. But we have been giving them the necessary tools to do so. Let's not forget when the President signed the Defense authorization bill into law last year, again, those words: This should be the year of transition.

We have given the Iraqis the necessary tools. Now it is up to them. The sage words of Benjamin Franklin, following the success of the 1787 Constitutional Convention come to mind in thinking about Iraq at this moment in history. When Franklin was approached by a Mrs. Powell of Philadelphia on the streets of Philadelphia and said to him: What have you given us?—Ben Franklin said to that woman: Mrs. Powell, we have given you "a republic, if you can keep it." The Iraqi people are asking a similar question of us: What have we given them? We have given them a republic, if they can keep it. But it is up to them to keep it.

I urge the adoption of the Levin amendment. It puts us on the right road for success.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the terrorists have had a very difficult almost 5 years since 9/11. That was clearly the high-water mark, their attack on America, the killing of over 3,000 people.

Ever since that day, they have been on defense because the President, with widespread support in the Congress, decided to go on offense. And for the last 4½ years, we have been killing terrorists, capturing terrorists. Many are hiding in their caves. We have liberated 50 million people in Afghanistan and Iraq. The number of rogue regimes, which numbered four when President Bush took office—at that time there was Libya, Iraq, Iran, and North Korea—is now down to two. Libya and Iraq no longer threaten their neighbors. The terrorists have had a very difficult 5 years.

Now, the President made it clear at the beginning of this war—and we all agreed—that there was not going to be a sort of clear end date. I have heard this conflict compared, by many of our colleagues, to the length of time in Korea or the length of time in World War II. It seems to me those comparisons are not apt. They do not apply to the current war in which we are engaged.

No one predicts a kind of ticker-tape parade at the end of this conflict. We are dealing with international gangsters who move across borders, who are adept at using the Internet and other modern means of communication.

The best way, then, to measure success in the war on terrorism is this: Have we been attacked again here at home since 9/11? While none of us would confidently predict that will never happen again, it is truly remarkable that we have not been attacked again since

9/11. I wonder why that is. Just good luck? A quirk of fate? Or good policy? It is no accident we have not been attacked again since 9/11. We have been on offense going after the terrorists where they are so they have to confine their mischief to their territory and not here.

So it is a statement of the obvious that they want us out of Iraq. They saw what happened in Beirut in the 1980s. They saw what happened in Somalia in the 1990s. In fact, they are anticipating it, and we have their own words. We have their own words. Ayman al-Zawahiri, No. 2 to Osama bin Laden, in a message to the late Abu Musab al-Zarqawi killed 2 weeks ago in Iraq—last year intercepted by us—this is what al-Zawahiri had said to say: The Jihad in Iraq requires several incremental goals . . . The first stage: Expel the Americans from Iraq. . . . The second stage: Establish an Islamic authority . . . in order to fill the void stemming from the departure of the Americans, immediately upon their exit and before un-Islamic forces attempt to fill this void. . . . The third stage: Extend the Jihad wave to the secular countries neighboring Iraq . . . the mujahedin must not have their mission end with the expulsion of the Americans from Iraq . . . their ongoing mission is to establish an Islamic state, and defend it, and for every generation to hand over the banner to the one after it until the Hour of Resurrection. . . . The Americans will exit soon, God willing.

We do not have to guess about what their goals are. They have been quite clear about it—quite clear about it.

So here we are debating which kind of exit date, which kind of announcement of imminent departure we are going to send in a message to them.

Our good friend from Massachusetts, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, has had no less than four different plans over the last 12 months or so. The first plan of the Senator from Massachusetts was to withdraw 20,000 troops by the end of 2005 and the bulk of troops out by the end of 2006. That was Senator KERRY's first plan.

Senator KERRY's second plan: to withdraw if the Iraq Government was not finalized by May 15 of this year. The third plan of the Senator from Massachusetts, which we had an opportunity to vote on last week, was to have all the troops out by the end of this year. Fortunately, only six Senators—six—voted to have all the troops out by the end of this year.

And tomorrow we will have Senator KERRY's fourth plan, which is to have the withdrawal consummated by July 1 of next year—about a year from now.

So four different plans—a kind of floating withdrawal date. But the one thing all the plans have in common is they send a message to the other side that if you can hang on until a date certain, we are on the way out.

We heard the distinguished Senator from Oregon mention earlier he had

not been able to find a single time in history in which setting a specific time for withdrawal produced a positive result.

One thing we know for sure, if they drive us out of Iraq, they will soon be back here. If they drive us out of Iraq, they will soon be back here. And they have already demonstrated they had the capacity, the intelligence, to carry out catastrophic attacks on us here at home.

We all regret and have great anguish over the death of every single American soldier. And it is a fact that we have lost 2,500 of our finest in this war. We revere human life, unlike the gangsters in Baghdad who mutilated two of our soldiers in the last couple of days.

But it is noteworthy that in liberating 50 million people in Afghanistan and Iraq, we have lost fewer soldiers than we had Americans killed in one day on 9/11, 2001, and fewer soldiers than we lost in Normandy on one day in World War II.

We hurt with every loss, but the losses have been quite minimal given the enormity of the task. And the job, of course, has not been completed. We have to keep on offense, keep after the terrorists, or they will be back here.

So I think this is an extremely important debate. I am glad the Senate is having it. We have sort of different versions of what kind of notice we are going to give to the enemy—that we are either on the way out by a certain day or beginning to pack up to go next door or pack up to go somewhere else by a certain time.

All of those are not good messages for our own troops, who are involved in trying to win the conflict, not a good message to the new Iraqi Government, which is trying to establish itself and get control of Baghdad, and the worst possible news to every terrorist anywhere in the world, just aching for an American defeat, after almost 5 years of a tough situation for them, because they know a lot of their colleagues are dead, they know some of their colleagues are at Guantanamo, they know a bunch of their colleagues are hiding in caves, and they know all the rest of their colleagues are occupied on their turf and not on ours.

They would love to get back on offense. They would love to come back over here and kill Americans right here at home. But as long as we are forward deployed, as long as we are taking out the terrorists where they are, we are winning the war on terror. But we need to keep reminding ourselves what the war was about. It was about protecting us here at home. And so far, I would have to say the policy has been extraordinarily successful.

This is a great debate. We are going to hear from a number of our colleagues over the next day or so. When we finally have votes on both the Levin amendment and the Kerry amendment, I hope they will be defeated, and it will be made clear to the terrorists, once again, that we do not intend to send

them a notice, do not intend to send them a notice that we are on the way out by a certain date.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I intend to support the Levin-Reed amendment, and I also intend to support the Kerry amendment.

Both amendments make clear that Democrats are united in our belief that it is time to shift to the Iraqis the responsibility for their own future and to begin to withdraw our troops from Iraq. It is wrong for the Republican-controlled Congress to be a rubber-stamp for the President's failed policy. We cannot ignore our responsibility to our men and women in uniform.

America was wrong to go to war in Iraq in the way we did, when we did, and for the false reasons we were given. There was no immediate threat. There was no persuasive link to al-Qaida. Saddam Hussein was not close to acquiring a nuclear weapon.

But as my brother Robert Kennedy said in 1968:

Past error is no excuse for its own perpetuation.

Mindless determination and foolish consistency don't make a better outcome likely. With each passing day, the American people are growing more and more impatient with the war in Iraq.

They want a policy worthy of the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform, not sloganeering and accusations of "cut and run." The American people don't want our troops deployed in Iraq indefinitely, defending the same flawed strategy. Staying the course is not an acceptable strategy when the course is a failed course.

Our military forces have now been deployed in Iraq for 39 months, more than 3 years. That's longer than the 37 months of combat in the Korean war. By the end of this year, it will be longer than it took to fight and win World War II.

The American people want a realistic strategy for our troops to be redeployed out of Iraq, and this amendment provides it. It sends clear message: now that a democratic government has been elected by the Iraqi people, it is time for American troops to begin to come home.

We need to view disengagement as part of the solution in Iraq. Our overwhelming military presence and our open-ended military commitment have only fueled the insurgency, made America a crutch for the Iraqi Government, made our country more hated in the world, and made the war on terrorism harder to win.

The best hope for the success of the new Iraqi Government to succeed is for

us to begin disengaging from Iraq, and they from us. The Iraqi Government must begin to make its own decisions, make necessary compromises to avoid full-scale civil war, and take responsibility for its own future.

As Iraq's National Security Adviser wrote in the Washington Post yesterday: "Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems."

Iraq has had elections, a permanent government has been established, more than 200,000 members of Iraqi security forces have been trained, and it is time to begin bringing Americans home. The Levin amendment and the Kerry amendment can help us achieve that goal and prevent our troops from being caught in an endless quagmire.

The cost of this war in blood and treasure has been far too great. More than \$320 billion has already been spent, with no end in sight. A recent estimate by Nobel Prize winning economist Joseph Stiglitz suggests the total cost will exceed \$1 trillion.

Our military is stretched to the breaking point. Many soldiers have been deployed more than three times to Iraq.

More than 2,500 American lives have been lost, including more than 50 sons of Massachusetts. More than 18,000 of our troops have been wounded. Clearly, despite the death of Zarqawi, al-Qaida terrorists and insurgents remain determined to kill American soldiers.

Despite what Vice President CHENEY says about the insurgency being in its last throes, the insurgency rages on. Last month, 68 American soldiers were killed in Iraq. Insurgents attacked American soldiers 90 times a day.

We always knew that deposing Saddam Hussein would be easy, but the administration should have foreseen that winning the peace would be difficult. Unfortunately, for our men and women in uniform, the arrogance of the administration blinded it to the cold, hard realities that our troops would face every day in Iraq.

Alarm bells had been ringing, but the Bush administration ignored them.

As General Hoar, former head of the Central Command, warned before the war, in September 2002, winning the peace would be bloody. He said: "In urban warfare . . . It looks like the last 15 minutes of Saving Private Ryan."

General John M. Shalikashvili, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned, before the war, in September of 2002: "I think if it gets to urban warfare, and the likelihood is certainly great that it could . . . it could get very messy. The collateral damage could be very great, and our own casualties could increase significantly."

In fact, in their 1997 book, *A World Transformed* the first President Bush and his National Security Adviser

Brent Scowcroft explained why they didn't go on to Baghdad in the first Gulf war. They wrote that it: "would have incurred incalculable human and political costs . . . We would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq. The coalition would instantly have collapsed, the Arabs deserting it in anger and other allies pulling out as well. Under those circumstances, there was no viable exit strategy we could see. . . . Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land."

Those words eerily describe what happened when the current President Bush ignored that wise advice and invaded Iraq.

We must not forget that ultimately this is a debate about real people who are risking their lives every day. With this amendment and the Kerry amendment, we provide a realistic way out of the quagmire in Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to support both.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, this is a very important debate. There is a lot of interest in this debate throughout the world. I am sure everybody at home is probably not sitting on the edge of their seats listening to what I am saying, but in many ways this debate will define the U.S. relationship with the Middle East and the world at large for a long time.

The authors of this amendment are as patriotic as anyone I have ever met. They are fine Senators. They are smart. They are trying to do what they believe is in the best interest of the country and the world at large. The problem I have with the amendment and the reason I rise in opposition to it is that there is an underlying premise about this amendment that we need to set timetables to send a signal to the Iraqi people to do their part and to get on with the transition and to stand up faster and to get political solutions to hard problems faster so that we can come home, and without this amendment, the Iraqi people may just draw this thing out and rely on us too much.

I understand your concern, but I take a different view of the Iraqi people. I am here today publicly to say that I could not be more proud of standing with the Iraqi people and their Government than I am now. What we have asked of them, they have delivered. Senator DODD was right. Every time we tried to set deadlines, they delivered. They delivered on some of the most difficult circumstances imaginable. If you want to run for office in Iraq—it is tough in America; they say awful, bad things about us in this body when we run—they try to kill you, and they come after your family. So to those

Iraqis who have joined the police force for the right reasons, to those who are serving in the military for the right reasons, to those politicians trying to bring that country together with a unity coalition government, my hat is off to you. I admire you. I am proud to stand by your side. I have no desire to leave you in a lurch. I have every confidence that you want us gone as much as we want to leave, but you understand your capacity is limited right now.

The National Security Adviser said there is a roadmap for us to leave, and the Iraqi people want to have the ability to chart their own destiny sooner rather than later.

To my friends in the Senate, if the U.S. Congress sets a timetable, it is a rebuke of the Government in Iraq. It is a vote of no confidence in the Iraqi people, and it will be seen as such on al-Jazeera and throughout the Middle East.

There will be a timetable for us to leave. It will be performance driven, and it will be authored by the Iraqi people themselves. The day they set the timetable and they set the benchmarks, it will empower their Government and their people and it will diminish the terrorists. If we set those timetables and the benchmarks, it will diminish the Iraqi Government, all of the efforts of the Iraqi people, and empower the terrorists.

I hate to say that I disagree with my good friends, but I do. We are going to come home one day. That day is not so far away. History will judge us by not when we left but by what we left behind. I want to leave behind a regime capable of pulling off something no one else has been able to do in the Middle East, a functioning democracy so the Shias and Sunnis and Kurds can live together under the rule of law and they can take out their differences at the ballot box and the courtroom. It has been 3½ years almost. They have come a long way. We have been at this over 200 years. We still have our problems. Under the best of circumstances it is very difficult to bring people together of different backgrounds, religions, and ethnic groups. We had our own Civil War. It started in my State. When we wrote our Constitution, after 11 years, women couldn't vote. African Americans were not even recognized as people. We have come a long way, and it has taken us a long time to get there.

Our Iraqi friends, the moderates are fighting and dying for their own freedom. They have come a long way in 3½ years. I am begging this body, let us not, as a body, set a timetable that would diminish their sacrifice and not recognize it for what it is. The truth is, the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people are doing historic things in the Mideast that no one else has been able to accomplish. They are not lazy. They are not indifferent. They are not letting us fight their war. They are fighting it alongside us and dying. They are dying in larger numbers than we are. If

they pull this off with our help, the world will be eminently safer. If they fail, moderate forces in the Mideast will be less likely to rear their head and stand up against terrorists, and the terrorists will seize the moment in the decades to come.

Never has so much been at stake for mankind and with so few people sacrificing. Stand with the Iraqi people. They want us out, but don't diminish their sacrifice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the situation in Iraq and to ask several questions about the withdrawal proposals being offered by the other side.

Why would we risk our success by a premature withdrawal? Why would we risk handing over Iraq to the terrorists when they are on the run? Why would we send a message to the families who had loved ones die fighting for freedom that it was all in vain? Why would we pass legislation that calls for the withdrawal of our troops and that undermines everything we have achieved? These same questions are being asked by many of my constituents in Colorado.

According to the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, a key newspaper in Colorado's western slope:

President Bush and Congress are right not to set a date certain for moving all the troops out of Iraq. That would signal terrorists they only need to hide out until the Americans leave, then reignite their attacks. . . . And it would tell others that our commitment to freedom in the Middle East is limited.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Sentinel, June 18, 2006]
IT WOULD BE FOLLY FOR CONGRESS TO CUT
AND RUN

Days after President George W. Bush told the new prime minister of Iraq that the United States would not abandon the fledgling democratic nation to terrorists, both houses of Congress gave the president much-needed overwhelming support for his position.

Late Thursday the Senate voted 93-6 to reject a deadline by the end of this year to withdraw all U.S. troops from Iraq. On Friday, the House voted 256-153 to kill a deadline for withdrawal from Iraq.

No one wants to keep American military personnel in that dangerous country indefinitely and risk more than the 2,500 U.S. military personnel who have already sacrificed their lives there. Fortunately, there are encouraging signs that the United States may be able to start reducing its military presence before long.

The raid on the safehouse of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi proved to be successful far beyond the death of one important leader. It pro-

vided a treasure trove of computer documents and other intelligence that led to more than 400 additional raids and the arrests of more than 700 suspected terrorists.

What's more, 140 of the additional raids and many of the arrests were handled entirely by Iraqi forces, without back-up from U.S. troops, a sign that the Iraqi forces are becoming more capable of protecting their country.

Additionally, with an Iraqi Cabinet finally in place, the government has initiated much-needed security efforts in and around Baghdad. Those measures haven't eliminated terrorist attacks, but they may be slowing them.

Even so, Bush and Congress are right not to set a date-certain for moving all of the troops out of Iraq. That would signal terrorists they only need to hide out until the Americans leave, then reignite their attacks. And it would tell others that our commitment to freedom in the Middle East is limited.

There was, to be sure, a good deal of politics involved in the Republicans' push for a vote on Iraq. But it was not entirely the GOP's doing.

It was Democrats such as Sen. John Kerry of Massachusetts and Rep. John Murtha of Pennsylvania who have been loudly calling for an immediate troop withdrawal from Iraq. With congressional elections in November, it makes sense to let voters see how their senators and representatives feel about withdrawing now.

Nobody should read these votes as unqualified support for Bush administration and the mistakes it has made, especially in underestimating the strength of the terrorists. But the votes do recognize it would be wrong to abandon the Iraqis even as they are beginning to take control of their country. And that's good news, not so much for either party's election prospects, but for the ongoing efforts to overcome the savage forces of Islamofascism.

Mr. ALLARD. Relationships between the 3rd Armored Cavalry and the local community were so strong that the Iraqi mayor of the city of Tall Afar actually traveled to Colorado Springs to present these soldiers with a proclamation from the city.

I ask unanimous consent that the full copy of the proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, CITY OF TALL'AFAR
IN THE NAME OF GOD THE COMPASSIONATE AND
MERCIFUL

To the Courageous Men and Women of the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment, who have changed the city of Tall' Afar from a ghost town, in which terrorists spread death and destruction, to a secure city flourishing with life.

To the lion-hearts who liberated our city from the grasp of terrorists who were beheading men, women and children in the streets for many months.

To those who spread smiles on the faces of our children, and gave us restored hope, through their personal sacrifice and brave fighting, and gave new life to the city after hopelessness darkened our days, and stole our confidence in our ability to reestablish our city.

Our city was the main base of operations for Abu Mousab Al Zarqawi. The city was completely held hostage in the hands of his henchmen. Our schools, governmental services, businesses and offices were closed. Our

streets were silent, and no one dared to walk them. Our people were barricaded in their homes out of fear; death awaited them around every corner. Terrorists occupied and controlled the only hospital in the city. Their savagery reached such a level that they stuffed the corpses of children with explosives and tossed them into the streets in order to kill grieving parents attempting to retrieve the bodies of their young. This was the situation of our city until God prepared and delivered unto them the courageous soldiers of the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment, who liberated this city, ridding it of Zarqawi's followers after harsh fighting, killing many terrorists, and forcing the remaining butchers to flee the city like rats to the surrounding areas, where the bravery of other 3d ACR soldiers in Sinjar, Rabiah, Zumar and Avgani finally destroyed them.

I have met many soldiers of the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment; they are not only courageous men and women, but avenging angels sent by The God Himself to fight the evil of terrorism.

The leaders of this Regiment: COL McMaster, COL Armstrong, LTC Hickey, LTC Gibson, and LTC Reilly embody courage, strength, vision and wisdom. Officers and soldiers alike bristle with the confidence and character of knights in a bygone era. The mission they have accomplished, by means of a unique military operation, stands among the finest military feats to date in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and truly deserves to be studied in military science. This military operation was clean, with little collateral damage, despite the ferocity of the enemy. With the skill and precision of surgeons they dealt with the terrorist cancers in the city without causing unnecessary damage.

God bless this brave Regiment; God bless the families who dedicated these brave men and women. From the bottom of our hearts we thank the families. They have given us something we will never forget. To the families of those who have given their holy blood for our land, we all bow to you in reverence and to the souls of your loved ones. Their sacrifice was not in vain. They are not dead, but alive, and their souls hovering around us every second of every minute. They will never be forgotten for giving their precious lives. They have sacrificed that which is most valuable. We see them in the smile of every child, and in every flower growing in this land. Let America, their families, and the world be proud of their sacrifice for humanity and life.

Finally, no matter how much I write or speak about this brave Regiment, I haven't the words to describe the courage of its officers and soldiers. I pray to God to grant happiness and health to these legendary heroes and their brave families.

NAJIM ABDULLAH ABID AL-JIBOURI,
Mayor of Tall'Afar, Ninewa, Iraq.

Mr. ALLARD. Let me read a portion of the proclamation as written by the Najim Abdullah Al-Jibouri, Iraqi mayor of Tall Afar:

To the Courageous Men and Women of the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment, who have changed the city of Tall' Afar from a ghost town, in which terrorists spread death and destruction, to a secure city flourishing with life. . . . Our city was the main base of operations for Abu Mousab Zarqawi. The city was completely held hostage in the hands of his henchmen. . . . Their savagery reached such a level that they stuffed the corpses of children with explosives and tossed them into the streets in order to kill grieving parents . . . this was the situation of our city until God prepared and delivered unto them the courageous soldiers of the 3d Armored Cav-

alry Regiment, who liberated this city, ridding it of Zarqawi's followers after harsh fighting.

The commander of Iraq's 3rd Army Infantry Division, MG Khorsheed Al-Dosekey, wrote the following in a letter to our soldiers:

Your ability to plan, the excellent coordination, the overall supervising and the right decisive decisions along with your great leadership have helped us build up the individual soldier and increase his abilities. Your leadership and devotion to duty have helped form an army from the gathered people. Your behavior and your actions have built strong friendships that will last a lifetime.

I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

3RD IRAQI ARMY INFANTRY DIVISION,
Headquarters in AKMTB.
3rd Armored Cavalry,
Regiment Headquarters.

Bravery, strength, determination, correct thought, flexibility, knowledge, and impartiality. These are the features of your regiment's leadership that are displayed through participation with our division headquarters, our troops, and their units in all the daily occasions. Your wise daily, operational, and successful leadership was the decisive factor in achieving victory. We noticed clearly the main features for victory in your leadership. They are the same for each people or army who are looking for victory, and it is the common purpose of your troopers and faith in their goal along with their principles, high morals and focus on their mission, coupled with perfect logistics support and impartiality and sincere leadership that makes you the right people for this mission.

Your abilities to plan, the excellent coordination, the overall supervising and the right decisive decisions along with your great leadership have helped us to build up the individual soldier and increase his abilities as well as those for the platoons, companies, battalions, brigades and division. It is said that heaps of construction materials cannot build a house and the gathered people cannot be considered an army. Your leadership and devotion to duty have helped us form an army from the gathered people.

Your behavior and your actions have built strong friendships that will last a lifetime. Your behavior is a feature of the wise leadership, which is the tree and the reputation you leave behind is the shadow of the tree.

So we present our heartfelt thanks, appreciation and respect to you as we touched during this past period of cooperation and coordination and fighting side by side. We also offer the thanks of the division's staff, NCOS, and enlisted. You will disappear from our eyes, but you will stay in our hearts.

We send our greetings to the 3rd ACR fighters and to their families and we wish all of you to get back home safely under victory's flag.

With God's Care,
MAJOR GENERAL KHORSHEED SALEEM
AL-DOSEKEY,

3rd IA Infantry Division Commander.

Mr. ALLARD. That is the message from the Iraqi people for the heroic efforts fighting for freedom. I know most if not all the Members of this body share in their appreciation for the valiant service of our men and women in uniform. I was pleased last night when we passed my sense-of-the-Senate

amendment which commends the members of our Armed Forces for their outstanding service to our Nation in Iraq and for their commitment to the highest ideals and values of our Nation. It also honors the families of our servicemembers who have given so much in the fight against terror. Our soldiers deserve our support and our trust.

In conclusion, I ask, why would we risk all this by a premature withdrawal and set a specific date for withdrawal?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I understand that Senator CARPER is on his way over. He is next on our side. I wonder if I may inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 50 minutes 40 seconds. The Senator from Virginia has 41 minutes 29 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, is the other side ready?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Virginia is next, to be followed then by the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL.

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if I may list the sequence on our side so it would be understood that after Senator CARPER, we would expect Senator LAUTENBERG and then Senator MURRAY, Senator OBAMA, Senator BIDEN, and Senator DURBIN.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we will go from one side to the other. I have waiting the Senator from Virginia, Senator HAGEL, Senator ROBERTS, Senator BOND, and Senator THUNE. I will try to get them all in order of appearance. The Senator from Virginia is next on our side. I will sort out the sequence of the others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, before I speak on these amendments, I will share with my colleagues three amendments I have introduced.

The first amendment will double the current referral bonus from \$1,000 to \$2,000, which will encourage more men and women to enter the U.S. Armed Forces.

The second amendment will provide statutory authority to the Army to pay \$8,000 dollar enlistment bonuses to individuals who enlist in Officer Candidate School. The Army has made this promise—and this amendment provides statutory authority to fulfill that promise.

And finally, I have offered—with Senators CRAIG, HUTCHISON, BURNS and SNOWE as cosponsors—an amendment that will provide financial protection to the 25.6 million military personnel and veterans whose personal data and Social Security information were stolen from the home of a Veterans Affairs employee in May of this year.

Under the terms of my amendment, the VA would be required to provide credit monitoring and data theft protection to these veterans at no cost to

our veterans. My amendment is supported by the VFW.

I spoke to Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jim Nicholson earlier today, and he informed me that he had announced that the VA will provide credit monitoring and data theft protection, and at no cost to the servicemembers and veterans. I thank Secretary Nicholson for making this sound and responsible decision.

I also rise in strong opposition to the amendments brought forth by Senators KERRY and LEVIN which, in my view, is a vacillating strategic plan of retreat. We don't need a plan of retreat. We need to have a steady, strategic plan for success in the war on terror and, in particular, in the theater of Iraq. We need to honor our troops and honor their families, whether they are serving now, or those who have fallen in the midst of this battlefield in Iraq.

We need to move forward in Iraq, and we need to unite all Americans behind our mission, unite Americans behind a strategic plan for success, bringing Americans together, and also our NATO partners and other allies, and get the neighbors of Iraq together, whether they be Jordan, Turkey, Kuwait or Saudi Arabia—they are all important—rather than Senator KERRY's plan, which is a plan for retreat, a tuck-tail-and-run approach. That is not what is needed.

We want to see this new unity, diverse Government elected by the people of Iraq, have a chance to stand on its own feet and defend its own interests. We want to see measured, tangible success as quickly as possible, and we want to bring home our troops as soon as possible. But I believe some on the other side of the aisle are too anxious, and that would be retreating. This is not the sort of steady leadership that I believe would unite the American people.

Moreover, I think this approach can embolden our enemies. It would show a weakened resolve in the midst of this war on terror. The terrorists always talk about the United States and Mogadishu or the Beirut bombing and how Americans will retreat. We don't need to be emboldening our enemies. Moreover, it can cause discouragement and dismay to the Iraqi leaders who are bravely trying to stand up for a free and just society. It also can be a discredit to the United States in the eyes of some of our allies. Our European allies came out strongly in support of us today, for example, in our negotiations with Iran and telling the Iranian leaders: You ought to take the carrot, take the right approach. It is important as we deal with the Iranians that the United States shows there is a resolve and a commitment to sticking to a path of security and peace.

Just a few weeks ago, I was on a bipartisan delegation to Iraq. Everyone we spoke with, whether they were Kurds, Sunnis, or Shiites, was grateful to the United States for liberating them from that repressive regime. We

asked what would happen if we left in 6 months. They all said it would be a "disaster." That was the word we heard more than anything else. Even the Sunni speaker of the new assembly, who was once imprisoned by the United States, said that if the U.S. military left—as a Sunni who was once imprisoned and was against the United States being there in the first place—he said to us, as he said subsequently to the President, that: We are grateful, and the U.S. military presence in Iraq is helpful to them. If we left, then those who would come in would be the Iranians, the Syrians, or potentially, of course, in the north, the Turks.

We are making progress. We are fighting vile terrorists. We need to understand who we are fighting. These terrorists are beheading men and women in Iraq. Meanwhile, the United States and our coalition partners are trying to give the Iraqis the chance to vote, to have a say on their public servants in that country.

We are also making progress on the security fronts. General Casey relayed to us that, right now, maybe a quarter of military operations are led by Iraqis. He said that by the end of the year, as much as three-quarters of the military operations will be led by the Iraqis, with the United States being in a supportive role for medical, intelligence, and military efforts.

Mr. President, I know Iraq has been tough. It is a tough battlefield for Americans. But it is a war and a theater in this war on terror that we can win and must win. The next few months will be vitally important. This is not the time to get weak in the knees. The future of Iraq is ultimately the responsibility of the Iraqi people. It is going to be the Iraqis' hands, backs, and minds that will be needed to build a secure and free Iraq. We don't want to stay a day longer than absolutely necessary. We are supporting Iraq in this because we are a generous people, but it is also good for our national security.

So I think we need to make sure that Senator KERRY's strategic plan for retreat—a tuck-tail-and-fail approach—must be rejected. We must unite as Americans for a renewed commitment for a strategic plan for success. It is important for Iraq, important for the Middle East, and it is vitally important for the security of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

MR. HAGEL. Mr. President, I thank the sponsors of this amendment, Senators LEVIN and REED, for offering a thoughtful amendment. They are making a responsible contribution to this debate. All Americans want a successful outcome in Iraq. Congress has an obligation to help craft a responsible policy to help achieve a successful outcome in Iraq. Congress fails in its duty when we do not probe, when we do not ask tough questions, and we fail when

we don't debate the great issues of our day.

There is no issue more important than war. The war in Iraq is the defining issue on which this Congress and the administration will be judged. The American people want to see serious debate about serious issues from serious leaders. They deserve more than a political debate. This debate should transcend cynical attempts to turn public frustration with the war in Iraq into an electoral advantage. It should be taken more seriously than to simply use the focus group-tested buzzwords like "cut and run" and political slogans and debase the seriousness of war. War is not a partisan issue. It should not be held hostage to political agendas. War should not be dragged into the political muck. America deserves better. Our men and women fighting and dying deserve better.

As mentioned earlier by Senator FEINSTEIN and others, there was a very important piece in yesterday's Washington Post, written by Iraq's National Security Adviser. It was titled "The Way Out of Iraq; A Roadmap." The National Security Adviser's op-ed mentions three very important things we need to clearly understand. The first thing this op-ed provides is measurable goals for the progress of the Iraqi Government with regard to U.S. troop presence. The Iraqi National Security Adviser says this:

Iraq's ambition is to have full control of their country by the end of 2008. In practice, this will mean a significant foreign troop reduction. We envision the U.S. troop presence by year's ends to be under 100,000, with most of the remaining troops to return home by the year 2007.

The second point the op-ed makes clear is the unavoidable reality that an endless U.S. troop presence is not in the interest of the new Iraqi Government. The Iraqi National Security Adviser says this:

The eventual removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help Iraqis who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be. The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors that have, to date, been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance because of what they call the "coalition occupation." The removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of the people.

He makes clear that it will be the Iraqis who determine the success of the Iraqi Government. He says:

The government in Iraq is trying to gain its independence from the United States and the coalition, in terms of taking greater responsibility for its actions, particularly in terms of security. There are still some influential foreign figures trying to spoon feed our government and take a very proactive role in many key decisions. Though this may provide benefits in the short-term, in the long term it will only serve to make the Iraqi government weaker and will lead to a culture of dependency.

I believe the Iraqi national security adviser has it exactly right. After all, he is the Iraqi national security adviser. Americans listening to this debate on Iraq are too often being given

false choices between, one, supporting the Iraqis with no end of troop deployments in sight or staying the course, or, two, laying down arbitrary deadlines for troop withdrawals. The reality is more complicated than this.

We should not limit the Commander in Chief's options in Iraq. That is why I will vote against the Levin amendment. However, anyone who believes we will be in Iraq indefinitely ignores the forces of reality, as the Iraqi Security Adviser's op-ed makes very clear. It is not in Iraq's interest for the United States to remain in Iraq. Our influence is limited and becoming more limited every day.

I note another story in yesterday's Washington Post that detailed the reaction of Vietnam veterans to the war in Iraq. I know a little something about this. My generation worries about Iraq becoming not the failure of our sons and daughters fighting in Iraq, but our failure as policymakers—policymakers—because I believe our policymakers failed us in Vietnam.

Our troops today are doing what we did a generation ago in Vietnam. They are fighting bravely. They are doing their very best. They believe in their country, they have faith in their leaders, and we cannot let them down.

I would say that there may be two Members of Congress today—Congressman MURTHA in the House and myself—who served in Vietnam and were both here working in the Congress in the spring of 1975. Many might recall that time because that was the time the House of Representatives essentially voted to cut off funding for American presence in Vietnam. That was a disastrous decision for disastrous reasons, but it was the result of having a Congress absent and not involved in the policy formation, not involved in asking the tough questions, not involved in doing its job.

This debate today is critical. It is important for our country, agree or disagree with it. Amendments such as the Levin amendment are relevant, and they are an important contribution. When we debate these issues, Congress is doing its job. We do not want our legacy as a Congress to be no congressional oversight. We do not want it to be said we were irrelevant when it becomes too late. We do not want to repeat the history of Vietnam. We must not allow what happened in the Congress in April of 1975 to happen with Iraq, and it happened because we didn't debate the issues. It happened because the Congress was absent; it forfeited its responsibilities. It debased the very responsibility of elected officials. And that is why to debate these issues in a legitimate, honest, open manner is so important to our country, and to keep it out of politics, the "gotcha" kind of amendments, the "gotcha" kind of phraseology of which America is sick.

This is a serious issue. We have lost over 2,500 men and women in Iraq. We have been in Iraq longer than the Korean war. We have over 18,000 wounded.

We are spending around \$10 billion a month. The Congress must be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is advised he has now consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. HAGEL. I ask for 15 seconds.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, take a minute or so.

Mr. HAGEL. I thank the chairman.

I conclude, Mr. President, with this: What would be the real disaster for America, the real disaster for Iraq, the disaster for the Middle East, the disaster for the world is if this Congress is not present and accounted for and is not part of a policy formation for not just Iraq but the Middle East and the future of our country and the world. That would be the disaster. That is why it is so important today that we debate this issue; it is so important that we have amendments, such as the Levin-Reed amendment, that are offered in an important way that make a contribution to the understanding of America's presence and commitment and our responsibilities as a free nation and the beacon of freedom in the world.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank our colleague for his remarks. He speaks from a body of personal experience and considerable courage as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, which he has exhibited in these years.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, may I have 10 seconds? I wish to add my thanks to the Senator from Nebraska for his very constructive, positive remarks.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we have on our side Senators THUNE and ROBERTS who are waiting. I know Senator BOND has indicated he wishes to speak, and Senator INHOFE. I wish to advise those Senators I have to recognize those on the floor; otherwise, we lose time to a quorum call or otherwise. So we are going to alternate at this time. We are going to shift to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, 6 months ago, I was in Iraq with Senator HAGEL. We met with a number of people. Among the people with whom we met in one of the beautiful palaces of Saddam Hussein not far from Baghdad Airport, were the leaders of our American military forces in that country.

During the course of that conversation, we heard these words from our top military leader: It is time for America to move toward the door. He didn't say it is time for us to walk out of the door, leave, close the door. He said: It is time for us to move toward the door.

Subsequent to that, we met with Iraqi military and political leaders and our own diplomatic leaders, and the message I heard in almost all of those meetings was: it is time for America to begin moving toward the door.

We have had a policy in Iraq, at least in the last couple of years, of stay the course. "Stay the course" is a good slogan, and there have been times in our history as a nation when staying the course was actually a pretty good strategy. This is not one of those times.

What is needed is a different—not a different slogan, but a different strategy, and the strategy we need would be not stay the course but change the course.

The American people would like for us to begin to bring our men and women home and, as it turns out, so would the Iraqi people. In talking with the President upon our return, I said: You know, Mr. President, sometimes less is more. In this instance, having a smaller presence, a less visible presence would actually be more supportive of our efforts in Iraq than not.

The Iraqi people don't want us to cut and run. They don't want us to leave. They want us to be close by. They want us to be not far away and to be helpful if we can be, if needed. But they don't want us to leave this year. They don't want us to leave entirely next year.

Senator HAGEL just quoted the words of the Iraqi National Security Council. That is what we heard in Iraq last December. Their message has been pretty consistent, and it has been pretty much the same.

Last year in the Senate we voted by an overwhelming majority that 2006 needs to be a year of significant transition in Iraq. In other words, the Senate, on a bipartisan basis, called on the Bush administration to take action this year in 2006 to change course in Iraq to make clear to the Iraqis and the rest of the world that the United States does not intend to stay in Iraq forever.

The amendment before us today, the Levin-Reed amendment, builds on that resolution we passed barely a year ago. It rejects the extremes on both sides of the Iraqi debate—the one side of the extreme that would say either we should stay in Iraq on an open-ended basis, and the other extreme to say we ought to withdraw all of our troops by an arbitrary deadline. This amendment rejects both of those, and it says instead: Why don't we find a way to change the course going forward?

The policy of "stay the course" isn't working for our troops. They have served bravely, they have served honorably despite very difficult circumstances in extended tours of duty. More than 2,500 of our finest have been killed in action. Almost 18,000 have been injured, including a former member of my staff, Marine Corps LCpl Sean Barney, who was shot in the neck last month in Fallujah. Fortunately, he is alive. He is going to live.

The President's "stay the course" plan also is not working for the Iraqis. Insurgent violence is on the upswing, and our efforts to help rebuild Iraq are at a standstill. Electricity output has been pretty much flat-lined in the last couple of years, and we haven't been able to finish building the schools and hospitals they want and need and that we would like to help them build.

"Stay the course," I say to my friends, is not working. This amendment is about a new direction in Iraq. It is about accountability. It is about being tough. It is about being smart. It is about changing the course, not staying the course. It is about laying out a plan for victory in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and the advice I heard not 6 months ago that it is time for America to move toward the door—not to leave, not to leave precipitously but to move toward the door and to allow the Iraqi people themselves to carry more of the burden in an effort to relieve from us some of that burden, an effort to make sure they have, in the end, a democracy and a country of their own to govern.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I advise colleagues on my side, there is one Republican waiting, and others who have indicated a desire to speak. I urge them to come to the floor because I have under my control roughly 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COBURN). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we face a difficult choice in Iraq and the war on terror at large. Iraqis are desperately trying to form a fragile government in the face of overwhelming odds. They are, as John Dickinson once said of American independence, "braving the storm in a skiff made of paper."

Despite that, the odds they face, look at the progress that has been made just of late. Prime Minister Maliki just completed the formation of a new Iraqi Government, including filling three national security positions. In the past few weeks, U.S. forces have taken out terrorist leader al-Zarqawi, the head of the snake, and many of his henchmen. This was a huge blow to al-Qaida and a major victory in the war on terror.

Iraqi security forces are growing in number every day. Only a year and a half ago, Iraqi security forces had just begun to form. Today there are 264,400 trained and equipped Iraqi security forces, more than double the number of U.S. troops in the region.

At the beginning of this year, the Iraqi forces had 10 brigades and 43 battalions. They controlled areas of responsibility. Only a few months later and those numbers have nearly doubled to 18 brigades and 71 battalions.

Large- and small-scale water treatment facilities have been rehabilitated

or constructed for an estimated 3 million people at a standard level of service, with plans underway to deliver clean, safe drinking water to 5 million more.

May oil production was over 2.1 million barrels of oil per day, and the Treasury Department, from the United States, is sending additional professionals to Iraq to provide technical support for the creation of a public finance system that is accountable and transparent. And our State Department is coordinating a broad effort to support an economic policy framework that enhances investment, job creation, and growth.

As Americans, we know, as Thomas Jefferson once said, "the price of freedom is eternal vigilance." In America, we like things to happen in a 24-hour news cycle, but it doesn't always happen that way. If we look throughout the pages of history, we have countless examples of those who have come before who have understood the stakes and the risks that were at work in the conflicts they faced. A great figure from history of the last century, Winston Churchill, said wars are not won by evacuations. Churchill and those of his generation knew they were in a pitched battle for future generations, a titanic struggle between good and evil.

A more recent example is, as I was growing up in the State of South Dakota and going through what at that time we knew was the Cold War, I remember a great leader at the end of the last century, Ronald Reagan, when asked his strategy for winning the Cold War, who said: It is very simple, Mr. President, we win; they lose.

I believe that is the same strategy and same objective we need to apply to the war on terror because the evil we face today—it has a different name—is equally deadly. Failure to confront and prevail in this war on terror and we will be creating huge problems for the next generations of Americans.

When we hear this debate on the floor of the Senate and, I believe people have sincere motivations—I don't doubt the motivations of anyone who comes to the floor to debate this issue, and I think it is appropriate to have this debate, but this is not and should not ever be about partisanship. It is not about politics. It is about the future and the security of future generations of Americans.

We have heard lots of people come here and say, Well, staying the course is not a strategy, it is not a solution. Yet at the same time, we know full well that as we look at the threat that we face from the war on terror, failure is not an option either. We cannot afford a strategy that includes running away from our responsibility not only to the people of Iraq but to the people of this country who are counting on us to protect them and to provide security and safety for generations of Americans to come.

I think some simple questions we have to ask are these: Is Iraq a front-

line in the war on terror? I believe it is. We have demonstrated that in the last few weeks as we have eliminated many of the leading terrorist figures. We have to ask the question: Are the people we are fighting in Iraq terrorists who want the kill Americans? The answer clearly is yes. We also have to ask the question: If we don't have them pinned down there, will they not be planning and launching attacks against the United States? I believe the answer to that question also is yes.

The good men and women of the United States military are doing good work in Iraq. They are doing the job that we asked them to do. We need to make sure they understand we are there to win.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would ask simply that as we vote on this amendment and the one that will follow, that we vote them down and give our generals and our troops the ability to complete the work that we have asked them to do, and that is to win, to prevail, and to make this country safer for future generations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, and then following the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, will be recognized, and then following Senator ROBERTS, the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BOND.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, may I claim my full 8 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can claim his full 8 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the resolution put forward by the senior Senator from Michigan. I appreciate the fact that he has framed the debate on the war in Iraq both for the Senate and for the American people.

Last week the American death toll in Iraq passed 2,500. It is a tragic milestone and the American people are not happy about it, because our President has yet to articulate exactly what we are trying to accomplish in Iraq.

I maintain a gallery of pictures of U.S. servicepeople who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan outside the front door of my office. It reminds me and all who visit my office about the loss of young lives and the terrible cost of this war.

As a war veteran, I know what these troops and their families are going through. I heard the Bush administration say that some Iraqis are worried about us leaving. But I say this: The American people are worried about us staying.

What more can we do for the Iraqi people? We have spent over \$300 billion of U.S. taxpayer funds there. We have

helped them hold three elections. We have trained and armed their police and their military.

I say it is time for them to take control of their country.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that we would bring dishonor to those who lost their lives if we begin to leave Iraq. But ask the families with loved ones over there how they feel. I met with a group in my Newark office with loved ones in Iraq, including a mother who lost her son there. As far as they were concerned, it would bring dishonor to other families if we just stay there with no plans for the future.

So why are we having so much trouble securing Iraq? The answer is clear: The administration has no plan in place to do it. When they tried, we saw misstep after misstep by the civilian leaders in the Pentagon. And the leadership problems at the Pentagon start at the top.

This administration went to war on the cheap: Not enough troops, not enough body armor, not enough help from our allies. I think we are down to a coalition that has very little cohesiveness attached to it. No help. And our troops have paid the price for these mistakes.

There were so many mistakes and miscalculations by the Bush administration that it is hard to believe it at all.

Secretary Rumsfeld said the Iraqis would welcome U.S. troops and that the Iraqi resistance would be limited. He was obviously wrong.

He also failed to build coalitions with our allies. One of the few major allies that did join the coalition was Poland, which sent about 1,600 troops. But they began withdrawing early this year. Half are already gone, and by the end of the year, Poland will have all of its troops out of Iraq. Just this week, the Japanese announced they will withdraw their troops.

We ask, when are we going to start withdrawing our troops?

So far, 16 nations who have provided some assistance in Iraq have withdrawn their troops. The administration's failure to build a real coalition has caused our troops to bear the vast majority of the risk and suffer the casualties.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No, I will not yield. I don't have enough time, I am sorry to say. Perhaps afterwards, the Senator from Oklahoma can use his own time to have an exchange.

Secretary Rumsfeld said the war would be short. He said, "I doubt 6 months." More than 3 years later, we know how tragically wrong that assessment was.

Additionally, Secretary Rumsfeld was also way off on the cost of the war. He said it would cost no more than \$100 billion. But the staggering reality is that it has cost \$320 billion thus far, and we expect it will get close to half a trillion dollars before this year is over.

Now we are experiencing a crisis in military recruiting. But about that, Secretary Rumsfeld is in denial. Whether in public or in private, he claims that recruiting is fine. Well, it is not. Here is the reality: The Army National Guard and Reserve are falling well short of their goals, and the only reason other branches are meeting goals is because the Pentagon has reduced the target numbers.

Eight retired generals have come forward to say what many in the military have been thinking for years, and that is: It is time for a change at the top as well as the recovery of our people back home. One of the generals, General Eaton, who served in Iraq, said the following about Secretary Rumsfeld:

In sum, he has shown himself incompetent strategically, operationally, and tactically, and is far more than anyone else responsible for what has happened to our important mission in Iraq. Mr. Rumsfeld must step down.

But instead of taking a stand like the generals, we have heard our colleagues on the other side of the aisle simply repeating talking points that were handed to them by the Bush administration: "Cut and run"—disgusting words when you look at the reflection of what is intended there.

We know this because the Secretary of Defense sent a Republican briefing booklet to Democrats by mistake last week. This briefing book is a three-ring binder of spin. It contains the same spin that we hear today from the other side of the Chamber.

Instead of developing talking points and spin for Republican Senators, we should concentrate on putting together a plan for our troops in Iraq: For our troops to come home.

I think my Republican colleagues should have stamped that briefing book "Return to Sender" and told the administration that they will think for themselves. That is what I would hope my colleagues across the aisle would do.

I know that they want to protect our troops and I know that they care as much about loss of life. But we have a different approach on it. We need a fresh start, honest leadership, and we are not going to get either one as long as those in charge maintain their positions.

In sum, I think it is time for Secretary Rumsfeld to go, and it is time for our troops to start to go home.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, how much time remains for the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nineteen minutes and 22 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I recognize on the floor Senator ROBERTS, Senator BOND, and Senator INHOFE, and Senator KYL intends to come. So with the balance of that time, I will try to allocate it as equally as we can. I think Senator ROBERTS is next in line, so I yield to Senator ROBERTS 4 to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 4 to 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the President and I thank the chairman. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Senator LEVIN. I would just tell the Senator from New Jersey that nobody gave me my billet points; I wrote this myself out of conviction, and I know he speaks from conviction as well.

There is nobody in the U.S. Congress, nobody in America that does not want stability in Iraq and to get our troops home as soon as possible. But there is a right way and a wrong way. Last week the Senate voted overwhelmingly against adopting a strategy focused on an arbitrary date for the withdrawal of U.S. forces. We are back again. Despite that lopsided vote of last week, we are again debating yet another withdrawal amendment. By the time we are done, no less than three withdrawal amendments, three messages to our troops, three messages to our adversaries, and three very damaging blows for I think the resolve of this country.

Senator HAGEL brought this up. As a careful reading of the amendment clearly shows, I think we are setting a disturbing and counterproductive precedent. We, the U.S. Senate, are now getting into micromanaging the military and the military's plans and the military's strategy—not the President, not the commanders in the field, but the Senate. This is the same body, by the way, that has a little difficulty trying to decide when to adjourn.

While we may wish otherwise, the blunt truth of it is there is no exit from either Iraq or the global war on terrorism but through success. So in that regard, we did not ask for this war, but in fighting worldwide terrorism, a war that must be successful, we must be willing to use force if necessary and to protect our security and that of our allies or we invite more insurgency, more terrorist acts for the next President, the President after that, and on down the line. So regardless of future policy, current or future Presidents, our ultimate success against terrorism will only be won through resolve.

Let's talk about one thing that has been missing in this debate, and that is consequences. Calling for withdrawal is one thing; facing the consequences of that action and the responsibility for it is another. I fully understand the need and the value of full debate on this issue, but we should do so with the understanding that words do have consequences, and their effect not only influences the intended audience, the partisan base or otherwise, but they also affect the morale of our troops in the midst of war and the terrorists who question our resolve.

Make no mistake: if America leaves—all at once or in stages—our adversaries will rejoice—all at once or in stages.

Last year we received an intercepted letter that Osama bin Laden's deputy sent to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi which urged Zarqawi to prepare for what the terrorists clearly believe will be a U.S.

retreat from Iraq. Ironically, while the terrorists are preparing for what they hope will be a premature U.S. retreat, we are making real, tough, step-by-step progress, highlighted with the recent killing of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

But of all things, in a paradox of enormous consequence and irony, we stand here today debating this withdrawal commensurate with the predicted retreat by al-Zarqawi and his terrorist associates.

Now is not the time to abandon our momentum and retreat. Such a retreat would do more than encourage the bin Ladens of the world. Jihadist terrorist cells throughout the world, and in our own country, would be rethinking their attack plans with ominous repercussions.

Let us not ignore the very nature of our adversaries. Senator ALLEN spoke to that. They think of us as dust. We have no human value. And they are not giving up. They are planning attacks as we speak—everybody knows that—within the U.S. Capitol. Imagine how such a withdrawal would be viewed in places like Iran, in the midst of aggressively building up its nuclear capacity; North Korea, with its existing capacity; China, with its continued military expansion, the greatest since World War II; and Russia, where we are now witnessing a return to totalitarianism round II, especially with Ukrainian democracy; and Venezuela, where Hugo Chavez has become the next Castro.

Imagine what doubts the lack of resolve would really create in the minds of our allies now working with us with unprecedented intelligence cooperation, and the impact on the progress we have made in Pakistan and Afghanistan, leading to a radical Islamic takeover of the Mushariff and Karzi governments and further leading to increased threats within the next terrorist nerve centers in Indonesia and Africa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, what is the time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes and 40 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. I will yield the 2 minutes, and then the two other colleagues can divide equally the time that is remaining.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this amendment has consequences to our allies, including Libya, Tunisia, Jordan, Egypt, even Saudi Arabia, and Israel. Basically, this amendment has consequences, introducing it on the floor of the Senate has consequences, debating it has consequences, and voting for it has consequences.

I am going to close by calling to mind a lesson of historical precedent. Upon learning of the attack on Pearl Harbor, Sir Winston Churchill said this:

Silly people; that was the description many gave in discounting the force of the United States. Some said they were soft,

others that they would never be united, that they would never come to grips. They would never stand for bloodletting, that their system of government and democracy would paralyze their effort.

Now we will see the weakness of this numerous but remote, wealthy and talkative people. But, American blood flows in my veins. I thought of a remark made to me years before—the United States is like a gigantic boiler. Once the fire of freedom is lighted under it, there is no limit to the power it can generate. It is a matter of resolve.

I say to my colleagues that, if approved, this amendment could, in a matter of minutes, undo that resolve now, and for the next generation who will face new threats to our way of life. Setting an artificial timetable will send the wrong message to the Iraqi's, who need to know that America will not leave before the job is done, and our troops, who must know that we are serious about the mission that they are risking their lives to achieve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want the same thing all Americans do, for our troops to complete their mission in Iraq and return home safely and quickly. To accomplish that, the President must define what our current mission is and how that mission serves our Nation's security interests.

The men and women of our military have done everything we have asked them to do. They looked for weapons of mass destruction and found none. We got rid of Saddam Hussein. We helped the Iraqis hold elections and set up their government and security forces. So what is our mission today?

Right now, our Nation's policy on Iraq is adrift. Instead of addressing this head on, the administration and this Congress continue to build on the miscalculation and incompetence of the past and are dismissing any serious discussion of the challenge the American people now face.

Instead of working to unite this Nation behind a common purpose in defense of our security and freedom, the President and his aides are using the war as political fodder for the next election cycle. Instead of being honest with the American people about the costs of our effort and the sacrifice necessary to support them, the Congress continues to hand a blank check to the administration to continue the status quo. That approach has left us with heated rhetoric and a long series of bad choices.

True security for the American people depends on an honest assessment of the threats we face, a very clear mission, and an honest discussion about the costs of confronting those threats.

On Iraq we do not have any of those components. Continuing the status quo is unacceptable. We need the President

to tell us what the mission in Iraq is so we, as Congress and as a country, can decide if it is worth the continued price we are paying.

Like all of us, I want the troops home as soon as possible. In fact, I think they should start coming home this year. It is absolutely time for a new strategy in Iraq. An arbitrary, specific date for full withdrawal, however, could force us to ignore facts on the ground, facts that have a direct impact on the security of our troops or the interests of our Nation. I appreciate those who ask for a date certain. I, too, am frustrated with where we find ourselves today. But what we do need is change. What we do need is leadership. What we do need is a defined mission. And what we do need is a plan for success.

The troops on the ground, as well as the American people, deserve an honest discussion and a plan for victory and a goal to achieve that. That is why I support the Levin amendment.

This administration, this Congress, and this Nation should be focused like a laser on how we can be successful and bring our troops home safely. Our troops and the American people deserve a plan that brings us all together to accomplish that goal.

I yield my remaining time.

Mr. WARNER. What is the time remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 13 minutes 2 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. I am going to relinquish the time I hoped to use to do wrapup remarks and divide it equally between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 6 minutes 30 seconds.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the floor manager of the bill. As we have heard, the end of al-Zarqawi is a significant blow to al-Qaida operations in Iraq. It is another clear indication of the progress we are making. In addition, the documents we captured at that time indicate that the al-Qaida terrorists themselves know that we are making progress. They are worried that time is now on our side. They know they cannot withstand our military forces.

But even before our troops eliminated one of America's fiercest enemies, some at home had described the current situation in Iraq as bleak. Now they are introducing measures for a timetable for withdrawal from the region.

The insurgents will no doubt consider the debating of this measure one of the best pieces of news they have had this year. That is because the terrorists know that time is on our side unless we give them a timetable for withdrawal. We know that a timetable for withdrawal will undercut the momentum that the insurgents themselves say we have gained in Iraq.

As I have talked to our troops who have been in the field, they say, doesn't

anybody understand that the terrorists watch our media? They have calendars. If they know we are going to get out on a certain date they will declare victory, lay back and wait to take over the country after we have departed.

I would imagine that the terrorists are dumbfounded, yet ecstatic with this self-destructive proposal. I am dumbfounded and aghast. If insurgents had any representation in the Senate, I am sure they would support it. I am not saying my Democratic colleagues are in any way intentionally aiding the insurgents or undermining our troops, but regrettably that is what it would do. I implore my colleagues on both sides to consider the facts and the words of the insurgents themselves, who view this as a time when they are losing.

Last Monday night, when our President was addressing a group outlining in detail the program of progress and how we are going to build up the security forces in Iraq so they can take over, and committing to finishing the job we in Congress overwhelmingly endorsed, Mr. Howard Dean was on national television claiming that Republicans were sitting in air-conditioned offices asking others to do the work in Iraq. He stated:

Republicans are great about sending other people's children to war.

I take issue with the words of Mr. Dean, the voice of the Democratic National Party. First, our brave young men and women volunteered to serve, to go to war to keep America safe from the terrorists who struck on 9/11 and who would strike again if they had the chance.

Second, 77 of us on this floor, Democrats and Republicans, voted to support the President to carry out the mission that President Clinton first outlined about regime change in Iraq.

Finally, I say to Mr. Dean personally, my only son returned from Iraq over a year ago and is preparing to go back. When I told him we were going to have this debate, I asked him: What is your view on it? I got this e-mail back. He said:

In case anyone is paying attention, there is progress being made. AMZ himself indicated as much in the confiscated letters around the time of his death. If al-Qaida, No. 1, confesses the U.S. is having good success, who here in conus has the standing to contradict us?

I don't get it. I am not wild about going back to Iraq but I'd sure as heck would rather do that than essentially invalidate everything we have done to date by leaving too early and inviting chaos.

Happy Father's Day.

That was a message from one of the people who are serving us in Iraq, and he speaks for all the other young people he knows.

I implore my colleagues, let our troops finish what we started, what most of us voted for. Let's leave Iraq self-sufficient, free, and stable, an Iraq no longer a safe haven for terrorists, threatening to bring WMD and terrorist attacks to our shore. Let's leave

when the job is done, not before. Let's not defeat our mission with political attacks on the President and the Secretary of Defense as we have heard today, and on those of us in Congress, giving the terrorists a victory politically by laying out for them a "get out of jail free" card, giving them a timetable for withdrawal whether or not Iraqi security forces are fully capable of controlling their country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 10 minutes to Senator BIDEN.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will just yield a minute to myself. I compliment the Senator from Missouri. That was a heartfelt message. I hope Mr. Dean gets it verbatim because your son, whom I have watched grow up through these many years, is proud to be a United States Marine and to take on his duty.

Mr. President, I wish to advise colleagues at the hour of 5 o'clock this debate on the Levin amendment is concluded. My understanding is we proceed to an amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LEAHY. In examining that amendment, I say to my colleagues who are anxious to continue addressing the issues of the amendment of Senator LEVIN, I think the basic format in this amendment lays a clear predicate for all those who are desiring to speak to have their word tonight sometime because we are to conclude this debate tonight. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You have 34 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. How much?

Mr. LEVIN. We started at 12:15. I would then yield for 10 minutes to Senator BIDEN. I then yield 8 minutes to Senator OBAMA, and then Senator DURBIN will be next. Depending on how much time is left we can determine the time allocation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Was this a unanimous consent request made by the Senator from Michigan? We are still going back and forth?

Mr. LEVIN. No. We understand that.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan. I, too, compliment the Senator from Missouri for the service of his son. My son is not—he is in the military, in the National Guard. He is not in Iraq, although he did spend some time in Kosovo. I admire the patriotism of his son and respect the point of view his son expressed. But I think it confuses things.

Mr. President, last Thursday, we passed by a 99–1 vote an emergency spending bill to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and provide relief to the victims of Hurricane Katrina.

Unfortunately, behind closed conference doors, a key provision of both the House and Senate versions was stripped out—an amendment, introduced by Representative BARBARA LEE and myself that would bar any funds from being used to establish permanent U.S. military bases in Iraq or to control Iraq's oil.

I voted to support our troops, though I was surprised that my amendment was stripped after not a single Senator publicly spoke against it during the floor debate.

But what bothers me is that by removing the "no permanent bases" amendment, we make life more difficult for our men and women in uniform and undercut our Nation's broader effort against terrorism.

So I will reintroduce my amendment as part of the Defense authorization bill.

It is straightforward, clear, and simple. It affirms that the United States will not seek to establish permanent military bases in Iraq and has no intention of controlling Iraqi oil.

I will repeat what I said 6 weeks ago:

While it may be obvious to Americans that we don't intend to stay in Iraq indefinitely, such conspiracy theories are accepted as fact by most Iraqis.

In an opinion poll conducted by the University of Maryland in January, 80 percent of Iraqis—and 92 percent of the Sunni Arabs—believe we have plans to establish permanent military bases.

The same poll found that an astounding 88 percent of Sunni Arabs approve of attacks on American forces in Iraq.

Why do Iraqis believe we want permanent bases? Why do they think we would subject ourselves to the enormous ongoing costs in Iraq in blood and treasure? Do they think we want their sand? No, they think we want their oil.

To my mind, the connection between these two public opinion findings is incontrovertible.

Before you dismiss these as simple conspiracy theories, remember what Iraqis have been through in the past 3 decades:

Three wars and a tyrannical regime that turned brother against brother and made paranoia a way of life.

And there is a longer history, too: 400 years of British and Ottoman occupation have led to a deeply ingrained suspicion of a foreign military presence.

These views extend well beyond Iraq. In a 2004 Pew Charitable Trust survey, majorities in all four Muslim states surveyed—Turkey, Pakistan, Jordan, and Morocco—believed that control of Mideast oil was an important factor in our invasion of Iraq.

Our enemies understand the boon these misconceptions provide to their recruiting efforts and use them as a rallying cry in their calls-to-arms.

Last year in a letter intercepted by the United States military, Ayman al-Zawahiri, the deputy leader of al-Qaeda, wrote to the recently killed

Jordanian terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi:

The Muslim masses . . . do not rally except against an outside occupying enemy.

Our military and diplomatic leaders understand that countering this vicious propaganda requires clear signals about our intentions in Iraq. And they have done just this.

General George Casey, the ground force commander in Iraq, told the Committee on Armed Services last September:

Increased coalition presence feeds the notion of occupation.

At the same hearing, General John Abizaid, the commander of all U.S. troops in the Middle East, told Congress:

We must make clear to the people of the region we have no designs on their territory or resources.

In March, the American ambassador to Iraq, Zalmay Khalilzad, told an Iraqi television station that the United States has "no goal in establishing permanent bases in Iraq."

Unfortunately, this clarity has been clouded by mixed messages from the senior-most decision-makers in the Bush administration.

To my knowledge, President Bush has never explicitly stated that we will not establish permanent bases in Iraq, and both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State have left the door open to do just that.

On February 17, 2005, Secretary Rumsfeld told the Committee on Armed Services:

We have no intention, at the present time, of putting permanent bases in Iraq.

"At the present time" is not exactly an unequivocal statement.

On February 15, 2006, at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing, my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, asked Secretary Rice:

Is it, in fact, the policy of the administration not to have permanent bases in Iraq?

Rather than answering the simple one word, "Yes," Secretary Rice said during a 400 word exchange on the question:

I don't want to in this forum try to prejudice everything that might happen way into the future.

Just last Thursday, columnist Helen Thomas asked the White House press secretary to unambiguously declare that the United States will not seek permanent bases in Iraq. Again, the press secretary could not unequivocally declare this to be the case.

These mixed messages are confusing to the American people and the Iraqi people alike. They feed conspiracy theories and cede rhetorical space to our enemies. They make it that much more difficult to win the battle for the hearts and minds of 1.2 billion Muslims in the world. Our success in that battle will determine our success in the struggle between freedom and radical fundamentalism.

Against this backdrop, I believe that it is incumbent upon us to speak where the administration has not.

My amendment will have no detrimental effect on the military operations of our Armed Forces in Iraq or their ability to provide security for Iraqi oil infrastructure.

United Nations Council Resolution 1546 recognizes that the American and coalition forces are present in Iraq at the invitation of the Iraqi Government and that their operations are essential to Iraq's political, economic, and social well-being.

In his first speech to the Iraqi parliament last month, Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki endorsed that resolution. We are anxious for the day when Iraqis can take control of their own destiny, but the Iraqis are suspicious of our intentions and growing increasingly impatient.

This amendment may not in itself change a lot of minds on the ground or in the region.

But it can mark the beginning of a sustained effort to demonstrate through words and deeds that we have no intention of controlling Iraq's oil or staying there forever.

I believe it is our duty to do so.

I want to point out a couple of things. I have listened to some of this debate. Sometimes I wonder whether we are debating the Levin amendment or not. The Levin-Reed amendment says two things. It lays out a plan. The front part of it is the part that is being ignored by most people. The amendment lays out a specific plan to avoid trading a dictatorship for chaos in Iraq. Right now, I respectfully suggest the President has a plan how not to lose but no plan how to win. In my view, a plan to arbitrarily set a date to leave is not a plan. It is an expression of overwhelming frustration and maybe on the part of some a conclusion reached that it is not winnable because it has been so badly handled the last 2 years. I respect that position. I don't agree with it, but I respect it.

The fact is, what is before us in the Levin amendment is it first calls for a political settlement and the sharing of economic resources. That is another way of saying the Iraqis need a deal on oil that gives the Sunnis a fair share of the revenues; and, secondly, it calls for the President to convene what not just JOE BIDEN and this amendment but BIDEN before, and before that Henry Kissinger, and Secretary Shultz and others called for, and that is convening of an international conference to promote a durable political settlement and reduce the interference by Iraq's neighbors in Iraq. And it calls for the things that everyone agrees have to be done, purging the sectarian militia which has infiltrated the security forces.

My friend from Missouri stood up and talked about the Iraqi security forces. The Iraqi security forces are riddled with sectarian infiltration. There is overwhelming evidence that Sadr suggests his Mahdi militia join the military. There is overwhelming evidence that the SCIRI and Dawa Parties have

moved their people into the military as have the Sadr militia. There is evidence of the fact that the Peshmerja are in the north. So let me ask a question: How is it remotely possible that this government, assuming it is really good government, has a lot of personal courage and wisdom?

How can it run a country when it does not have a military that—at least at any one time—one-third of the country doesn't trust?

Did you all notice what happened today? Saddam's defense lawyer, for whom I have no particular empathy or sympathy—guess what. Five cops or four cops—Iraqi police—show up with identification, take him away, and shoot him.

What has been going on? Pick up the paper. Every day—almost every day for the past months—a bus gets stopped, a group of Iraqi policemen take people off the bus identified as Sunnis and blow their brains out; or the next morning—every morning—you read the paper. What do you find? You find 9, 12, or 30 Sunnis handcuffed with bullets in their heads.

So I ask you the question, imagine the United States of America trying to unite the North and the South, and if you had hit squads in the South after the Civil War going after anybody who fought in the Confederacy—this is a big deal.

There is no possibility of avoiding a civil war, in my humble opinion, if you don't purge the police and then purge the military of the sectarian thugs.

Second, we have a very first-rate Ambassador there. The best thing that has happened to our effort is our present Ambassador. What did he do? Remember when he said the first unity government wasn't legitimate because the Sunnis didn't participate? It was a legitimate point. How do we get the Sunnis to participate in the election? You had the acting Parliament pass a law defining what could kill the Constitution—changing the law. That is a disaster.

So what did our Ambassador do? He said: Change it—quietly; a brilliant diplomatic move. They changed the law going back to what it had been under the law that was written in the first instance. Second, what did he do? He said: This isn't the final document. They amended the Constitution at the last minute it was being voted on to say you can amend it later. Why? For a specific purpose. Everybody knows that unless you get the Sunnis to buy in, there is no possibility of success. So everyone has anticipated from the beginning, beginning with our Ambassador, that you have to amend the Constitution to give the Sunnis a piece of the action.

Up to now, our administration has been saying quietly that would be divisive absent the Parliament doing what is called for under the law, convening, as they should be now, and now with about 3 months left, reporting to the entire Parliament amendments to the

Constitution that will then be sent out to the people to vote on. Absent that, I do not know how this works.

The Sunnis need a piece of the action, to stay in the action.

My friend, the chairman, understands that there are three things going on. One, they are so-called insurgents. They are basically the old Saddamists. They are the Baathist Party, they are former military, and they are the Republican Guard.

As I said to the President, who asked the question after my first trip from Iraq—he said: We have taken care of—I don't want to put words in his mouth—he said it was a great victory. And it was a great victory. I said: But Mr. President, 400,000 people went home with their guns. I said: Count the bodybags. We had such a blitzkrieg success; what happened? They didn't resist. They took off their uniforms, kept their guns, and raided the 800,000 tons of ammunition dumps we didn't guard. That is the insurgency—not bunch of dead-enders, as the Secretary of Defense said some time ago, and they are getting increasingly organized.

There is a second group. The second group is the Zarqawi guys. They are the guys who are the jihadists—mostly from out of the country. As my friends, the chairman and ranking member, know, the military has never estimated them to make up more than 5 percent to 8 percent of the entire insurgency. They do bad things, but they are a separate group, coordinating with but separate, with separate agendas, from the insurgents.

There is a third group. The real problem is civil war. Insurgency is not the big problem. It is a problem. The problem is sectarian violence with Sunnis killing Kurds, Kurds executing Shiites, and Shiites mostly eliminating Sunnis. Unless you stop that, what is the deal? I hope I am wrong, but as I say, take a look at my record on this for the last 3 years and tell me. Am I wrong a lot of times? I haven't guessed this one very wrong very many times.

Ask the following question: By December of 2007, we are going to have a drastic withdrawal of American forces for one of two reasons: either because we actually have things going in Iraq, the Iraqis have not only stood but stood together, dealt with the Sunnis, dealt with the militia and kept the neighbors out, which means we will be able to draw forces home, or we are going to be in a full-blown civil war.

I will make a prediction. This is a dangerous thing to do on the floor, and I pray to God I am wrong about it. I think there is at least an even chance that you will hear the following debate among the foreign policy intellectuals on the left and on the right a year from now. You have to let them fight it out in a civil war. It has to be decided in a civil war; nothing we can do about it. Let the chips fall where they may, and we come back in and try to pick up the pieces. That may be the ultimate strategy we have to deal with.

But to my friends who say get out at a time certain, I say I understand your frustration, but what do you do afterward? What do you do if things go to hell in a hand basket quickly and there is civil war that turns into a regional war? What is your plan?

The Levin amendment lays out a plan. It says take care of the insurgency by giving the Sunnis a piece of the action so they turn on the insurgents. They have a reason to want to be a part of the deal.

I thank the Chair.

I have a more detailed plan as to how we should proceed. But don't confuse the Levin plan by ruling it out. The Levin plan lays out what must be done, how to do it, and it is done on the path by which we can leave and leave our interests intact.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues for allowing me a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that I did want to get in there when the Senator from New Jersey was speaking.

They keep talking about 8 generals out there—8 generals out of 4,000 generals who are retired right now. Three of the eight generals who had their own political plans were using that. I have listened to that over and over again.

I have just returned from my 11th trip. I say that to my friend from Delaware, to the Iraqi AOR. The reason I have done this is so I can watch the progress that is being made—and I see the progress.

When the Senator from New Jersey stood up saying nothing has happened, consider the fact that we now have three successful elections behind us. Before each election, the Democrats on this floor said it is not going to work, they will not have a free election, it isn't going to be successful. We now have had three. I was over there. I went over the day the Ministers were ratified, and they are in there.

There are 164,000 trained and equipped troops. I think it is really bad, particularly when it is in error, for us to stand here on the floor of this Senate and say that those troops are really not trained and equipped, that they are really not serviceable for war. I have heard all kinds of things which are a great disservice to these people. I was up there in Fallujah during the last election when these Iraqi security forces were risking their lives going into town to vote.

Anyway, I went over there the other day, the day Zarqawi was killed, and I thank God that happened. It happened to be the same day that the 4 Ministers out of some 30 Ministers were confirmed. I can remember talking to them on a one-to-one basis.

Dr. al-Rubaie, the National Security Adviser for the Iraqis, is really a quality guy. I spent several hours talking to him. He projects that the number of troops in Iraq will drop below 100,000 by the end of this year. This is kind of in-

teresting. Here we are trying to dictate terms as to when we are going to pull out when they already know when they are going to request and make a recommendation to us to pull out. The other side has it completely backward. He is saying that right now; he projects, the way we are going, that they are going to make a request by the end of this year to drop the U.S. forces and the coalition down to 100,000. That would be a reduction of 30,000. Then he says that by the end of the following year, they should be all the way out.

Dr. al-Rubaie has made it clear that a timetable has to be on Iraq's terms and that there is already a roadmap. For people who say we don't know, there is no roadmap, there is no criteria out there, there is.

Let me tell you. This is a quote from Dr. al-Rubaie. This isn't me talking, this is a quote from him. He said that Iraqi governorates must meet "stringent minimum requirements as a condition of being granted control. Threat assessment of terrorist activities must be low or on a downward trend. Local police and the Iraqi army must be deemed capable of dealing with criminal gangs, armed groups and militia, and border control. There must be a clear and functioning command-and-control center overseen by the governor." He said, and this is his quote, that "13 of the 18 provinces"—18 in Iraq, and 13—"have met" or are close to meeting this criteria already.

One thing which has bothered me most recently is the inconsistency I have observed over time in the Democrats' position. They claim to disagree with the war in Iraq for the very same reasons that they used for supporting going into Bosnia and Kosovo. I remember them standing on this Senate floor saying that we have no reason to be going to Bosnia and Kosovo because we don't have any security interests at stake.

In 1995, President Clinton urged Congress to support involvement in Bosnia, and they agreed with his philosophy to "stand up for peace and freedom because it's in our interest to do so." That sounded real good at the time. Now, when President Bush is doing exactly the same thing, they are saying: No. We have changed our position. We don't want to do that anymore.

Opponents of the war in Iraq contradict themselves.

Senator KERRY stated, on April 6 of this year, that "the [Iraq] insurgency grew day by day to be an insurgency that is now a low-grade civil war . . . and our troops can't resolve a civil war."

The Senator from Delaware characterized this as a civil war. This isn't a civil war. This is a war where others are going after the Iraqis. The insurgents aren't Iraqis. I don't know why people can't understand that.

Zarqawi was Jordanian, and Osama bin Laden is Saudi. There are outsiders

who caused them to coalesce into getting along better with each other. There were factions in Iraqi that you do not see today.

But Kerry endorsed involvement of U.S. troops in Bosnia and Kosovo, both of which were civil wars. Those were civil wars. This is not a civil war.

In 1995, President Clinton said that “we must not turn our backs on Bosnia,” which was echoed by Senator KERRY when he stated that, “History has taught us that we can’t sit idly by while people commit these incredible evil acts against humanity.” He was talking about Bosnia and Kosovo. I would like to ask him: What evil acts are you talking about when compared to Saddam Hussein, who murdered and tortured to death hundreds of thousands of his own people; where they dropped people into vats of acid; where people were begging, before they were put into the shredders, to put their heads in first so they could die quickly; women being raped and buried alive? We have not seen atrocities such as this since Hitler in World War II. And here he was talking about things that were taking place in Kosovo and Bosnia. It wasn’t happening.

Let me tell you what Dr. al-Rubaie said. He said:

There is . . . an unofficial “roadmap” to foreign troop reductions that will eventually lead to total withdrawal of U.S. troops.

The roadmap is there. It is there, and it is one which they have put down in writing.

I am going to deliver to you what Minister of Defense Jasim asked me to deliver to you—to us—in this Chamber today. He said:

Tell them their sacrifice is for a very noble cause, they have given freedom to 26 million people. I believe they are waging a just war for humanity. The terrorism must be stopped or it will spread all over the world, like a carbon copy of fascism and communism. . . . The American victims have borne the price of a freer world. . . . We are very grateful. . . . The war in Iraq is a just war and we have no option but victory. It is not a war that affects Iraq alone, but is truly a world war.

The terrorists are a sickness that must be eliminated . . . There is great transformation taking place in Iraq but, the international media does not focus on positive things happening.

Here he talks about the only focus being on the negative things.

I will talk against the next amendment later.

I can tell you, after 11 trips to Iraq and the AOR, that every time I come back to this Chamber and talk about the quality of the Iraqi security forces and the successes they have had, I am very proud of them, and they are very proud of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for wrapping up close to 20 Senators on this side who have spoken to this issue. I remind my colleague there will be further debate tonight. I am anxious to have as many as possible come over

and join me. I commend the Senator on his statement and thank the Senator for his long, hard work on our bill throughout this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for managing this fine amendment.

In October of 2002, I delivered a speech opposing the war in Iraq.

I said that Saddam Hussein was a ruthless man, but that he posed no imminent and direct threat to the United States.

I said that a war in Iraq would take our focus away from our efforts to defeat al-Qaida.

And, with a volatile mix of ethnic groups and a complicated history, I said that the invasion and occupation of Iraq would require a U.S. occupation of undetermined length, at undetermined cost, with undetermined consequences.

In short, I felt the decision unfolding then to invade Iraq was being made without a clear rationale, based more on ideology and politics than fact and reason.

It is with no great pleasure that I recall this now. Too many young men and women have died. Too many have been maimed. Too many hearts have been broken. I fervently wish I had been wrong about this war; that my concerns had been unfounded.

America and the American people have paid a high price for the decision to invade Iraq and myriad mistakes that followed. I believe that history will not judge the authors of this war kindly.

For all these reasons, I would like nothing more than to support the Kerry amendment; to bring our brave troops home on a date certain, and spare the American people more pain, suffering and sorrow.

But having visited Iraq, I am also acutely aware that a precipitous withdrawal of our troops, driven by congressional edict rather than the realities on the ground, will not undo the mistakes made by this administration. It could compound them.

It could compound them by plunging Iraq into an even deeper and, perhaps, irreparable crisis.

We must exit Iraq, but not in a way that leaves behind a security vacuum filled with terrorism, chaos, ethnic cleansing and genocide that could engulf large swaths of the Middle East and endanger America. We have both moral and national security reasons to manage our exit in a responsible way.

I share many of the goals set forth in the Kerry amendment. We should send a clear message to the Iraqis that we won’t be there forever, and that by next year our primary role should be to conduct counterinsurgency actions, train Iraqi security forces, and provide needed logistical support.

Moreover, I share the frustration with an administration whose policies with respect to Iraq seem to simply repeat the simple-minded refrains of “we know best” and “stay the course.” It’s not acceptable to conduct a war where our goals and strategies drift aimlessly regardless of the cost in lives or dollars spent, and where we end up with arbitrary, poll-driven troop reductions by the administration—the worst of all possible outcomes.

As one who strongly opposed the decision to go to war and who has met with servicemen and women injured in this conflict and seen the pain of the parents and loved ones of those who have died in Iraq, I would like nothing more than for our military involvement to end.

But I do not believe that setting a date certain for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops is the best approach to achieving, in a methodical and responsible way, the three basic goals that should drive our Iraq policy: that is, (1) stabilizing Iraq and giving the factions within Iraq the space they need to forge a political settlement; (2) containing and ultimately defeating the insurgency in Iraq; and (3) bringing our troops safely home.

What is needed is a blueprint for an expeditious yet responsible exit from Iraq. A hard and fast, arbitrary deadline for withdrawal offers our commanders in the field, and our diplomats in the region, insufficient flexibility to implement that strategy.

For example, let’s say that a phased withdrawal results in 50,000 troops in Iraq by July 19, 2007. If, at that point, our generals and the Iraqi Government tell us that having those troops in Iraq for an additional 3 or 6 months would enhance stability and security in the region, this amendment would potentially prevent us from pursuing the optimal policy.

It is for this reason that I cannot support the Kerry amendment. Instead, I am a cosponsor of the Levin amendment, which gives us the best opportunity to find this balance between our need to begin a phase-down and our need to help stabilize Iraq. It tells the Iraqis that we won’t be there forever so that they need to move forward on uniting and securing their country. I agree with Senator WARNER that the message should be “we really mean business, Iraqis, get on with it.” At the same time, the amendment also provides the Iraqis the time and the opportunity to accomplish this critical goal.

Essential to a successful policy is the administration listening to its generals and diplomats and members of Congress especially those who disagree with their policies and believe it is time to start bringing our troops home.

The overwhelming majority of the Senate is already on record voting for an amendment stating that calendar year 2006 should be a period of significant transition to full Iraqi sovereignty, with Iraqi security forces

taking the lead for the security, creating the conditions for the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq. The Levin amendment builds on this approach.

The White House should follow this principle as well. Visiting Iraq for a few hours cannot resuscitate or justify a failed policy. No amount of spin or photo opportunities can change the bottom line: this war has been poorly conceived and poorly managed by the White House, and that is why it has been so poorly received by the American people.

And it is troubling to already see Karl Rove in New Hampshire, treating this as a political attack opportunity instead of a major national challenge around which to rally the country.

There are no easy answers to this war. I understand that many Americans want to see our troops come home. The chaos, violence, and horrors in Iraq are gut-wrenching reminders of what our men and women in uniform, some just months out of high school, must confront on a daily basis. They are doing this heroically, they are doing this selflessly, and more than 2,500 of them have now made the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

Not one of us wants to see our servicemen and women in harm's way a day longer than they have to be. And that's why we must find the most responsible way to bring them home as quickly as possible, while still leaving the foundation of a secure Iraq that will not endanger the free world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized. The Senator has 14 minutes 47 seconds remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is time for American troops to come home. That was the judgment of the Senate last year. Last year, by a vote of 79 to 19, we adopted on a bipartisan basis an amendment written largely by the Senator from Michigan but amended and then cosponsored by the Senator from Virginia. It was a bipartisan amendment.

By 79 to 19, we said last year that this year would be different. This just would not be another year, it would be a year of significant transition, and we were specific about what that transition meant. It meant that the Iraqis would be moving toward control of their own nation. It meant that their forces would take the lead. Those were our words—"take the lead"—in defending their country. It meant that we would create the condition for phased redeployment—that is, withdrawal of U.S. forces. That is how we voted last year, 79 to 19.

Today, we are now debating again whether American forces can start to come home. I thought we already decided that last year, that this would be

the year when they start to come home.

Senator LEVIN brings an amendment to the Senate and says again, as we did last year, we will start redeploying or withdrawing American forces this year. What do we hear from the other side of the aisle? The same Republicans, many of whom voted to start bringing troops home this year, now resist the idea.

Is that because Iraq is stronger today? Unfortunately, the statistics do not suggest it. The news reports from the New York Times tells us in May 2003, there were five recorded incidents of sectarian violence. In May of 2004, 10; in May of 2005, 20; in May of 2006, 250.

To suggest that Iraq is stronger this year, a year later, is at least subject to debate. But this much we do know: We know we are paying a price every single day. The heartbreaking newscasts we listen to are of our men and women, our brothers and sisters, our sons and daughters who continue to die in Iraq, as they simply drive their vehicles down the road or stand and guard a security installation, 2,508 of our best and bravest who have died.

The obvious question is, When will this end? The Bush administration, what plan do they have? No end in sight for the way they view it. I listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say the Iraqis will take control in the future. This is the fourth year we have been told that the Iraqis will stand up and defend their own country. We are told they have 260,000 soldiers and police prepared to defend their own country, ready to fight.

You know when I will believe that? When the first American soldier comes home, replaced by an Iraqi soldier. That has not happened yet. We are about to send 21,000 more American soldiers over to fight in rotation to keep 130,000 on the ground. If these Iraqi forces are so well trained and so well prepared, why are we sending another 21,000? I don't think we can explain that.

I think we know what this is about. We are facing a situation in Iraq today where the Iraqis have the wrong message from America. The Iraqis believe that they can wait, patiently wait, until the day comes when they defend their own country.

And why not? They have the best military in the world, the American military, in place defending their country. They have the American taxpayers paying for that defense. They understand we are prepared to invest those resources, and they think it will be indefinite. Nothing we are going to do on the floor of this U.S. Senate will change that point of view, unless we adopt the Levin amendment which says we will begin to withdraw the forces, redeploy the forces, this year.

There has been a lot of criticism on the floor that the party on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, is all unified and the Democrats cannot seem to all agree on anything. I do not know

what the vote will be on the Levin amendment. I think it will be a substantial vote within the Democratic caucus. But our critics are wrong.

Mr. President, 100 percent of the Democratic caucus believes it is time for change. And 100 percent of the Republican caucus believes it is time to stay the course, not change. They stand unified for the premise that we will not demand accountability. They stand unified for the premise that we will not have any change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I think the American people understand, as we do, that it is time for us to say to the Iraqis: Stand and defend your own nation. Let American soldiers start coming home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask, how many minutes remain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes 14 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island, my cosponsor, Mr. REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. President.

There are two key elements in the Levin-Reed amendment. The first is to begin redeployment, this year, of American combat forces in Iraq. So many of my colleagues have mentioned Mr. Rubaie, who is the National Security Adviser for the Iraqi Government. On two occasions he has said it is not only feasible but desirable. He said it first on television, and then he said it just this week in a carefully crafted editorial. So this is something that I think can be done, and, according to a key leader in the Iraq Government, should be done.

The second element is that the President should submit to Congress a plan by the end of 2006, with estimated dates for the continued phased redeployments of U.S. forces from Iraq, with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise. The President should do this with the understanding that unexpected contingencies may arise.

This has been referred to as an arbitrary timetable. It is not arbitrary, and it is not a timetable. It is not a timetable of our creation, but it would be of the President. So do, I assume, those who object to this feel that the President could not produce such a timetable? Or if he did produce such a timetable, it would be arbitrary, that it would be made without consultation with our military leaders, that it would be made without reference to conditions on the ground? I do not think so. In fact, I think such a timetable would be appropriate and necessary.

Also, I should point out that our amendment recognizes the residual

presence of U.S. forces in Iraq, those that will be training Iraqi forces, those that will provide logistical support, and those that would conduct counterterrorism operations, our special operations troops.

But, essentially, what we would also like to do, which is so critical, is to begin this transition from a predominantly military response to a nonmilitary one. During and after the phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq, the United States will need a sustained nonmilitary effort to actively support reconstruction, governments, and a durable political solution.

One significant reason why our military is stuck in Iraq today is because we have not made an appropriate nonmilitary effort. The administration has bungled reconstruction. They have yet to deploy more than 4 provisional reconstruction teams in the almost 18 provinces in Iraq. They continue to lag behind in terms of political mentoring, in terms of reconstruction, in terms of economic activity. They have done nothing.

As a result, the only real viable tool we have is military forces. And the commanders will tell you on the ground that they are just buying time, that without this nonmilitary effort, all of our plans for Iraq will not succeed.

Any effort like this requires popular support. Popular support rests upon candor with the people. This administration has not been candid with the people. They have not been candid with respect to the costs of this war. And those costs will go up.

Indeed, to stay the course, we can predict billions and billions and billions of more dollars. They have not been candid with respect to the length of our operations. They have not been candid with respect to the impact of these operations on our troops. They have substituted slogans for candor.

This amendment gives the President an opportunity to present a plan not only to the Congress but to the American people, a plan that will be candid, a plan that will strive for victory, a plan of his making. Without such a plan, we will continue to drift, and the chances of success will continue to diminish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes 11 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, there is much we all agree upon in this body. We have an interest in the stability of Iraq. And we want to improve the chances of success in Iraq. The disagreement is over whether the present course, with its open-ended commitment to maintain our military presence in Iraq, as we now have it, contributes to that stability or whether or not we must prod the Iraqis to do what only they can

do—come together to end the insurgency and to avoid an all-out civil war.

The President of Iraq, Mr. Talabani, a few months ago, said the following about what Iraqis believe. He said that Iraqis believe that U.S. forces are ready “to stay as long as we ask them, no matter what the period is.”

That perception on the part of the President of Iraq, reflecting the view, presumably, of many Iraqis, that the United States is “ready to stay” as long as the Iraqis ask us, no matter what the period is, is a perception which must end. It is a perception that was based on our administration’s commitment, which was open-ended, unlimited, unconditional.

Iraqis must make a choice. It is a choice that our blood and our treasure has given them. The Iraqis, and the Iraqis alone, can unite to avoid all-out civil war, by making the political power sharing that needs to be done. Only the Iraqis can decide that they are going to divide the resources equitably so that they can bring in all the groups and the insurgency and avoid an all-out civil war. Only the Iraqis can unite to remove the militia control of the police.

Their unity can do that. We cannot do that for them. We have given them an opportunity. Mr. President, 2,500 American lives, 7 times as many American wounded, have given them an opportunity. They must make a choice: Do they want a nation or do they want civil war?

To maintain this open-ended commitment, which we now have, is contributing to a dependency of the Iraqis on us rather than forcing them, prodding them, to do what only they can do to build a nation.

The Levin-Reed sense-of-the-Congress amendment proposes that a phased redeployment of U.S. troops be begun by the end of this year. Our amendment does not establish a fixed ending date for redeployment. It does not propose a fixed timetable once the phased redeployment has begun. But while it does not establish a timetable, it does establish a fixed time for the beginning of a phased redeployment by the end of this year. It is not precipitous. It is by the end of this year begin a phased redeployment of American troops.

Mr. President, the National Security Adviser of Iraq has been quoted a number of times on the floor.

Do I have a minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 5 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The National Security Adviser of Iraq said the following in yesterday’s Washington Post: We envisage the United States troop presence by year’s end to be under 100,000. That is a reduction of 30,000. That is totally in keeping with what the Levin-Reed amendment proposes. That is the Iraqi envisioned timetable. We want to hold them to that vision for their sake and for ours.

Then Mr. Rubaie, the Iraqi National Security Adviser, said the following—and these are words which every one of us should soak in—that the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq’s Government in the eyes of its people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Let us do that in a way which is thoughtful, orderly, and planned. And that is what the Levin-Reed amendment proposes.

I thank the Chair. And I thank my good friend from Virginia, our chairman, for the way in which this debate has been handled on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, with regard to the pending amendment, I would only say, in response to the extra 10 seconds you had, I would hope that security adviser was in consultation with our Government at the time he made those remarks to determine the authenticity of those remarks.

Now, my understanding is we now turn to an amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement—

Mr. WARNER. Cosponsors of that amendment: the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY.

I inquire of the manager, in consultation with the proponents of this amendment, first, if we could get some estimate of the time for the introduction of the amendment. And then I would hope we would continue the practice that we have had today by which Senators go back and forth on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would propose that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Wisconsin control the time which has been allocated to them. And as to when they bring up their amendment, it would be up to them because, as I envision this, they and you or your designee would manage that time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I intend to remain. I do not know that there is a time agreement on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unaware of a time agreement at this time.

Mr. WARNER. In other words, we are in an unusual situation. Now, maybe the distinguished colleague from Massachusetts can help advise his leadership and me as to the time. It would be helpful because, like colleagues on this side, there are commitments on our side with regard to what Members wish to do this evening.

So I am just trying to strike a note of comity so that we can accommodate those Senators on both sides of the aisle who are anxious to participate in this debate.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator would yield, I totally concur that this next amendment should be brought up and debated in an orderly way, but that being agreed upon, I would hope, between the sponsors of that amendment and the chairman, the Republican manager.

So I do not think there is any need for me, frankly, to intervene in that process. Perhaps you could hear from the Senator from Massachusetts as to what his plans are and how he plans to proceed. I think that would be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the managers of the bill. I see no reason why we cannot proceed as we normally do in the Senate. I am happy to live by the tradition, with the distinguished manager, of going back and forth. We do have a little bit of an issue with a couple of Senators who need to attend other events. They are not going to speak very long.

So what I would like to do is be able to have both of them speak. Then if I could open up, and then Senator FEINGOLD speak. And then we would go back and forth. We have a number of speakers. I can't tell you exactly how long it is going to take now. But we are not trying to prolong it. We, obviously, have waited a significant amount of time. We were going to bring this up last week, and then we ran into this little parliamentary game that was played, wanting to go through the caucus. And now we are finally here.

So I want to make sure we have an opportunity to adequately lay out and counter what has been about 6 days of both misinterpretation and misstatement about what this is and what it is not. So I am happy to manage it. I respect the willingness of the Senator from Michigan to let me do that. We will try to be as expeditious as we can.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I don't wish to misinterpret his comments, but there was an amendment brought up by his senior colleague from Massachusetts that took an inordinate amount of time, which we had not anticipated. If there was some disjuncture of the process over here, I believe it was initiated on that side.

Let's return to the matter at hand. Would 30 minutes allow you to begin this debate and then we could have, say, 15 or so on this side and then—

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we would need a little bit longer than that to sort of open it up if we can. Simply because I am trying to accommodate these two Senators, if we could let them speak, I think the Senator from Illinois would like 10 minutes and the Senator from Vermont would like about 10 minutes. Then I could open up. Senator FEINGOLD, I know, wants to speak. I think he wanted to speak for about 45 minutes or more.

Mr. WARNER. Do you think we could have some response from this side before Senator FEINGOLD begins?

Mr. LEAHY. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, like the Senator from Vermont, has been here a long time. He knows that sometimes on these things, we can spend more time working out the agreement before time than it would actually take. Since I am one of the ones who has to leave, I would ask at least on the original consent that right after Senator DURBIN, I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes. I suspect this is going to work itself out.

Mr. WARNER. I am not objecting to that. I recognize you Senators have commitments. There are colleagues on this side who have commitments. We are trying to balance that and recognize that the proponents of the amendment should have an opportunity to lay it down. It so happens that there are four cosponsors.

Mr. KERRY. So that we don't chew up all the time trying to figure out how to chew up the time, let me suggest that we agree that we have 20 minutes quickly divided between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont. Then if Senator FEINGOLD and I could open for the time that we need, and then it would be up to the Senator from Virginia. He obviously would want to have an appropriate amount of time to respond.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, but can he give us some definition of the time desired by yourself and Senator FEINGOLD? Let's assume it is a half hour now between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont; that is, 30 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Twenty minutes, 10 and 10.

Mr. KERRY. Just to make certain that we are covering the time—and I am not sure we will use it—I certainly would want to reserve an hour for each.

Mr. WARNER. That would be an hour and 20 minutes before anyone on this side—

Mr. KERRY. Two hours and 20 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Two hours and 20 minutes before anyone on this side gets an opportunity to seek recognition other than the manager for purposes of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, the Senator asked me how much time we needed. Whether it is before someone answers or not is something that can be worked out. That is the time we need.

Mr. WARNER. That is a substantial departure from the manner in which we have managed this bill thus far. I really think that this is most unusual. We have no time agreement. We have an open-ended amendment. We have four sponsors. We have colleagues that have commitments tonight. I really believe at some point—

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, how about if we let the two Senators I mentioned proceed. Senator FEINGOLD and I could each take 30 minutes at this

point. Then they have a response. Then we can come back and respond afterwards.

Mr. WARNER. Fine. That is quite agreeable to me, take 30 minutes to present the amendment. Then we will on this side have an equal amount of time.

Mr. KERRY. Instead of taking an hour each—I need to protect Senator FEINGOLD's request. He is not here, and I am already compromising myself on his behalf—we would both give up a half hour to begin with, so we would take an hour and 20 minutes, and then the Senator from Virginia would have an hour or whatever he wants to respond.

Mr. WARNER. So an hour and 20 minutes on this side to initiate the amendment. I will concede that we will do that. But it seems to me somewhat a departure from the way we normally manage things. Then it comes to this side for, let's say, an hour's debate.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair. Senator LIEBERMAN has been here off and on during the day wanting to speak.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. REID. If there is going to be any time agreement, Senator LIEBERMAN ought to be worked into this. We have Senator BYRD here who has been calling all day.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would be happy to say, when the time comes to this side, he can initiate on our time his remarks.

Mr. REID. Senators BYRD and LIEBERMAN or both.

Mr. WARNER. Senator LIEBERMAN. I didn't hear Senator BYRD mentioned. Let's hear from our senior colleague as to what his desires are.

Mr. REID. We will take you up on that, if you will give Senator LIEBERMAN 10 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I would be happy to do that at the conclusion of 1 hour and 20 minutes, that our side be recognized for a period of, let's say, 30 minutes, of which the first 10 will be given to Senator LIEBERMAN.

Mr. REID. As usual, the Senator from Virginia is very kind.

Mr. WARNER. I do believe we ought to hear from our senior colleague as to what his desires might be.

Mr. LEAHY. Before the Senator speaks, does that mean that the original request that Senator DURBIN and I would each be heard first—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not heard a unanimous consent request from the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we agreed that since these two Senators are under a timeline difficulty, we would try to accommodate them. Could we have the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois each speak for 10 minutes?

Mr. WARNER. I have no objection, if you wish to initiate with those two

Senators beginning with 10 minutes each. Then what is to follow thereafter?

Mr. KERRY. At that point I would hope that Senator FEINGOLD and I would have an opportunity to introduce the amendment itself.

Mr. WARNER. Therefore using what amount of time?

Mr. KERRY. As I said, we would like 30 minutes each, and then we will come back afterwards.

Mr. WARNER. So we are back to the hour and 20 minutes on that side before we receive any time on this side?

Mr. KERRY. We won't even introduce the amendment, if we don't do that.

Mr. WARNER. The amendment has been here for some time. I have had an opportunity to examine it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Before the Senator does that, may I inject—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, out of respect for our distinguished colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair, and I thank my distinguished friend from Virginia, Senator WARNER.

I have an amendment. I would at least like to debate it or have some time to speak on it. I was hoping that I might be able to speak for not to exceed 30 minutes on my amendment. I would like to throw that in the mix.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: To inform both the senior Senator from West Virginia, myself, and others, what is the order before the Senate at this time? My understanding is the Kerry-Feingold amendment with an unlimited amount of time on it and there is no provision for other amendments at this time; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Massachusetts, under the previous agreement, was to be recognized for his amendment at this time.

Mr. WARNER. I say to my good friend, the order has been in for some 24 hours by which this is the amendment. The time allocation is under the control of the two managers. We will work that out momentarily, hopefully on an equitable basis. I do not at this point in time see the opportunity for the introduction of your amendment, I say with due respect, until such time as the debate on the Kerry-Feingold amendment is concluded.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have not heard all of the debate, but from what I have heard, I don't think that another Senator, this Senator, would be precluded from asking for time to explain his amendment. Now if the agreement may preclude other amendments—I don't know whether it does or not. If it does, then that is one thing. But I have an amendment, and I would like to speak on it. I wonder if Senators wouldn't allow me to speak. I have four to six pages. I can do those in 40 minutes or less.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would be more than happy to accommodate my distinguished friend and leader. I simply say that unless we amend the order at this point, I do not see that opportunity. I will be glad to put in a quorum in hopes that we can resolve not only the time allocation on this side but how we could accommodate our distinguished colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. LEVIN. I suggest that the two Senators who need 10 minutes each be recognized now and that we try to negotiate these various time needs during their presentation.

Mr. WARNER. That is a very reasonable request. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois be—

Mr. KERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, could I please have the unanimous consent request stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent request is the following—

Mr. WARNER. That the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois be recognized at this time seriatim for 10 minutes each, during which time we are going to try to negotiate the time allowance. Then at the end of that 20 minutes, we resume under the standing order of the Senate and the Kerry amendment goes back.

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

The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the Levin-Reed amendment on Iraq, and I will also vote for the Kerry amendment, of which I am a co-sponsor.

Both amendments are a step in the right direction, as they finally begin the process of winding down what has been the most poorly conceived, costly, and tragic misuse of United States military power since Vietnam.

We got into this war for reasons that bear little if any resemblance to the reasons the White House gives for keeping our troops there today at a cost of more than a billion dollars every week.

First it was weapons of mass destruction. There were none. Anyone who urged continued monitoring by United Nations inspectors was ridiculed by the White House as being naive.

Then it was Saddam Hussein's supposed ties to al-Qaida, which was a blatant, calculated distortion.

There was none, yet the Vice President continues to say there was. Today, thanks to the policy of the President and the rubber stamping by the Congress, Iraq and Guantanamo are the rallying cry for terrorists around the world.

Then it was because Saddam Hussein—who posed no threat to the United States—was a brutal dictator, which he was. He was also supported by the Reagan administration.

That, however, is not a justification for a war that has cost the lives and

limbs of thousands of young Americans and tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians.

Winning against terrorism, like stopping the proliferation of dangerous weapons, promoting peace between Arabs and Israelis, or solving any other regional or global problem, requires the trust, the respect, the cooperation and the support of our allies.

Unfortunately, these, too, are casualties of this war. Squandered away.

The damage that this reckless adventure has caused to our reputation, particularly among the world's Muslims in countries like Turkey, Jordan, Indonesia, Egypt and other traditional allies, is incalculable.

We have heard a lot of partisan rhetoric about cutting and running. How easy it is to ask others to fight and die from the safety and comfort of an office in Washington.

How easy it is to vote for tax cuts and to self-righteously wave the flag, while our troops are scavenging for scraps of metal to protect themselves from IEDs. They were sent to fight and die without armor, by top Pentagon officials back home who proudly, dismissively and resolutely insisted they were ready, when they were not.

How easy it is to mislead the country, with patriotic pronouncements by the President like "mission accomplished," or that we are seeing the "last throes" of the insurgency.

Contrary to the blatantly partisan and false attacks of the President's political advisors, no one questions the threat that al-Qaida and other terrorist networks pose to the security of Americans and to the people of other nations.

No one questions that we need an effective strategy to combat it. The issue is how best to combat it.

This administration has shown the world how not to do it, creating a lengthening catalogue of squander.

You don't do it by starting a war with selective, faulty intelligence, by dismissing thoughtful criticism as unpatriotic, without enough troops, with no plan to win the peace, by cavalierly discounting the risks.

You don't do it by repeatedly misleading the American people.

You don't do it by creating and fueling a terrorism problem where there was none.

And you don't do it by shamelessly denigrating the Geneva Conventions and the rights and values that distinguish us from the terrorists.

Unlike the war to defeat the Taliban, which continues to this day and shows no signs of abating, the invasion of Iraq had nothing to do with Osama bin Laden or the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

It has degraded our military in ways that will cost us trillions—not billions—trillions of dollars to rebuild.

It has left a legacy of thousands of maimed and crippled young veterans with medical and other needs that they, their families, and their communities will cope with for the rest of their lives.

Our troops have fought bravely in the harshest of conditions. They are our constituents. They are the sons and daughters of our friends and neighbors. They have carried out extraordinarily difficult missions, including tracking down and capturing Saddam Hussein and killing Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

They have sacrificed so much. We support them unequivocally, Democrats and Republicans. The question is how we can best support them.

This was to be the year of transition. That was what the Congress voted last year, and what the President signed into law. Yet, the Administration continues to simply stay the course. This course is not in America's best interest.

Iraq has a new constitution. It has had elections. It has a democratically elected government.

We have trained and equipped more than 100,000 Iraqi soldiers.

It has been more than three years since the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. More than 2,500 Americans have died. We have been there as long as we were in World War II.

The Iraqi people need to take responsibility for their own country. It will not happen immediately, but both the Levin amendment and the Kerry amendment move us toward that goal.

I have cast over 12,000 votes in this Senate. I am as proud of my vote against the open ended resolution that gave the President the authority to invade Iraq as any I have cast in 32 years. It is time for the Congress to change the course of a policy that has cost us hundreds of billions of dollars that would have been far better spent here at home, that has weakened our leadership, that is dividing our country, and that has not made us safer.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Illinois is to be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 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. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, in the course of a congressional career, you are asked to make many votes. Most of them are fairly routine and not long remembered. In the course of my career on Capitol Hill, those votes that have kept me up at night, those I remember years after they are cast relate to one issue—the issue of war. When you have cast that vote, if the decision to go forward has been made, people will die—not just the enemy but brave Americans and usually innocent civilians.

So I remember very well that night in October 2002, when we were called to

this floor of the Senate to vote on the issue of authorizing the President to go to war in Iraq. I say to the Senator from West Virginia, I will never forget that moment. There were 23 of us—22 on this side of the aisle and 1 on the other side—who stood up and voted no. If the Senator recalls, that vote ended late at night, near midnight. I stayed on the floor because I knew I would not be able to sleep when I got home. There were two Senators who were here waiting with the same feelings of emotion. One of them was our late colleague, Senator Paul Wellstone. Senator Wellstone was going back home to Minnesota to face reelection. I remember saying to him, “Paul, I hope this doesn't cost you the election.” Do you know what he said to me? He said, “It doesn't matter, this is what I believe. This is who I am.” That was the last conversation I ever had with Paul Wellstone. He died in a plane crash a few days later. I have thought about him a lot ever since and I miss him. I miss his voice. I wish he were here today. If he were here, I know what he would be doing. He would be joining me in supporting the Kerry amendment. I believe that in the meantime he probably would have voted, as I have, to support the troops. I voted to give the President every penny he has asked for in this war. Once that decision to go forward was made, my yardstick was very basic. If it were your son or daughter in uniform in Iraq, would you not give them everything they needed to wage this war and to come home safely? It was an easy question to ask and answer, particularly if you lived through the debacle of Vietnam, when our poor soldiers became the victims of public contempt because of our displeasure with the decisions of politicians. That must never happen again.

So now in the fourth year of the struggle, I have given the President every resource he has asked for. I have stood behind him and this administration even when I disagreed with their policy because I felt it was best that we stay uniform.

Today, I join in a decision being made by several of my colleagues to say that we must make it clear to the Iraqi people that our commitment is not forever. What have we given the Iraqis? We have given them 2,508 American lives. We have given them 18,000 soldiers who have returned home with injuries of body and spirit—2,000 with head injuries that may be life-changing. We have given them \$300 billion of our treasury. We have given them the focus of our attention and the focus of our resources at the expense of our own country. What have they received in return? Their dictator has been deposed. We dug him out of a hole in the ground, put him on trial in front of his own people. We have given the Iraqi people three elections and two governments. We said control your future and your fate; this is your country. We helped them train about 264,000 soldiers and policemen. We invested billions in their infrastructure for oil and water.

We have given that nation virtually more than any other nation has ever given. But now we must tell the Iraqis something very straight and simple: It is time for them to stand and defend their own country. If they truly believe in the future of Iraq, it is time for them to stand and risk their own lives and their own blood for their own nation. This amendment by Senators KERRY, FEINGOLD, and others, says to them that at the end of the year we will consider the withdrawal of all of our troops.

Now, I say that with some equivocation because if you read the amendment, Senators KERRY and FEINGOLD have been careful. They understand that we are not going to pull every troop out as of the last day regardless of the circumstances. They have carefully crafted the language, which says that if we face a threat of terrorism, if we are still needed to continue training troops, or if there is danger to Americans at our facilities, we can stay and defend, as we should. It is not an immediate withdrawal on the last day. But it says to the Iraqis: You must stand and fight on your own.

I have been told over and over again how well trained these Iraqi soldiers are. The proof of their fitness for battle is when the first Iraqi soldier replaces an American soldier, so that soldier can come home with his mission truly accomplished.

If we leave this open-ended, as those on the other side would suggest, I am afraid the Iraqis will understand that they have the best military in the world that will stay there indefinitely. How can we do that to our soldiers who have performed so well, who have been the model of bravery, the model of patriotism?

We have been misled into this war. We were given information by the administration that was not true. This war has not been well managed by this administration in terms of the number of troops sent into the field or the equipment being given to them. We know that. For years, we have been promised that these Iraqis would stand and fight and we could come home. That has not happened. Now I have reached that point that other colleagues have reached as well, where I believe the Iraqis must be told that now it is your nation, now it is your turn.

For those who say that one year is not enough time—one year is not enough time? What happened in the last 12 months in Iraq, in the last 12-month period of time? We have lost 762 American soldiers in the last 12 months. We have spent \$90 billion in the last 12 months. We have seen thousands of soldiers return home with injuries. It is not just the passage of time, it is the passage of life and life's journey for so many of our soldiers. Twelve months is a reasonable time—12 months, and all that it means for us and all that we would give, is a reasonable time.

I say to the Senators from Massachusetts and Wisconsin, I thank you for bringing this measure before us. I think it is now time for the American people to stand up and say to this administration: You misled us into this war. You have no plan for it to end. Our brave soldiers deserve the leadership that brings us to the right conclusion. I think we can do that. I think this amendment is a step in the right direction. I will support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, 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. 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, I thank all for their cooperation. I think we have reached a reconciliation of the needs and requirements of all for a period of time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KERRY be recognized now to offer his amendment and, provided further, that he then be allocated 30 minutes to speak; further, that there be debate only as follows; provided further, that that be followed by up to 30 minutes under the control of the chairman, Senator WARNER, to be followed by up to 30 minutes under the control of Senator BOXER, to be followed by 20 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD; provided further, that there now be a period of 10 minutes under the control of Senator LIEBERMAN; thereafter, provided further, that there be 30 minutes under the control of Chairman WARNER, to be followed by Senator FEINGOLD, to be followed by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am one of the main cosponsors of the amendment. I request to be the next Democratic speaker for 30 minutes after Senator KERRY.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my good friend, we have now spent 30 minutes working out this time arrangement.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I will cede my time to Senator FEINGOLD now, Senator BOXER can go, and I will go afterwards. I will just flip with Senator FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. As amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As amended.

Mr. LEVIN. No objection.

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

Mr. WARNER. Has the Chair announced the acceptance of the unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, there is no objection to the request.

AMENDMENT NO. 4442

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4442, and I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. LEAHY, proposes an amendment numbered 4442.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq in order to further a political solution in Iraq, encourage the people of Iraq to provide for their own security, and achieve victory in the war on terror)

On page 437, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1084. UNITED STATES POLICY ON IRAQ.

(a) REDEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS FROM IRAQ.—

(1) SCHEDULE FOR REDEPLOYMENT.—For purposes of strengthening the national security of the United States, the President shall redeploy, commencing in 2006, United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007, in accordance with a schedule coordinated with the Government of Iraq, leaving only the minimal number of forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi security forces, conducting targeted and specialized counterterrorism operations, and protecting United States facilities and personnel.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REQUIRED.—The President shall consult with Congress regarding the schedule for redeployment and shall submit such schedule to Congress as part of the report required under subsection (c).

(3) MAINTENANCE OF OVER-THE-HORIZON TROOP PRESENCE.—The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security interests.

(b) IRAQ SUMMIT.—The President should work with the leaders of the Government of Iraq to convene a summit as soon as possible that includes those leaders, leaders of the governments of each country bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that engenders the support of Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds by ensuring the equitable distribution of oil revenues, disbanding the militias, strengthening internal security, reviving reconstruction efforts and fulfilling related international economic aid commitments, securing Iraq's borders, and providing for a sustainable federalist structure in Iraq.

(c) REPORT ON REDEPLOYMENT.—

(1) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretary of State, submit to Congress a report that sets forth the strategy for the redeployment of United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007.

(2) STRATEGY ELEMENTS.—The strategy required in the report under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The schedule for redeploying United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007, developed pursuant to subsection (a)(1).

(B) A schedule for returning the majority of such redeployed forces home to the United States.

(C) The number, size, and character of United States military units needed in Iraq after July 1, 2007, for purposes of counterterrorism activities, training Iraqi security forces, and protecting United States infrastructure and personnel.

(D) A strategy for addressing the regional implications for diplomacy, politics, and development of redeploying United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007.

(E) A strategy for ensuring the safety and security of United States forces in Iraq during and after the July 1, 2007, redeployment, and a contingency plan for addressing dramatic changes in security conditions that may require a limited number of United States forces to remain in Iraq after that date.

(F) A strategy for redeploying United States forces to effectively engage and defeat global terrorist networks that threaten the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. I am going to abbreviate my remarks so he and I can hopefully split this time and yield it back. It is regrettable that we are not able to present this amendment in the manner we normally would expect, which is the two lead sponsors would each offer their thoughts without that type of limitation.

Nonetheless, this amendment is something that I think represents not only the views of the Senator from Massachusetts and myself but the views of the majority of the American people which they have come to in a very painful way after this war has proceeded in the way it has.

In fact, I find it jarring that we spend so much time on the floor of the Senate and throughout the Congress talking almost incessantly about the situation in Iraq as if on 9/11 the situation involved Iraq, as if the attack had come from Iraq. Of course, it didn't. We were attacked by al-Qaida operating out of Afghanistan on 9/11. And yet here we are discussing day after day, week after week every tiny aspect of the situation in Iraq.

Of course, it is a terribly important situation, but I submit—and I think the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with me—that the overriding issue is what is in the best interest of the national security of the United States of America, what is in the best interest of protecting the American people when they are at home and when they are abroad.

All of us in this Chamber, every single one of us, supported the appropriate action to invade Afghanistan. It was a necessary war, a war that had to be fought in order to go after the Taliban and al-Qaida. None of us stood back and said, as the Senator from Texas wants to say, that somehow some of us who don't believe in war will never support a war and the rest support wars.

That is absurd. We understand when it is absolutely essential, and it was essential in the case of Afghanistan.

I voted against the Iraq war because it appeared obvious to me that was not the wise next strategic move in the fight against al-Qaida, those who attacked us. It was pretty clear to me, but it was even clear apparently to this administration when, on their own State Department Web site, where President Bush had his name, they listed the 45 countries where they believed al-Qaida was operating. This came out in November of 2001. It included, obviously, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Ireland, the United States. Guess what country wasn't even on their list. Iraq. And this has been confirmed publicly by the recognition now, despite the gross misrepresentations that al-Zarqawi was not even in the part of Iraq controlled by Saddam Hussein when we invaded Iraq.

It is pretty obvious on the face of this that this was not the place to go if we wanted to deal with al-Qaida. They were not there then, but because of the errors we have made, we created a beachhead for them to do far more in Iraq than they ever could in the past.

I understand former Secretary of State James Baker, Secretary of State under the first George Bush, said he used to go around the country and people would ask him every day: Why didn't you go on into Iraq at the time of the first gulf war? He says with a smile: I don't get asked that question anymore because it didn't make sense. It didn't make sense then, and it doesn't make sense now.

One of the theories we hear is that somehow staying in Iraq is necessary because what we are going to do is have all the terrorists come into Iraq, and we are going to get them all, and then they wouldn't be able to attack us anywhere else. Some call this the roach-motel theory, the idea that all these terrorists all over the world are simply focused on Iraq and by staying we are going to get them. This is what I would like to call an Iraq centrist policy, a policy that somehow believes Iraq is the be all and end all of our foreign policy when, of course, it is nothing of the kind.

The fact is, those against al-Qaida is a much broader fight. I have seen estimates of somewhere between 60 to 80 countries where al-Qaida is operating. Yet our focus, our troops, and our resources are only heavily focused on this Iraq situation. This is just plain tragic 5 years after 9/11.

One might say we are fighting the terrorists in other countries, too; we are doing whatever we can. But we are not. We have taken our eye off the ball. We are not dealing with the al-Qaida threat in other countries because we are so focused on Iraq.

One good example is Somalia. Remember Somalia? This is a place where we know there were al-Qaida operatives and affiliated groups. It is one of those failed states where it is al-

most an invitation to terrorist organizations to come in and organize and be away from any kind of control. Because we haven't been paying attention to Somalia, because we don't have a policy in Somalia, guess what just happened. A radical Islamist group has taken over Mogadishu and now threatens to take over the rest of the country.

I can't say for sure what they will do, but there are indications they may be very much like the type of Taliban government or organization that fostered al-Qaida in Afghanistan.

So we have taken our eye off the ball. In fact, I asked Ambassador Crumpton last week in a public hearing: How many people do we have in the Government devoted to Somalia full time? Mr. President, do you know what his answer was? One person. One person in a country that is clearly a threat in terms of al-Qaida.

It is not just there. What about Indonesia? Indonesia is the largest Islamic country in the entire world. It is the fourth largest country in the world. I heard Senators debating who had been to Iraq the most. One said he had been there 12 times. One said he had been there 11 times. Guess how many Senators have even been to Indonesia once in the last 2½ years. Just two of us, Senator BOND and myself, to a country that is being terrorized by a group called JI, Jemaah Islamiah, that is clearly affiliated with al-Qaida.

We are not paying attention to Indonesia. We are not putting our political and other resources there. We are only focused on Iraq where al-Qaida wasn't even operating as of the time of the invasion.

If that isn't enough, what about Afghanistan? I think we can all agree that Afghanistan is a place where we ought to win, where we shouldn't deplete our resources—well, we shouldn't, in the words of my colleagues on the other side, cut and run. But we are now feeling the consequences of what some have called the Iraq tax in Afghanistan, and that is the resurgence of Taliban fighters.

The recent death of more U.S. and Afghan soldiers there and the continued presence of terrorist networks in the region show how shortsighted this administration was by taking its eye off the ball.

We have not finished the job in Afghanistan, and we are now at risk of backsliding into instability. This is where the attack on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon was planned. This is where it was done. And because of this overemphasis and obsession with only staying in Iraq, we are allowing the Taliban and perhaps al-Qaida to get back in.

Let me give an example of what some said about this. A recent expert indicated with regard to the Afghanistan situation:

It is now 5 years since George W. Bush declared victory in Afghanistan and said that the terrorists were smashed.

Since the Bonn meeting in late 2001, a smorgasbord of international military and development forces has been increasing in size. How is it then that Afghanistan is near collapse once again? To put it briefly, what has gone wrong has been the invasion of Iraq. What has gone wrong is the invasion of Iraq. Washington's refusal to take State-building in Afghanistan seriously, and instead waging a fruitless war in Iraq. That view is shared by many others. I assure you I could give you many other examples.

But the point is, despite the fact that we all know who attacked us on 9/11, we are not focused on them. It is the most absurd situation I have ever seen in my 25 years as a legislator. Everybody knows we went into Iraq on a mistaken basis. Everybody knows that al-Qaida is the one who attacked us. Yet somehow our colleagues on the other side are trying to pretend they are one and the same thing, when everybody knows it is nothing of the kind.

So we have to change course. We have to refocus our energies on those who attacked us. I have heard a number of statements on the floor today, and I have been out here on and off since noon listening to the debate. I heard the Senator from Kentucky make the assertion that if we don't, they will soon be back here—meaning in the United States—if we don't stop them in Iraq. Well, the fact is, they are being effective in attacking us and our colleagues and our allies in many other places: In Indonesia, in London, in Madrid, in Turkey, in Morocco. It is not as if there haven't been any attacks. It is not as if this al-Qaida organization isn't functioning. I mean, under their argument, apparently we should invade all those other countries on false pretenses as a way to somehow root out the terrorists. But we know that approach doesn't work.

If we continue to be stuck in Iraq, we are facilitating al-Qaida's future. We are facilitating their recruitment. We are facilitating the growth of their operations in places such as the Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia. We are facilitating al-Qaida if we continue to make this mistake in Iraq over and over again. That is what I care the most about.

One of my colleagues, the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON said: If we were to withdraw the troops or re-deploy the troops in the coming year, we would be giving the enemy the playbook. Well, my point is, we need a new playbook. The playbook has nothing to do with 9/11. The playbook has nothing to do with al-Qaida. We need a new playbook that has something to do with what really threatens the American people. That is what the Kerry-Feingold amendment is all about. It is not about just taking off. What it is about is refocusing.

Of course, we have been faced all day with all of the horrible things that might happen if we bring the troops

out of Iraq, and that is a fair debate. What happens if the other side is wrong? What happens if a reasonable redeployment over the next year would work, and the Iraqi Government would be able to handle it? Think about the "what if" there.

We had a moment of silence on the floor, I believe on October 31, for the two thousandth American troop killed in the Iraq war. I believe last week we had a moment of silence for No. 2,500. What if they are wrong? What if we can get out of there now in a reasonable way and refocus on the fight against terrorism so we don't have to stand here and have that moment for No. 3,000, for No. 3,500, for No. 10,000. That is the direction we are heading, and the American people know it. Do we think it makes sense for our national security to have some 135,000 American troops on the ground in harm's way without any clear idea of how that is going to change the situation in Iraq?

Mr. President, it was bad strategy to go into Iraq in the first place, and it is a bad strategy to stay there because we are there and we don't want to admit that it was a bad idea in the first place. Some will say: Well, what you are saying then is those who have died have died in vain in Iraq. I disagree. I think anytime an American gives his or her life pursuant to a decision of our democracy, it is impossible for that person to die in vain. That is how our system works. I voted against this war. I didn't think it was a good idea. But we voted on it. That is how it works. As long as those troops fight in that spirit in support of a democratic decision, they do not die in vain, and we honor them for their sacrifice.

If the policy is wrong, if we made a mistake, we owe it to their families, we owe it to those who are injured, we owe it to those who are still there and who will still go and who will die in the future to correct that mistake, to change course. We owe it to them to do what makes the most sense.

What makes the most sense? We have, in my view, two choices—not this absurd notion that somebody wants all the troops to leave tomorrow. Choice No. 1 is a completely open-ended commitment, with no guarantee that this will end anytime in the near future or a commitment to finish the mission by a reasonable date and redeploy the troops where they can be better used to help us in the fight against those who attacked us on 9/11.

Mr. President, I heard the junior Senator from Virginia say: We don't need to embolden our enemy. It is his view that the idea of having a reasonable timetable to bring the troops out emboldens the enemy. Well, I will tell you what emboldens the enemy: Thinking they have us in a trap and we don't know how to get out. That emboldens and exhilarates them. They wanted us in Iraq. They are glad we are in Iraq. And they are using it as a way to fuel the hatred that generated 9/11. That is the bottom line.

To me, this is about national security. To me, this is about those who attacked us on 9/11. This administration and this Congress made a mistake by thinking that Iraq was the logical next step in this fight. It is time to reverse course. It is time to redeploy. It is time to focus on the real security of the American people.

Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield back the time to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am going to speak, obviously, a little bit in an abbreviated fashion at this point, and then I will reserve time and speak again later because of the way things have worked out.

I want to thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I want to thank him for his foresight and his leadership with respect to this issue, and I also want to thank him for his cooperation and efforts in the last days to put together what I think is a reasonable and sensible approach to how we deal with an obviously complicated situation.

Let me say that I have heard this debate over the course of the last days and I have listened carefully and I am saddened, in a sense—but I guess I have grown to expect it in the course of our politics—that there is an awful lot of characterization going around, an awful lot of stereotype sloganeering which tries to characterize something as other than what it is. It is what we have come to.

The fact is that this amendment is not what it is being characterized as. I have heard a number of people say it is a precipitous withdrawal. I have heard obviously the words "cut and run" and other words used many times.

Let me first point out the differences between this and the other amendment that has already been debated. First of all, this is binding. The other amendment is a sense of the Senate, and our troops and our country deserve more than a sense of the Senate. They deserve a policy.

Secondly, we have a date; the other is open-ended. It is almost like what President Bush is doing. We are going to stay the course and be open-ended.

Thirdly, this has an over-the-horizon force specifically to protect the security interests of the United States of America in the region and with respect to Iraq. But in addition to that, this amendment specifically strengthens the national security of the United States. It is not an abandonment of Iraq; it is, in fact, a way of empowering Iraq to stand up on its two feet and for the Iraqis to be able to do what they have expressed their desire to do, which is have their sovereignty.

It is interesting. In the last day we had a huge debate about the sovereignty of Iraq, and colleague after colleague came down and said how important it is to respect the sovereignty

of Iraq. Well, this amendment respects the sovereignty of Iraq. In fact, it increases the sovereignty of Iraq. It provides specifically for three provisos under which the President has the ability to be able to lead troops. There is no abandonment of Iraq. It sets a date by which, over the course of the next year, the Iraqis themselves have said they have the ability to be able to take over their own security. Prime Minister Maliki said a few days ago that by the end of this year—December—in 16 out of 18 provinces, they will be able to take care of their own security. This amendment holds them accountable.

In addition to that, it provides for the ability of the President to maintain a minimal number of forces who are critical to the job of standing up Iraqi security forces, of conducting targeted and specialized counterterrorism operations like the kind that got Zarqawi and also protecting United States facilities and personnel.

So even when you reach the date of next year—ample enough time for the Iraqis to complete the task of standing up—it will be 4 years, Mr. President, next year, and I think the American people have a right to expect that after 4 years, soldiers who have been trained over the course of those years are prepared to stand up for their country. In the United States of America, when we send a marine recruit to Pendleton or to Quantico, we can tell you in a matter of months when that recruit is ready for deployment. When we send a pilot to Corpus Christi or Pensacola, we can tell you exactly when they are ready to deploy. Is this administration telling us that after 4 years, we don't have Iraqis who are trained enough to drive trucks and perhaps be blown up by an IED, rather than an American soldier? Are they telling us they are not going to be prepared enough to be able to stand up for the security of Iraq?

This amendment demands the same kind of accountability that the President was prepared to demand each step of the way of the Iraqis up until this point. We set a date for the transfer of the provisional Government. They said: Oh, we can't do it that fast. We said: You have to do it that fast, and we did it. We then set a date for the Constitution and the referendum. Some Senators, some of whom have spoken against this amendment, came out and said: Oh, I think it is too early. I don't think we ought to have that date. Many of us stood up and said: No, we have to hold the date and hold them to the date. Guess what. We did it. We held them to the date and we got the Constitution.

The same thing happened for both elections. A lot of people came up and said: Oh, we can't get this all together on time; we have to delay the election. We said: No, we are going to stick with the election date, and we did. General Casey himself has said that the large presence of American troops is lending to the occupation, the sense of occupation, and it is delaying the willingness

of Iraqis to stand up. It is human nature. Anybody who has to go out and take the risk of loss of life, if somebody else is there to do it for you, you stand back. The fact is, countless numbers of conservative voices, including people like Bill Buckley, have suggested that the time has come for American forces to leave. He happens to believe, as others do, that it is lost. I think there is nothing in this amendment at all that, as some colleagues have said, that some people have decided it is all lost. I do not believe that.

I believe this is the way you empower the Iraqi Government, with its own people. This is the way you have accountability for what they need to achieve in the next year. This is the way you require their forces to take on responsibilities they may be reluctant to do today. And it allows for the President to make a determination that the job is not quite done and we can address the troops that may be necessary to complete that task.

That is anything but abandonment. I have heard some people say there is no plan. There is more plan here than there is in any other approach to what is happening in Iraq. Why do I say that?

Again, listen to our own generals. General Casey and others have all said that the reality is that this war cannot be won militarily. Our own commanding general is saying to us: You can't win it militarily. Secretary Condoleezza Rice has said it can't be won militarily, it must be won politically.

Our soldiers have done their job. Our soldiers have won the part of the war they need to win. They have given the Iraqi people a government. They have given the Iraqi people several elections. They have given them a constitution. Now it is time for Iraqis to stand up and want democracy for themselves as much as we want it for them. The best way to guarantee that is going to happen is to set a date with a proviso that the three things that we still need to do can still be done: make sure they are trained, continue to fight al-Qaida, and protect American forces and American facilities. All of that is provided for in this amendment.

This has been quoted a couple of times out here today, but let me remind my colleagues what the National Security Adviser to the Prime Minister has said, himself, in "The Way Out of Iraq, A Roadmap."

The eventual removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help the Iraqis who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be. It will remove psychological barriers and the reason that many Iraqis joined the so-called resistance in the first place. The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors who have, to date, been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance to what they call the coalition occupation.

That is the National Security Adviser to the Prime Minister of Iraq,

telling us that withdrawing American troops will, in fact, help them provide order in the streets of Iraq.

The Senator from Virginia and I were in Iraq together. Nobody works harder in the Senate at protecting our security than he does. I respect him, and he knows he is my friend. He knows as well as others know here that what General Casey said is true. There is no military solution to what is happening in Iraq. You either resolve the differences between Shia and Sunni and provide for an adequacy of the differences that are fueling the insurgency or the insurgency will continue.

There are five different components of that insurgency. There are outright criminals, and there is organized crime. There is al-Qaida. You have the Baathists, who have one attitude about regaining power. And, of course, you have the insurgents who are different from the Baathists, who are hardcore.

Those are different elements that are going to have to be resolved in different ways. I ask any of my colleagues, where is the diplomacy necessary to deal with this? What we do in this is require the kind of diplomatic effort that, in fact, is a plan to resolve all of the problems that are outstanding in Iraq: the problems with respect to governments bordering the country, the problems with respect to Shia and Sunni, the problems with the divisions of royalties of oil, how do you protect the rights of Sunnis in the minority, what is the degree of federalism that will exist in the government. These are the reasons for the insurgency.

At this moment, I don't see the kind of effort I have seen historically, whether it was from Henry Kissinger in the Middle East with shuttle diplomacy, in Vietnam, or Jim Baker in his efforts to put together a major coalition with respect to Desert Storm—that doesn't exist today. So a policy to say "stay the course" is a policy to say you are not going to resolve those issues. It is a policy to hope that somehow the Iraqis will pull their act together. It is a policy that is based on more wishful thinking than on real policy changes that address the question of shifting responsibility.

When the Prime Minister of Iraq can tell us that they can manage 16 out of 18 provinces within a year, when 87 percent of the Iraqis are polled and say they think we ought to set a date for withdrawal of American troops, when 94 percent of the Sunnis say we ought to withdraw, when 90 percent of the Shias say we ought to withdraw, we ought to listen to the Iraqis. After all the talk in the last days about sovereignty, where is that respect for sovereignty?

I have more to say about why it is important for us to take this effort here. The long list of mistakes that have been made do not inspire confidence in the judgments made by this administration. Congress helped to get us into this war. Congress needs to

take on responsibility for helping to get us out of it.

I had a lot more to say, and I have a lot more to say, but because of the way this is working, this will be truncated. I know I only have about a minute left so I reserve the remainder of the time, and we will go through the process and come back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. We all try to work within the framework of the unanimous consent.

At this point in time, the Senator from Virginia, myself, has the time between 6:35 and 7:05, a period of 30 minutes. I would like to now offer the first 15 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut and retrieve a period of time he had from 7:55 to 8:05 to be added to my time which commences at 8:05.

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

Mr. WARNER. Then, following the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Pennsylvania would be recognized for the remainder of my time in this time slot, Mr. SANTORUM.

That would be followed, I inform other Senators, by Senator BOXER, from roughly 7:05 to 7:35, and then the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, 7:35 to 7:55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, first let me thank the Senator from Virginia for previously responding graciously to the request from the Democratic leader, Senator REID, that I be granted time to speak on both of these amendments, and an extra thank-you for his allowing me to do so a bit earlier than the initial order.

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendments introduced by the Senator from Michigan and others, and the other amendment introduced by the Senators from Massachusetts and Wisconsin and others because they both would direct, in different ways, the withdrawal of American forces from Iraq without regard to the real conditions on the ground.

Let me begin with a harsh and familiar lesson history has taught us and that we are experiencing again in Iraq: War is hell. Precious lives are lost, blood is spilled, treasure is spent. Countries, communities, and families are deeply pained and disrupted. But history also teaches us that there are times when wars must be waged and won to prevent even more awful hell: to overthrow an evil leader or protect the noble causes of human freedom, opportunity, and peace.

At the outset of the war in Iraq, coalition forces, led by our own American men and women in uniform, brave and brilliant, succeeded with remarkable speed to achieve a most worthy goal, the overthrow of an evil leader, Saddam Hussein, and the opening of the opportunity for freedom, the opportunity for the people of Iraq and broader peace in the region.

After that, I would say, and I think all who support that war must admit, that mistakes were made on our side—some of them big—and the difficulties in Iraq increased. As others have said before me, the war in Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein may have been a war of choice. It is now a war of necessity. We must win it.

Why? Because the consequences of an American retreat and defeat there would be terrible for the safety and security of the American people at home whom we have a constitutional responsibility to protect.

I must say I also approach these two amendments with a sense of legislative history. They evoke debates that have occurred many times in the Senate. We had one just a decade ago on this floor, about how long our Armed Forces should stay in Bosnia. Some wanted to set a deadline for withdrawal, a date. Others, including myself, argued successfully that setting a day for automatic withdrawal was dangerous and wrong because it would discourage our allies and encourage our enemies. Our withdrawal should be consistent with the achievement of the goals we have set for the mission.

I remember in that debate quoting Biblical wisdom and warning, “If the sound of the trumpet is uncertain, who will follow into battle?”

I suppose in our time we might amend that to say, “If the sound of the trumpet is uncertain, who will stay in battle?”

I also remember arguing in that debate that a nation, I thought, should only set an unconditional date, a deadline for withdrawing troops from battle, if all hope of victory was lost, which it was not then in Bosnia and is not now in Iraq, unless the consequences of a too early American withdrawal by calendar instead of condition were acceptable to our country, which it was not. They were not then in Bosnia and are not now in Iraq.

The Kerry-Feingold amendment directs that all American troops be withdrawn from Iraq by the middle of next year, regardless of the intervening events. The Levin amendment is more complicated. I have spent some time studying it since it was made public on Monday. The Levin amendment directs that a withdrawal of American troops from Iraq begin by the end of this year, 2006, without regard to the conditions on the ground.

So, for that reason, consistent with what I have just said about legislative history and my own previously stated strong position, I cannot support either of these amendments.

I personally hope, as I am sure all Members of the Senate do, and I believe, that we will be able to withdraw a significant number of Americans in uniform from Iraq by the end of this year and even more by next year. I express that optimism based on the election and formulation of the new Iraqi unity Government, the increasing capacity of the Iraqi security forces to

protect their own people, and the commitment of the new Government to disarm the sectarian militias.

General Abizaid and General Casey have said that it is their hope to begin withdrawing more troops by the end of 2006 and even more next year. But I want them to decide based on the realities on the ground in Iraq, not on their hopes or my hopes or the shared hopes of the American people that we will soon be able to bring our Armed Forces home from Iraq. I do not want those distinguished American generals and the brave and steadfast American men and women serving under them to be directed by this Congress to exit before they conclude and recommend to us and the President that withdrawal is justified.

My own opinion is that the sooner the Iraqis take control of their own defense and destiny, the better it will be for them and for us. But if we leave too soon, it will be disastrous for them and for us.

Sponsors of the Kerry-Feingold amendment have stated a very clear and direct purpose. I disagree with it. The sponsors of the Levin amendment have argued on behalf of their amendment that they believe we must direct the beginning of a withdrawal of American troops without condition by December 31 of this year to make clear to the Iraqis that our commitment to them is not open-ended. I believe the Iraqis know very well that our commitment is not open-ended and is not a blank check. I will tell you that I personally have said that to their leaders directly, every time I have met them here or there. I know many of my Senate colleagues of both parties and leaders of the administration have said the same, openly and directly to the Iraqi leaders and the Iraqi people. And the Iraqis themselves have said over and over again that they know our commitment is not unconditional.

Just yesterday, in an op-ed piece in the Washington Post by the National Security Adviser of Iraq, he made clear that his Government wants the American military out of Iraq as much as we want our men and women to come home to America.

He and the rest of the Iraqi leadership doesn't need a congressional directive to convince them of the desirability of American forces leaving Iraq.

What will be lost by it? I will answer that in a moment.

I will say that in the interest of Iraq's security and ours, it should only happen—that is, our withdrawal—as the Iraqis step by step are more and more ready to stand on their own.

The amendment introduced by Senator LEVIN itself states that the Iraqis are making good progress in exactly that direction. The amendment itself reports more than two-thirds of the operational Iraqi Army combat battalions “are now either in the lead or operating independently.”

That is significant progress.

A national unity government has been formed. It took too long, but that

also is an enormous achievement. But, of course, there is much more work yet to be done—as the Levin amendment itself states, to amend the Iraqi constitution to get more help from international donors and to “promptly and decisively disarm the militias and remove those members of the Iraqi security forces whose loyalty to the Iraq government is in doubt.”

But then the amendment goes on to direct the beginning of withdrawal of American forces by the end of this year regardless of whether that work is done or those militias are disarmed.

That is where I respectfully believe it errs.

In doing so, I feel that this amendment would just underline the message the Iraqi leadership has clearly already received, accepted, and shares; that America's military commitment to Iraq is not open-ended and unconditional. I fear that it would also send another message to our terrorist enemies and to the sectarian militias in Iraq that America is not prepared to see this fight through until the Iraqis themselves can take over. That will actually encourage the terrorists to accelerate their cruel and inhumane attacks, and it will unsettle the sectarian groups to hunker down and rearm their militias to strengthen themselves for the civil war that they feel will follow a premature American retreat. And that might well create conditions that none of us want, which is to say chaos and civil war in Iraq, regional war in the Middle East, and the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11 being able to claim victory in Iraq and going on, emboldened, to attack us again here at home and to bring their terrorism to more Arab countries in the Middle East.

That is why I said the war in Iraq, however one thinks we got there, is now a war of necessity, a war we must help the people of Iraq to win or the security of we, the people of America, our children and grandchildren will be gravely endangered.

Section 2 on page 4 of the amendment which the Senator from Michigan introduced says:

The current open-ended commitment of United States forces in Iraq is unsustainable.

As I have said, our commitment is not and should not be open-ended. It is conditional on the Iraqis working hard to move themselves forward together on the path to self-government and self-defense and, in fact, as the amendment states, they are doing. And this conditional commitment of ours to them is surely militarily sustainable and must be honored.

The failure to do so I believe would have terrible consequences for our credibility in the world and our success in the long conflict ahead against the radical Islamist terrorists who declared war against us and much of the rest of the world during the 1990s and carried out a brutal act of war against our people on September 11, 2001.

We cannot and must not concede any battlefield to our enemies in this most unconventional but deadly serious war.

I do not think it is an overstatement to say that our freedom and security and that of most of the rest of the world, Muslim and non-Muslim, depends now, as it has at critical moments in the past, on American persistence and fortitude in this painful, awful, essential worldwide war.

For these reasons, I will respectfully oppose the Levin amendment and the amendment introduced by Senators KERRY and FEINGOLD.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will say to my good friend and colleague—and my remarks are not predicated on the fact in all likelihood that he will cast a vote which will be supportive of the views that this Senator and others on this side of the aisle have stated, but I say out of the long time that we have worked together to those Senators who may not remember it that I was tasked to draw up the first resolution in the Gulf War when George Bush, Sr., was President. The Senator from Connecticut stepped up and joined me. It was known as the Warner-Lieberman amendment at that time.

Subsequently, when the second resolution was to be drawn up, I again was joined by Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator BAYH. The four of us drew that one up.

He has been on the Senate Armed Services Committee these many years that he has served in the Senate, and he has shown tremendous leadership. And each day he grows in stature as a statesman and his stature as a knowledgeable person regarding the security interests of this country.

As they exist today and in the future—when I say “in the future,” for our children and grandchildren—they acknowledge their appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut for his wisdom.

The remainder of time under my control I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, first, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Virginia. If I could, I would like to also associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with him wholeheartedly. They were incredibly articulately made and hits on all of the relevant points as to why these two amendments should be defeated.

I actually want to talk about a different debate which has been brewing on the floor of the Senate for over 3 years. That is the debate as to the reasons why we entered into a war in Iraq in the first place. There was some information released today that I think sheds some light as to the facts relating to what the conditions were in Iraq prior to our commencing the Iraq war.

The essential nature of the decision that we made at the time when we had

to decide whether to go to war with Iraq was based on many factors. Colin Powell laid them out at the United Nations. One was that Saddam had possessed and had used biological and chemical weapons on his people and that he had biological. That is indisputable.

The second was that he had an active WMD program. And we have the Iraqi Survey Group which published the Delta Report. It was very clear in the Delta Report that, in fact, there was ongoing research at the time of the Iraq war, and if that research of those sanctions were lifted it could have quickly turned into a full-fledged biological and chemical warfare capability.

In fact, the Delta Report mentioned that they could, postsanctions, reconstitute anthrax and an anthrax program in 4 weeks.

So he already used chemical weapons and had chemical weapons research that could quickly be transitioned into programs.

The one aspect that has been in question or which most Americans find—and certainly many have spoken on the floor of the Senate—was whether at the time of the Iraq war back in 2003 Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction. That was always the claim—that he had not gotten rid of his weapons of mass destruction and potentially produced additional weapons of mass destruction.

Up until today, the general perception of the American public—and certainly Members in this Chamber—was that there were no such weapons of mass destruction.

In fact, today on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Rhode Island said, “We have heard the initial defense of the approach to Iraq as we are going after weapons of mass destruction. They were not there.”

The senior Senator from Connecticut said, “If I had known then what I now know, namely that Saddam Hussein possessed no weapons of mass destruction, I would not have given the President my vote.”

The senior Senator from Washington said, “We have looked for weapons of mass destruction and found none.”

Let me follow up these quotes with quotes from an unclassified version of a document released 3 hours ago coming from the National Ground Intelligence Center, a part of the Department of Defense. It is a summary of a classified document which I have had the opportunity to take a look at.

The document's key points in the unclassified version are as follows:

Since 2003, coalition forces have recovered approximately 500 weapons, munitions which contain degraded mustard or sarin nerve agents. Despite many efforts to locate and destroy Iraq's pregulf war chemical munitions, filled and unfilled pregulf war chemical munitions are assessed and still exist.

That means that in addition to the 500 that we have recovered, there are additional munitions.

The report goes into great detail as to what those munitions are. There are additional munitions that we have not categorized and identified specifically in number or in character.

Back to the document:

Pre-gulf war Iraq chemical weapons could be sold on the black market. Use of these weapons by terrorists or insurgent groups would have implications for coalition forces in Iraq. The possibility of use outside of Iraq cannot be ruled out. The most likely munitions remaining are sarin- and mustard-filled projectiles. The purity of the agents inside the munitions depend on many factors, including the manufacturing process, potential additives, and environmental storage conditions. While agents degrade over time, chemical warfare agents remain hazardous and potentially lethal. It has been reported in the open press that insurgents in Iraqi groups desire to acquire and use chemical weapons.

This is an incredibly significant document.

We now have a lot from our intelligence agencies that said we have recovered 500 chemical weapons and that there are a number of others.

It is hopeful that we can, in fact, get that number and that information out.

But the bottom line is, irrespective of whether there were any others, the fact that we recovered 500 and the fact that there are a likelihood of others to recover, maybe from Iraq, maybe from other places around the Middle East, suggests that Saddam Hussein did have weapons of mass destruction.

One of the principal concerns that we had in going into this war against terror, or terrorists as it has been defined, was that Saddam would not necessarily use chemical weapons or biological weapons against his neighbors again or against us, but, more importantly, that he would have these stockpiles of weapons to give to terrorists to use against us or to use against others. Now we have information that confirms that some 500, and likely more, weapons were, in fact, in Iraq at the time of the Iraq war.

The quotes that there were no chemical weapons, that the President lied, that all of this was a fabrication of neocons who wanted to go to war, is now—if it was not, in my mind, discredited from the other information we have gotten—is now, in my mind, completely discredited. He had chemical weapons before the gulf war. He used them after the gulf war. He used them during the Iran-Iraq war. They had weapons programmed in place at the time of the second gulf war, the Iraq conflict. And we now have found stockpiles.

The Duelfer report said there were no stockpiles. We have now found 500. You want to call that a stockpile? Five hundred is a lot of chemical weapons. We handed out a video upstairs, Congressman HOEKSTRA and I—who has been tremendously helpful in gathering this information and having this report, first finding the report and declassifying portions of it—he handed out information that showed an attack of the Iraqis using 15 sarin chemical

weapon shells like the ones recovered here that killed 5,000 people.

This is a serious and important document. This is a serious and important step in understanding what Iraq was all about when we, in fact, commenced military activities against them. It is an important finding to determine what our actions need to be going forward in making sure we rid this country of the chemical weapons that still may be available, as was mentioned, potentially on the black market.

I thank Congressman HOEKSTRA. I asked for this document from the National Ground Intelligence Center 2½ months ago. It took 2 months of going nowhere before I contacted Congressman HOEKSTRA. He, by the way, was not aware of this document, either. He was able to get this document and we were able to look at it. Several Members in the Senate and the House have reviewed the document. It is up in the Intelligence rooms. I encourage Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle to go up and view the document. It is a classification that all Members can review the entire document. Please go up, take a look at it. If you do not believe the statements or you do not think the statements are compelling enough, I encourage you to go up and read the entire classified report. It is very compelling. It is a very serious situation.

The bottom line is, the statements that Saddam Hussein at the time of the second gulf war, the Iraq war, had no weapons of mass destruction is now categorically untrue. This report puts that to rest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). The Senator from California.

The Senator from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WARNER. I yield back the remaining 2 minutes I have under my control. The order provides for 30 minutes for the distinguished Senator from California, to be followed by 20 minutes from the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia.

I come to the Senate tonight with a tremendous sense of loss for the victims of the tragic war in Iraq. Yesterday, the military informed two California families that their sons were murdered in cold blood by the very same Iraqi troops they had been training.

Let me repeat that: The military informed two California families whose sons were in the National Guard that their sons were murdered in cold blood by the very same Iraqi troops they were training.

Sgt. Patrick McCaffrey and 1LT Andre Tyson were killed near Balad 2 years ago. After 2 long years, the Army is now telling the families that Iraqi troops who their sons had been training turned on them and intentionally killed them.

This morning, the mother of Sergeant McCaffrey appeared on CNN and said:

Patrick was never at ease and he constantly said, "Mom, we're risking our life every day, all the time, permanently."

She told the press that Patrick told his commanding officer twice that he was fired upon by Iraqi troops. He told his dad the same thing and his dad told the press that his commanding officer said, and I quote his dad: "That he should keep his mouth shut."

Mrs. McCaffrey said she wants the story to come out because she believes there are other instances of Iraqi troops turning on our soldiers. This is a story that is all over the news. It is emblematic of what this war is turning into.

This week, we all were devastated to hear of the cruel and savage killing of two United States soldiers who were reportedly tortured in a barbaric fashion. These soldiers were manning a traffic check point when they were captured by insurgents. A third soldier also died in the attack.

Every day we hear of a new tragedy from Iraq. Why? Because more than 3 years ago, our President launched a war that was based on false premises. The administration told the American people that Saddam posed an imminent threat to the United States because of his close ties to al-Qaida and because he had an active nuclear weapons program. The administration's case has unraveled in light of the facts. We have a chance tomorrow to stand up and say no to the status quo. We can do it with two Democratic amendments. We know there was no working relationship between al-Qaida and Saddam, and Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program was dormant.

Just look at the State Department's own document which Senator FEINGOLD talked about. It says clearly when we were attacked by al-Qaida on that fateful day of September 11, there was not one al-Qaida cell in Iraq. Yet those who asked questions about these false premises were dismissed, ridiculed, called unpatriotic, and, in one case, the case of Ambassador Joe Wilson, he actually faced retaliation. The wife of Ambassador Wilson had her identity as a CIA agent exposed. Why? Because Joe Wilson blew the whistle on President Bush's claim that Iraq had sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

Why do I recount Valerie Plame's story? Because it shows just how far the Bush administration and their Republican friends in Congress will go to tarnish and hurt those who see the war differently from them. That is frightening no matter what side of the fence you are on. Imagine going after someone's family because you felt you did not like what the man said. In fact, he told the truth, that there was no truth to the claim that Saddam was seeking yellow cake uranium.

In this debate right now, those same voices are saying that anyone who dis-

agrees with the status quo in Iraq and speaks about an exit strategy for the war is advocating a policy of cut-and-run. Let me be clear, calling for redeployment of our troops out of Iraq is not cut-and-run. It is smart and strategic.

Why is it smart? Because it will give the signal to the Iraqis that they have to stand up and protect their own country.

Why is it strategic? Because it will allow us to use our resources to go after al-Qaida, Osama bin Laden.

Let's take a look at the status quo. The status quo in Iraq is an endless venture with ever-changing missions that has resulted in more than 2,500 United States deaths and 18,000 wounded. It is a blank check and a blind eye.

I have a chart that shows the costs. This is showing what this President calls "progress" and his Republican friends in Congress call progress. Let's look at the facts. The monthly cost of the Iraq war in 2003 was \$4.4 billion a month. It is now \$8 billion a month. It is causing our debt to soar. It is not being paid for in the usual way: It is put right on Uncle Sam's credit card and our grandchildren will pay the bill, maybe even their children.

The estimated number of insurgents in 2003, 3,000; estimated in 2006, 20,000. Is that progress in Iraq? I don't think so.

Insurgent attacks in 2003, 5 a day; now, 90 a day. Is that progress? I don't think so.

Incidents of sectarian violence, 5 per month; now it is 250 per month.

If that is progress, then we are in serious, serious trouble—more trouble than I think we are in.

How about Iraqis. Are they optimistic about the future? In 2003, 75 percent were optimistic. Do you know what the number is today? Thirty percent. These figures come from the Brookings Institution.

There are claims that the status quo is "progress," when actually the status quo is a disaster. The war is taking a heavy toll on our fighting men and women, many of whom are serving their third tour of duty. Suicides are up.

In 2005, 83 United States Army soldiers committed suicide, an increase of 16 suicides over the 67 reported the year before, and the highest number since 90 were recorded in 1993. Of those 83 soldiers, 25 had been deployed to either Afghanistan or Iraq.

Divorces are up. Where are the family values around this place? Between 2001 and 2004, divorces among Active-Duty Army personnel have doubled. Divorces have doubled. That is the weight of this war. And post-traumatic stress disorder is rampant. A study published in the July 2004 New England Journal of Medicine revealed that 15 percent of marines and 17 percent of soldiers surveyed after deployment in Iraq "met the screening criteria for major depression, generalized anxiety, or post traumatic stress disorder."

Our military men and women have done every single thing we have asked of them—even without a plan to anticipate the insurgency. Even without adequate body armor, even without enough up-armored humvees, here is what this administration has asked our fighting men and women to do: find the weapons of mass destruction, find Saddam Hussein and bring him to justice, find Saddam's family and bring them to justice, secure Iraq for elections—there have been three elections, successful, there—train Iraqi troops—there are now 260,000 of those Iraqi troops trained.

In light of all that our military has done—and they have paid the price in blood, in lost limbs, in pain and suffering and death—what are the Iraqi leaders saying? They have proposed amnesty for those who have killed American soldiers. The amnesty plan would include insurgents who have staged attacks against Americans—even as those attacks continue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a front-page story from the L.A. Times that ran this past weekend.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 18, 2006]

AMNESTY FOR IRAQI REBELS IS PLANNED

(By Borzou Daragahi)

The Iraqi government has crafted a far-reaching amnesty plan for insurgents, officials close to Prime Minister Nouri Maliki said Saturday, even as guerrillas killed at least 34 Iraqis in a barrage of bombs and rockets in the capital and the U.S. military hunted for two missing soldiers.

The Americans may have been captured after an attack Friday evening on a checkpoint south of Baghdad that left at least one soldier dead, the military said.

U.S. forces dispatched helicopters and surveillance planes over the area as well as teams of divers to scour the river and nearby canals for the missing soldiers.

The amnesty plan, which apparently would include insurgents alleged to have staged attacks against Americans and Iraqis, calls for the creation of a national committee and local subcommittees to woo rebels and begin a "truthful national dialogue in dealing with contradicting visions and stances," according to a version of the plan published Saturday in an Iraqi newspaper.

The reconciliation plan, which is expected to be formally announced soon, would be among the Iraqi government's most comprehensive attempts to engage with insurgent groups.

"The main thing," said Haidar Abadi, a leader of Maliki's Islamic Dawa Party, is that the plan doesn't rule out participation of "the bloody-handed people in the political process."

The plan, mysteriously released and rescinded by the prime minister's office last week, calls for the pardon and release of prisoners "not proven guilty in crimes and clear terrorist activities" and a review of the process by which former members of Saddam Hussein's Baath Party are excluded from public life.

U.S. and some Iraqi officials have long urged Sunni insurgent groups that don't have strong ties to the former regime's security apparatus or to foreign militants—and without the blood of innocent Iraqis on their

hands—to lay down their weapons and join the political process.

The new proposal, said an official close to Maliki, merely recognizes the difficulty of verifying insurgents' past actions.

"Theoretically, we can say we cannot give any amnesty to those in the [former] security agencies and those in Saddam's regime and those who have killed and bombed Iraqis after the invasion," said Salah Abdul Razzaq, a spokesman for several prominent Shiite religious organizations.

"In practice, anyone who comes to negotiations and says, 'I have no problem with Iraqis or Iraqi government, just with U.S. forces,' how can we check that?"

Some Kurdish and Shiite members of parliament, which is scheduled to convene today, voiced doubts about Maliki's reconciliation proposal.

"We think that any reconciliation talks should take place within parliament," said Baha Araj, a Shiite lawmaker close to radical cleric Muqtada Sadr's movement. "We don't need groups from outside—I mean the Saddamists, Baathists and killers."

But officials close to Maliki said the plan was days away from being formally announced.

A version of the amnesty plan—titled the "Reconciliation and National Dialogue Project"—was published in Saturday's edition of Al Mada newspaper. Copies were distributed to journalists and then quickly taken back at an abruptly canceled news conference Thursday at Maliki's office.

Abadi said the incident was a minor mix-up caused by inexperienced members of the prime minister's media office.

"It doesn't mean that the project of reconciliation was withdrawn, but that it was given more time for a consensus to be reached," said Abbas Bayati, a leading Shiite lawmaker. "We are ready to sit around a table with all the Iraqis, even those who participated in the resistance and now repent that."

It was unclear whether any amnesty plan would require legislative approval or be adopted by executive decision.

Sunni Arabs lead the Iraqi insurgency, which is fueled by the minority sect's perception that it was unjustly robbed of political power and prestige by the 2003 U.S.-led invasion and the Shiite-dominated governments that followed. Incessant insurgent attacks have sparked reprisals by Shiites and brought the country to the precipice of civil war.

Sunni Arabs said they were far more encouraged by the Maliki government's olive branches than those of his predecessor, fellow Islamic Dawa Party member Ibrahim Jafari, viewed by many as too sectarian in his outlook.

The death this month of terrorist leader Abu Musab Zarqawi opened a new opportunity to draw in Iraqi insurgent groups, Sunni officials said.

"The general direction and general understanding among politicians is that now is the time to differentiate between the extremists and foreign fighters on one side and the native Iraqi people in the resistance," said Alaa Makki, a leading member of the Iraqi Islamic Party, the main Sunni Arab political group.

"We think now there might be a reevaluation from A to Z among the Iraqi population," he said. "I think Maliki is going along with these ideas."

But the violence showed no signs of abating Saturday. Dozens of Iraqis were killed in a series of insurgent attacks targeting Iraqi security forces in Baghdad despite a highly publicized crackdown meant to bolster public confidence in the government.

At least seven large explosions rocked the capital. In the day's most deadly incident, a

car bomb explosion at 8 p.m. in a busy market in southwest Baghdad killed 12 people and injured 381 police said.

An earlier car bomb targeting a police patrol killed seven people and injured 11, hospital officials said.

A roadside bombing in downtown Baghdad killed six people and wounded 15.

In central Baghdad a car bomb targeting an Iraqi army patrol killed three civilians and a soldier and injured eight soldiers and four police officers.

A bomb placed inside a passenger bus killed at least two civilians and injured 151 police said.

In the northern suburb of Kadimiya mortar rounds landed on a busy market, killing at least two people and injuring 14.

An explosion killed a man in west Baghdad hospital officials said.

The search for the missing U.S. soldiers was underway near the Euphrates River town of Yousifiya south of Baghdad. U.S. forces launched raids on four sites, questioned local leaders and set up roadblocks around the area, presumably to prevent assailants from taking the soldiers elsewhere.

"We are using all available assets, coalition and Iraqi, ground, air and water, to locate and determine the duty status of our soldiers, Maj. Gen. William B. Caldwell IV said in a news release.

The attack Friday evening took place in a religiously mixed area south of the capital known as a stronghold of militants loyal to extremist religious groups, including Zarqawi's Al Qaeda in Iraq.

U.S.-led forces at a nearby checkpoint began radioing their colleagues after they heard an explosion and small-arms fire but could not make contact.

Backup forces sent to the checkpoint discovered the dead U.S. soldier and learned that two were missing, the military said.

Mrs. BOXER. It says: The premier is crafting a reconciliation program that "doesn't rule out participation of 'the bloody-handed people in the political process.'"

What happened when we brought up a resolution on this side of the aisle to say, no, no, we will not allow that to happen? What happened? The Republicans stalled us for 2, 3 days, figuring out a way they could get us to back down. But we did not back down.

I cannot believe it. They are still killing our soldiers, and the Republicans in the Senate are saying: Oh, give the Iraqi Government a chance. In their wisdom, they will do the right thing. Well, they are not doing the right thing when they are considering giving amnesty to those who are hurting, killing, brutalizing our troops. I cannot believe it.

And in light of all that I have laid out, what does our President say? He says: I will not allow us to leave until everything is absolutely perfect in Iraq. He does not know when that is. He is not even willing to talk about conditions that would be enough to bring our troops home. It is kind of like: Well, we will know it when we see it. Well, that is not enough for the American people. When the President said, "mission accomplished," it was not true. And when he says now, we can make this work, we can have a country at peace, we can do all this, and we just have to stay there as long as it takes—blank check. Open checkbook, America. Open checkbook for

you. Debts on your children, debts on your grandchildren, and a blind eye to what is happening and what the Iraqi people want.

What kind of leadership is that? You think I like standing up here and getting into this kind of debate? No, I do not. But I have never seen anything like this since the Vietnam war, folks. I lived through those years. That was the reason I got into politics, so we would not make this mistake again.

Senate Democrats are providing real leadership. Do we all agree every inch of the way? No. But I predict to you, at the end of this vote, tomorrow, Republicans will be firm for the status quo, and Democrats will be for changing the mission, changing the dynamic. And that is going to be important for the American people to know.

As I said, redeploying our troops is smart and strategic, and here is why. Again, it is smart and strategic because the Iraqis must stand up to the job of providing security for their own people. My goodness, that is what countries do, folks. That is what countries do. We did it. Yes, we had people help us in the Revolution. By the way, France was one of those countries. But when the fighting was over, we had the boots on the ground. The Iraqi people have to stand up. They have to want democracy as much as we want it for them.

And I will tell you, we should start concentrating on the war against terror. My friends on the other side blend it all together. They blend it all together. But I have already proven to you there was not one al-Qaida cell in Iraq on 9/11. The State Department's own documents show it. There were more al-Qaida cells in America than there were in Iraq. But our presence there is fueling the insurgency completely.

Let me tell you what Peter Bergen has stated. He is an expert. He is an expert on terrorism. He has written books about it. He says this:

What we have done in Iraq is what bin Laden could not have hoped for in his wildest dreams: We invaded an oil rich Muslim nation in the heart of the Middle East, the very type of imperial adventure that bin Laden has long predicted was the United States' long term goal in the region. We deposed the secular socialist Saddam, whom bin Laden has long despised, ignited Sunni and Shia fundamentalist fervor in Iraq, and have now provoked a defensive jihad that has galvanized jihad minded Muslims around the world. It's hard to imagine a set of policies better designed to sabotage the war on terrorism.

Now, I have spoken with many generals and military experts who agree that our long-term presence in Iraq is counterproductive. They tell us that our continued presence will continue to breed terrorists not only in Iraq but throughout the world.

Now, I want to show you, as I wind down this speech, how the Iraqi people now feel about our presence. The Brookings Institution revealed this poll. It was just printed in the press a

few days ago. If this does not tell the story, nothing does.

Eighty-seven percent of the Iraqis support a timeline for U.S. redeployment. Eighty-seven percent of the Iraqi people want us out of there and want a timeline specifically. By the way, this is one thing that unites all the groups there. Sixty-four percent of the Kurds want a timeline for U.S. redeployment. Ninety percent of the Shias want a timeline for U.S. redeployment. Ninety-four percent of the Sunnis want a timeline for U.S. redeployment.

So you tell me how it makes sense, at a time when we are learning that the Iraqis, whom we are training, have, in at least two cases we know about, turned against our soldiers, who are risking their lives—shot them in cold blood. For what? They are there to help the Iraqi people, and they are being killed.

I have to say that the status quo is leading us deeper and deeper into a place we don't want to be as a country. The American people want an exit strategy. An exit strategy is not cut-and-run; it is smart and strategic. The status quo is more of the same. How many more times will we come down here and talk about beheadings? How many more times will we come down? How many more deaths will it take until finally we say enough is enough?

That time, I hope, is coming. I think we are going to see votes on these two Democratic amendments that, when taken together, will indicate a real difference here between the parties.

Listen to what the Iraqi people are saying. Listen to what the American people are saying. Listen to what the world is saying. The views of the United States by people all over the world are going down. In the last year alone, favorable views of the United States dropped in Spain, from 41 percent to 23 percent approval; in Indonesia, from 38 percent down to 30 percent; in Turkey, from 23 percent to 12 percent; and in India—India is considered one of our best friends—it has gone from 71 percent down to 56 percent. This does not make us stronger in the world; it makes us weaker. This does not make us safer in the world; it makes us more vulnerable.

I believe in democracy. So let us look at what the Iraqi people are telling us they want. They want a timeline and want us out. Let's listen to the generals who have told us that our long-term presence is fueling the insurgency and we need to get out. Let's listen to the American people who are wise and love our troops and say it is time for an exit strategy.

Folks, we are paralyzed. We are paralyzed here. It is like we are in a hole and we can't get out. Well, I say today is the day to start climbing out of that hole. Senate Democrats have proposed two ways to change the dynamics here in this war.

I plan to vote aye for the Kerry-Feingold-Boxer amendment. It speaks to me as something that will work for us.

It is strategic. It is wise. It is smart. I will also vote for the Levin amendment because it moves us in the right direction. It shakes up the mission into something that makes sense. It changes the mission. It starts bringing our troops home and starts to redeploy them.

So my feeling is, the status quo is a disaster. It is a disaster. Let us open our eyes to the truth. Can you imagine how I felt when I got a call in my office by a woman who couldn't find out the truth about who killed her son? And the military had completed its investigation, and they knew her son was killed by the very same Iraqi soldiers whom he was training. And they kept it a secret? They kept it a secret until today from that woman. I have to say, why? Is it because they are fearful that when the American people learn of this, the support for this war will plummet even further? I don't know the answer to that question. But so far, I have no good answers. It worried me with Mr. Tillman, Patrick Tillman, in Afghanistan, when they said he was killed by the enemy, and the parents pressed on and pressed on, and it turned out to be friendly fire.

I am telling you, my colleagues, this is a turning point for us as individual Senators. I hope we have the courage to say no to the status quo, support the Kerry-Feingold-Boxer alternative, and also support the Levin alternative because they both shake it up and say, once and for all, we need to talk about an exit strategy. In the end, that is going to be the road for success.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, today the Senate is debating two amendments on Iraq. The first amendment has been offered by Senator LEVIN. It is a nonbinding sense of the Congress that clearly illustrates that there must be a change in our policy toward Iraq. It states that it is neither in the American nor the Iraqi interest to maintain an open-ended commitment of large numbers of our troops.

Some may challenge this idea and stubbornly maintain that we must stay the course, no matter the cost or the consequences. I would point these critics to the op-ed which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, written by Iraq's National Security Adviser. Here is what he said: "The eventual removal of coalition troops from Iraqi streets will help the Iraqis, who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be" and that "the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people."

The distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, has crafted a good amendment which I will support. We need a change in our Iraq policy.

Senator LEVIN has put his finger directly on the key issues facing our continued military occupation of Iraq.

The second amendment which is being debated is an amendment by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY. His amendment proposes that American troops be redeployed from Iraq no later than July 1, 2007. Senator KERRY should be commended for offering his amendment. It is an important amendment, and it deserves a full debate. It directly addresses the most pressing issue facing the American people today.

Last week the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, offered an amendment similar to that of Senator KERRY's. It was offered up as a sacrificial lamb, and a procedural motion was made to either kill the amendment or to continue debating it. I was one of six Senators who voted to continue debate on that amendment.

Some may seek to ascribe my vote as a vote for the substance of Senator MCCONNELL's amendment. But I shall speak for myself. As I have told Senator KERRY, my vote was not for the substance of Senator MCCONNELL's amendment. My vote was to continue debate on the most important issue in our country today. My vote was in favor of the institution of the U.S. Senate, a temple of debate and free speech.

Some may seek to hide from the controversial issue of Iraq, but I will not seek to hide from it. We Senators are sent by the people of our States to debate the critical issues facing our country, not to hide from them. My vote was in the minority on that procedural motion, but I stand by my vote which was in favor of debate on the momentous subject of Iraq.

The amendment the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY, offers will likely be voted on tomorrow, and I have spoken to Senator KERRY about the substance of his amendment. I know he is seeking a change in the administration's policy toward Iraq, which is acknowledged by most Americans to be a disaster. And he should be saluted for his courage in insisting on offering his amendment, even though he will be criticized—and perhaps even called unpatriotic by some—for speaking his mind. However, I cannot support the substance of his amendment.

I do not support setting a drop-dead withdrawal date for our troops from Iraq. I do not believe that this is a wise policy. I have called time and time again for the President to begin bringing our troops home. Our troops cannot be brought home overnight.

I also have concerns that this amendment is not strongly tied to the constitutional powers of Congress relating to the conduct of war.

So for these reasons, for as much as I support his efforts to make a change in an ill-defined, open-ended, stay-the-course policy in Iraq, I will not support the amendment by the distinguished

Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY.

But there are other ways to effect a change in direction. So I rise today to ask that I may be given time to offer another amendment on Iraq.

There is an urgent need for the U.S. Senate to consider as many options as we can to find an exit strategy with honor for our troops. Our country is polarized. The Senate is polarized. And I fear that we have let the usual partisan warfare put blinders, such as we put on horses, on ourselves and on our purpose.

Every Member in this body, I am sure, would like to see a successful end to the war in Iraq. Every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle would like to do something that would speed the return of our troops home to the loving arms of their families.

All of us, regardless of party affiliation, want to do the best thing for our country. And we would all do well to remember that both the President, the Chief Executive, and the Congress have important roles to play when it comes to the most critical decisions that can be made by any government; namely, the decision to go to war and the decision to come home from war.

The American people are dismayed, as they should be, by this conflict in Iraq. I voted against our entry into that war. I voted against the invasion of that country without any provocation toward our country.

Most assuredly, dozens of mistakes have been made and billions of dollars have been spent. Without a doubt, our international reputation has been damaged, and we are losing the support of our own people for a drawn-out commitment in Iraq and more and more loss of precious blood, precious life.

Can we not try one more approach? Can we not? Can we not spend just a little more time on the consideration of a way out of Iraq? Can we not? Can we not? Can we not attempt to speak with one voice on the matter? Is that asking too much?

I have a third way. This is a fresh approach, I believe. It returns Congress's rightful voice to the warmaking power, yet it avoids the pitfalls of usurping the executive branch's role in an ongoing war. It is respectful of the separation of powers, but it does outline a viable exit strategy for Iraq.

The amendment I would like to offer, the amendment I would like to see debated on the Senate floor, is an effort to move the debate over the war in Iraq away from the realm of political mudslinging to the realm of constitutional responsibility.

My amendment is a simple, straightforward approach to laying out a roadmap to bring our troops home from Iraq with honor and dignity, the honor and the dignity which they deserve.

My amendment establishes the policy that the democratically elected Government of Iraq should assume responsibility for its own security. My amendment sets forth the conditions

under which the congressional authority to maintain U.S. troops in Iraq would expire.

This amendment is a genuinely fresh approach to unraveling the conundrum of how to disengage the U.S. military from Iraq. My approach does not attempt to micromanage the war. It is not an attempt to set artificial deadlines. It is not based on politically motivated rhetoric. It does not preempt the authority of either the President or the Congress. What it does do is it returns the focus of the debate to the role of Congress in the authorization of war. What my amendment does do is to reassert—yes, reassert—the role of Congress to authorize—or to terminate the authorization of—the use of force.

The conditions under which the Iraq use of force authorization would expire are based on circumstances, not on timetables, and they include the following: When the Government of Iraq assumes responsibility for its own security; or if a multinational peacekeeping force were to assume responsibility for security in Iraq; or if the President certifies that the United States has achieved its objectives in Iraq; or if Congress were to enact a joint resolution to terminate the use of force authority.

Mr. President, the situation in Iraq has undergone seismic changes since the original use-of-force authorization was granted by Congress in October of 2002. Since that time, our troops have completed the mission of removing Saddam Hussein from power and paving the way for the establishment of a democratically elected government in Iraq. The authorization under which the United States sent its military forces into Iraq—which I voted against—is now painfully outdated. So it is time to update that authorization to provide a statutory framework for returning our troops home, and to acknowledge that the war in Iraq does have an end point and is not an open-ended commitment.

Mr. President, it is most important to understand that the amendment I am proposing speaks only to the intent and authority of Congress. So it does not—hear me now—it does not infringe upon, or in any way usurp, the authority of the President. No Senator has to set aside his or her support or opposition to the war in order to support my approach.

But this amendment would send a powerful message to the people of the United States and to the people of Iraq, and especially to the democratically elected Government of Iraq. It would send the powerful message that the United States supports the security of Iraq but does not intend to become a permanent occupying force in Iraq. This is a message that the people of Iraq need to hear. It is a message that the people of the United States need to hear. It is a message that the people of the United States are clamoring to hear. My amendment is a realistic roadmap for the United States to remove its forces from Iraq in an orderly

manner—a manner consistent with our national security interests. It is a legally enforceable formulation that should be embraced by all who are truly concerned with finding a solution to the problems in Iraq, not just using the debate over the war in Iraq as a political football.

Surely, we owe the over 2,500 patriotic souls who have died fighting for our country in Iraq a little more time on this debate. Surely, we can consider the matter of the conflict in Iraq for a few more hours for the sake of the over 18,000 U.S. troops who have been wounded in that country, and the unknown numbers of Iraqi innocents who have been killed or maimed. Surely, we can discuss this matter on a level that is deeper than sloganeering like “cut and run” or “stay the course.”

Mr. President, I hope our two leaders will work together to find a way for the Senate to debate my amendment and allow a vote on its merits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, what is the time agreement this evening?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is allocated 40 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia, I yield myself as much time as I might consume. We have speakers coming down here and, as they arrive, we will recognize them.

I do want to express my appreciation to Members on both sides who have participated in this debate. We have already had a very spirited debate. There will be others speaking throughout the course of the evening and again tomorrow before we ultimately vote on both of these amendments.

As you know, we have in front of us two amendments. One is a sense of the Senate, a nonbinding resolution, the Levin amendment, and we also have the Kerry amendment, which has a force of law and which would require a withdrawal from Iraq by next summer.

As we consider and contemplate both of those amendments, I know there are strong emotions that Members on both sides feel with respect to this issue, and clearly for good reason. I know in my own particular circumstance, as I travel South Dakota, I hear from people all across my State. I have participated, as many Senators have, in way too many funerals and have heard the playing of taps way too many times in the last year. It is that sentiment I think that makes people in this country very weary regarding the conflict in Iraq and the cost it has brought this country in terms of both blood and treasure. So as we see Members get up and express their thoughts on the Senate floor during the course of this debate, I think they are in many cases reflecting the sentiments of their constituents in their States, as well.

Generally speaking, I think a sense that people have across the country is

one of weariness with this conflict in Iraq. At the same time, I think we have to recognize what the stakes are in this debate and what the risks are as well. Clearly, as we have, I think, articulated—Members on our side—throughout the course of this debate, the stakes are high and the consequences of failure are disastrous for our country if we fail in this campaign in Iraq.

I have to say that, like many Members here, I have traveled to Iraq on a couple of different occasions. I was there as recently as a couple of months ago with Senator MCCAIN, as well as with the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, and a number of our Governors and House Members, representing different regions of the country. I had been there a year earlier and, of course, in the course of that year much had changed. In fact, I would have to say there had been, at that time, some mixed results. We had seen the outbreak of sectarian violence after the bombing of the shrine at Samara. But at the same time, we had seen vast improvements in the ability of the Iraqi security forces to provide for their own security. That, in my mind, was very encouraging because at that time about 75 percent of the battle areas were being policed either by Iraqi armed services or the police force, which was a marked improvement from the time I had been there a year before.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that, by any measure, if you look at any significant metric in the past year or so, we have seen some improvements and progress made in Iraq and I think, in a substantial way, in the broader war on terror. If you look particularly at Iraq, Prime Minister al-Maliki, just in the last couple of weeks, completed the formation of a new Iraqi Government, filling many Cabinet positions. If you look at the success our troops have had in taking out the terrorist leader, Musab al-Zarqawi and many of his allies in just the last few weeks, that is a huge blow to al-Qaida and a huge victory for our side in the war on terror.

As I said earlier, the Iraqi security forces are growing in number every single day. Only a year and a half ago, Iraqi security forces had just begun to form. Today, there are 264,400 trained and equipped Iraqi security forces, which is more than double the number of U.S. troops who are serving in the region.

The beginning of this year, 2006, the Iraqi security forces had 10 brigades and 43 battalions that controlled areas of responsibility. Here, only a few months later, those numbers are nearly doubled to 18 brigades and 71 battalions. Large- and small-scale water treatment facilities have been rehabilitated or constructed for an estimated 3 million people at a standard level of service, with plans underway to deliver clean, safe drinking water to 5 million more. May oil production was over 2.1 million barrels per day.

The U.S. Treasury Department is sending professionals to Iraq to provide

technical support for the creation of a public finance system that is accountable and transparent. The State Department is coordinating a broad effort to support an economic policy framework that enhances investments, job creation, and growth.

I have to say that that progress has occurred—and many of my colleagues have spoken in favor of these amendments in spite of the presence of Americans and our troops' efforts—due to and because of the efforts of our troops and their presence there. Contrary to what I have heard some of my colleagues on the other side say throughout the course of this debate, when I was in Iraq, which was as recently as a couple months ago, as I said, the Iraqi political leaders I talked to made it very clear that they thought it was important that we have a presence in Iraq.

I have heard Members get up on the floor and say they have talked to people there and they say they want us out, and they don't want the door to hit us on the way out. But that is certainly not the message that was delivered to me and the delegation I was with when we were there. I also have to say that part of our mission in going there was to impress upon the Iraqi leadership, the political leaders in that country, the importance of forming a national unity government, and to end the sectarianism and the sectarian violence that ravaged that area during the time that we were there. They have made that progress in the last couple of months since our departure from Iraq. They have formed this national unity government, and they continue to make progress toward what I believe is a democracy inclusive of the Shiites, the Sunnis, the Kurds, and the various groups over there that are all struggling to come together behind a government and to be able to assume responsibility for their own governance and also for their own security.

It seems to me at least that right now it would not be a good signal to send either to them or to our men and women who are fighting the good fight in Iraq that we intend to pull out at any particular time certain. It seems, just as a matter of policy, what we are simply doing when we do that is telegraphing to the terrorists our intentions, and they will just wait us out, that we are going to leave at some point and they will be able to assume control in that region. If there is a vacuum at some point, they will be able to step in and fill it.

I think we are at a strategic turning point, and I think we are at that point due to the good work of the men and women wearing the uniform. We have to listen to what they are saying and what our commanders on the ground are saying. I don't think it is in the best interest of our troops or the overall campaign in Iraq for us to be here in Washington, DC, in a political body such as the Senate—although clearly we have responsibilities with respect to

funding the troops and supporting them, giving them direction, but I don't think we ought to be passing judgment about when is the best time to pull our troops back.

We are moving in a direction that will enable us to do that, and I believe that our commanders have made it clear that as they see the Iraqi military stand up, as the government stands up, it is only a matter of time before our troops will be able to stand down, and we will begin to draw down some of our troop strengths in the region.

I make that point because, as I mentioned earlier, popular support is waning for the conflict and people are weary and they are frustrated as they see lives lost and they see the cost of the war, but at the same time I think they realize we have a mission to complete there. We listen to the people across the country, but it is also important to listen to what the troops are saying.

Whenever I travel, when I go to Iraq, when I listen to troops who have returned from Iraq, when I talk with National Guard units in South Dakota that have been deployed there, and, frankly, even when I discuss with families who have lost loved ones in Iraq their thoughts about the work we are doing there and whether we are making a difference, I consistently ask the questions: Do you believe we are making a difference? Do you believe progress is being made? Do you believe we are doing the right thing?

I try to ask those questions separate from—and especially when I am traveling into Iraq—the structured settings in which I would get a response—I wouldn't say a canned response but a response that might be less than completely forthright. I ask troops in different situations.

I remember when I was in Iraq in Baghdad the last time, I got up early in the morning and went to the fitness center and worked out in the weight room with a lot of our troops and visited, interacted with them, and asked their opinions on issues. Clearly, there is a belief, I think, that the work there is hard, that the work there has been costly, that people would like to be back home with their families but at the same time who understand the stakes of what they are doing and believe profoundly in the mission and the work we are doing at winning the war on terror.

As I said before, I think we have to, as we listen to this debate, keep in mind that the stakes are very high because it is not just about freedom and democracy in Iraq, as good as that objective may be, it is also about, in a broader sense, the national security of future generations of Americans.

I happen to believe that the war on terror is sort of our, as they used to say, rendezvous with destiny, that many generations that have come before have had to battle evil. We had World War II and Nazism and all the

characters of that time who wanted to kill and destroy and maim people. And since that time we have fought the Cold War. It has taken a certain amount of resolve in every one of those circumstances to prevail. But in either of those circumstances had we not had that resolve, had there not been freedom-loving people and leadership committed to finishing that mission, we could be living in a very different world.

They met, in their generation's time, the challenge that was put before them to make the world a safer and more secure place for future generations. That was true in World War II, that was true in the Cold War, and that is true today in the war on terror. I believe it is our time and our generation's, if you want to call it struggle between good and evil, and we have a responsibility to the people of this country and to freedom-loving people everywhere to make sure we do not fail in succeeding, in winning the war against terror, to ensure that future generations do not have to live in constant fear, in constant threat, and perhaps dealing with thugs such as al-Zarqawi and others who want to do evil and want to kill, want to destroy, and have nothing but the worst of intentions for the people of this country and people elsewhere around the world.

Mr. President, this amendment will be voted on tomorrow. I know the Senator from Massachusetts has time to talk about his amendment later. And the Levin amendment will also be voted on. I appreciate and believe it is appropriate for us to have this debate, especially in the context of the Defense authorization bill, where we are debating national security. This is a debate we have every year. I think it is very appropriate to have this discussion.

I don't question the motivations or intentions of people who bring these amendments; I think just in terms of their judgment, it is wrong. I don't think we can telegraph to our enemies what our strategies are. I believe it is important we complete the mission, that we listen to those commanders, those generals, those troops on the ground day in and day out, fighting the good fight, trying to protect our citizens in this country and around the world and future generations from what I believe is a very real, very serious threat to our security as we go forward.

Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Kansas is on the floor. I will be happy, if he is prepared at this time to make his remarks, to yield such time to him as he may consume. We have others who will be joining us in the Chamber. I, at this time, yield to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from South Dakota for yielding time to me on this very important topic that we are dealing with today, and I also thank my

colleagues from Massachusetts and from Michigan for raising these issues.

As Senator THUNE was stating, this is an important debate. It is time we had this debate. It is the right vehicle for us to have this debate, and I think it is helpful for us to have this debate for the United States as we move forward.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, can I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 25½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, it is time we had this debate and time we had this debate in front of the people of the United States and in front of the world. Rest assured that the terrorists are watching this debate. Those who seek harm for us in Iraq and in many regions of the world are watching this debate, and they are testing and sensing our sense of resolve or lack of resolve in this war on terrorism.

They are very much playing off us and saying the weakness of the United States is its willingness to stay the course or its lack of resolve or the shifting of public opinion, and that is what they drive at more than anything else, seeing that the weakest part of the U.S. military is public opinion, U.S. public opinion, so that our forces are not defeated on the battlefield. We have lost valiant soldiers, but we win the battles. What they are targeting is weakening U.S. public opinion and U.S. resolve. That is what they are targeting with the attacks, with the IEDs, with the roadside bombs. It is not going force on force and saying: OK, we are going to drive Americans out of this portion of Iraq; we are going to keep them out of this particular area. Much of it is saying: Look, we know the United States. We know they are a democracy. They respond to public opinion. What we have to do is have this be costly enough to the United States in American blood that public opinion shifts and they pull away. And once they leave, we take over. So their actual target is U.S. public opinion.

We need to disappoint the terrorists on that particular issue, that U.S. public opinion and U.S. resolve remains in place to see this through.

We are in a decades-long struggle with terrorism. It had been going on since before we had the attack on 9/11. It had been going on for a decade prior to that. We had the attack on Khobar Towers. We had the USS *Cole* attack. We had two embassies in Africa attacked. Hit, hit, hit, and ineffective, feckless responses on our part I think further emboldened the terrorists to take this even further. Hit, no response; hit, ineffective response; hit, ineffective response; and then 9/11, and after that, there was no way you were going to stop the United States from responding. We said: Look, that is it, we are going and we are going to deal with this. We went into Afghanistan, the headquarters. And after that we said: Where else are terrorists working out of? And the war effort moved to Iraq.

Let's look at it from the point of view of the terrorists. I think they misjudged us in thinking we wouldn't respond. We did respond, and we responded aggressively and we responded effectively. We sent a very strong message. But now if we pull out or if we set a timeframe for pulling out that says just wait a definite period of time, 1 year, wait that period of time and the United States starts pulling back, how do the terrorist groups read that?

My colleague from Massachusetts would have a certain point of view on that; maybe others would, my colleague from Michigan. I respect the motivation. I am delighted we are having this debate. It is important we have this debate with our Nation and with the world now.

The conclusions I draw from this are different. If we set timeframes, it says to them that they have us where they want, and they can start declaring victory in their own words saying: Look, we have them down; in a year's period of time, they are gone; all we have to do is wait that period of time.

We have to see this through to a successful conclusion. That does not mean, in any respect whatsoever, that I oppose us repositioning troops, pulling down the number of troops in Iraq or taking our troops away from the Sunni Triangle and handing more of that over to the Iraqis. It seems to me that our timeframes, as set by our military leaders—as set by the military leaders—that they would be the ones to recommend saying it is time we can pull troop levels down.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Not now. I have limited time, and I want to make this statement, if I may. That we can, at the appointment of our military leaders, start pulling our troops away from the Sunni Triangle so we can have the Iraqis taking over more and more of the security in more dangerous areas. I think that is an important thing for us to say here in this debate as well, that in opposing setting a timeframe for pulling out, we are not opposing changing tactics, or if our military leaders say it is time, we can start pulling troops down, let's do it. I want that to take place. But it should be the military leaders doing this, without the dictates of us saying here that we are just going to set an arbitrary timeframe for us to pull on out of this region. I think it sends the exact wrong signal, particularly at this point in time when we have momentum that we have gained and we have an Iraqi government in place.

Frankly, through the help of this debate, we are sending a message to the Iraqi people and their government that the United States is not in this for an unlimited period of time. We do expect the Iraqis to step up. You have to step up in taking more of this on and moving more of this forward. I think this should be done on our working with and listening to the military leaders of

what they would say would be the right route for us to go on this and not us setting an arbitrary date.

This has been, in my estimation, a very good debate to have. But I think it is important at the end of the debate that we have a very strong and clear vote on this that we are staying, and we are going to see this through to the end. We are not dictating to the military leadership an arbitrary time period, and we are going to win this war on terrorism, period, and that we have the resolve to win this war on terrorism. I think that is important for us to do.

I want to thank my colleague from South Dakota for chairing this debate at this point in time. I do hope that my colleagues join me again tomorrow in voting against this resolution with this timeframe.

Mr. KERRY. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNBACK. If we have time on our side, but I don't know if we have other colleagues wishing to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. The Senator from Kansas, if he wants to yield for a question, I guess that is your prerogative. We have other speakers coming. I am hesitant to allow too much time to burn off the clock.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I would rather reserve the balance of our time for other speakers.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the comments of my colleague from Kansas, because I think he too has laid out very clearly what the stakes are in this debate.

As I said earlier, we will have an opportunity to vote tomorrow on both of these amendments, the Levin amendment, the sense of Congress amendment, and then the Kerry amendment, both of which are directed at some sort of a timeline with respect to the conflict in Iraq. As I mentioned earlier, I think as we have undertaken to allow a very open debate on this, which, as I said before, I think is a good thing to do, particularly in the context of debating the Defense authorization bill, we are hearing from both sides some of the emotion that is felt on this and also some very strong opinions and views but, oftentimes, a different interpretation of the facts.

I think what we need to do in this debate is try and focus on the facts as they exist on the ground and not sometimes as we understand them here from what we read in the press, but we need to rely, in my judgment, on those people who are day in and day out fighting the good fight in the theater. Our commanders, our generals, our troops who are conducting this operation over there are doing the Lord's work, in my opinion, in protecting us from terrorist threats that exist. I dare say, as we look at the type of threat we will face in the future, it seems to me, at least, that the success or failure of the operation in Iraq is going to bear heavily

on whether we are ultimately going to succeed in the war on terror.

People have argued about whether we ought to be in Iraq in the first place, and that is a debate where Members on the other side have said we shouldn't have been there, we shouldn't have gone in the first place. Most who are making that argument are people who supported the resolution to go there, and I think many of those people also realize as well—and I think the vote will reflect this tomorrow—that they have strong misgivings about us pulling out prematurely and putting in jeopardy the good work that has been done by the troops in that region already.

So I expect tomorrow when we have this vote we will see a very strong vote against the Kerry amendment. I think it will reflect, hopefully, the will of this body at this point in time as we are making good progress, I think, at a very important turning point in the war in Iraq, the progress that has been made on the ground both with respect to the Iraqi security forces as well as with the Government of Iraq as it stands up. We want to make sure we are not telegraphing to our enemies that at this very point where we literally have them on their backs, that we are going to let them up and begin to assume many of the things that they were doing in the past: the killings, the planning, the launching of attacks against people not only in that region but elsewhere around the world and, in many cases, people from freedom-loving countries and American citizens. We want to make sure that never happens again.

My colleague from Alabama is here on the floor. Would the Senator from Alabama like to speak on this subject? We are waiting for the Senator from Georgia to arrive. He is not here yet, so if the Senator from Alabama would like to claim some time, I am certainly willing to yield to him. I think we have about 10 minutes left on our side if the Senator from Alabama would like to make some remarks.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I do have some remarks, and I would deliver those after the others have finished their time tonight if it is not too late, and I would just share a few thoughts at this time.

We have been given a great heritage in our country. We have been given a Nation that is the greatest Nation in the world at this time. We have the finest military the world has ever known. We have a great democracy where we have full and vigorous debate.

I was here when we debated the question of whether or not to issue that ultimatum to Saddam Hussein, and we knew then if he didn't accept it, if he didn't allow the inspectors in and if he didn't renounce weapons of mass destruction, we would be going to war, and that was the vote and we knew it and everybody discussed it. It went on for months. People say it was quick. It went on for months.

I will tell you what I said about why we went. I looked back at my remarks. It was not based on primarily weapons of mass destruction. We were dealing with Iraq for years. We had a war with them in 1991, and we defeated them and sent their Army going back to Baghdad. In effect, Saddam Hussein sued for peace and he made a series of promises to keep us from following and destroying his Army completely and invading his country and removing him from power, and he made those commitments, and he did not follow them.

There were a number of U.N. resolutions that he was in violation of. He rejected the international community, and an embargo had been placed on Iraq. The United States was attempting to enforce that embargo. Saddam Hussein was consistently working to get around that embargo. We were flying in no-fly zones and enforcing no-fly zones over Iraq. He was shooting at our airplanes on a daily basis, almost. We were dropping bombs on Saddam Hussein on a regular basis, dropping bombs from our aircraft.

So the question was, as *The Economist* magazine said, are we going to quit our efforts, are we going to issue an ultimatum and be prepared to go to war if they do not? Their editorial said, the London-based *Economist* magazine said, our vote is for war. That was that London journal's opinion.

That is the way I felt about it. Iraq was a rogue nation that had tremendous amounts of oil, it had a dictator prepared to use weapons of mass destruction, use weapons of mass destruction against his own people, and he was determined to break the embargo, determined to be able to sell his oil on the world market, not for his own people's good but to build up his military power, just like he did when he invaded Kuwait, and be the preeminent Nebakanezer of the Middle East. That was his goal. It remained his goal. It probably still is as long as he takes a breath.

So we gave him that ultimatum, and with the support of large numbers of nations in the world—I believe some 60 supported us, including nations like the United Kingdom and Australia and others—he refused to comply and we commenced our military action. This Nation made a decision to remove him from power and we voted on it as a Senate, and we sent our soldiers in harm's way. We did not do that lightly. No great Nation which expects to be respected will send its soldiers into harm's way with a half-hearted commitment to them.

When I talk to those soldiers, as I did recently at the 231st birthday of the United States Army over at the Jefferson Memorial, and I talked to those soldiers and we were discussing these kinds of deadlines and policies and directives to set forth plans as to how the war should be conducted, one of them said to me, Senator, let me tell you what we want. We want to win. And I have talked to families who lost

loved ones in Iraq, and they tell me every time—it is amazing—my son was doing what he believed in, what he wanted to do.

I submit we owe them the responsibility to be faithful to them and not to dishonor their sacrifice by cutting and running when it is not time to do so. I believe that very, very sincerely.

So I would just say to my colleagues, I can see how we have differences of opinion, and I understand that. I remember the debate and I remember the vote I cast and I knew it was very serious. No Nation that desires its own self-respect or the respect of other nations can be flippant about those kinds of matters. When you make a commitment, you stay the course.

Iraq has formed a new government completely now. They have a parliament. They have elected all their ministers. They have their interior and defense ministers in place. They are determined to continue to grow and strengthen their Army and their security forces.

I believe they still need American help to get over that hump and be successful. We should not disregard the advice of our military leaders and set an artificial date, not connected to military and political reality in Iraq, for leaving Iraq. I think that would be the very wrong thing to do. And nothing could be more corrosive to our self-confidence as a Nation or to our own military than to prematurely give up on the opportunity we have to create a good and stable government in Iraq.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, could I inquire how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise tonight in opposition to this amendment. As I have thought about this over the last several days, I believe it is critically important that we bring this issue up for debate. The Senator from Massachusetts, frankly, is to be commended for doing so. We could have eased through this bill without having this debate and the American people would not have had the opportunity to hear where we are, what is going on, and in particular why those of us who think it is important that we move ahead continue to do so.

First of all, when the President spoke to a joint session of Congress following September 11, he said we were going to be engaging in an entirely different form of military conflict than we had ever been engaged in before, and it was going to be a war on terror which was going to be a long and enduring war. He has been exactly right. We ultimately moved into Afghanistan, and liberated the people of Afghanistan. We took out hundreds if not thousands of terrorists in that country, and ultimately the decision was made to liberate the people of Iraq, and we have done that. It is about this conflict that, in the minds of a lot of Ameri-

cans, the question is still being asked, How much longer is this going to go on?

I remind the folks of America that the President did say it is going to be a long and enduring war. That is the case. The reason it is going to be a long and enduring war is because this is an unconventional war in every sense of the word. It would be nice if we had tanks on the battlefield or artillery being fired at an enemy over the hill. But we are never going to see that in this war on terrorism. It is being fought in the back alleys of Baghdad and Mosul and Tikrit, in towns that were foreign to anybody in America before we moved into Iraq and made the march to Baghdad. That is the kind of war which is going to continue to be fought.

The people of Iraq know that well. They have suffered as much if not more than any country in that region that has had a conflict like this. I say that because we all remember Desert Storm and what happened in Kuwait. We all remember what has been happening daily in that part of the world, whether it is Jordan or whether it is Israel or Egypt or some other part of that region of the world. The people of Iraq have truly suffered. They understand that America has made a sacrifice, and they understand that, were it not for the American soldier coming in to liberate them, they would not be in the condition they are today, which frankly is a pretty positive condition—both economically as well as otherwise.

Are there bad things happening? Sure. There are going to continue to be bad things happening. The one thing about war is there is nothing pleasant about it. There is nothing good about war. But at the end of the day, America has always stood tall in military conflicts. America has carried the day. America has always achieved victory, and victory means a democratic form of government in Iraq being formed. It means a unified government, which we have seen taking place in Iraq recently. It means taking out the bad guys, from a leadership standpoint all the way down. That is happening in Iraq every single day.

Recently, we saw the takeout of their leader, Zarqawi. That happened in a short period of time. But were it not for the first American soldier to set foot in Iraq and start the motion in process, that would not have happened the way it did 2 weeks ago. It will happen again. Whoever is next in line will ultimately be brought to justice or have justice physically brought to them at the hands of the American soldier.

We are in a situation today where we are discussing whether we ought to pull our troops out of there—whether we talk about next week, next month, or next year. In my opinion, that sends the wrong message to the Iraqi people. It sends the wrong message to the terrorists. And it sends the wrong message to the world. It is a different message from what the American military

and America itself has ever sent to any enemy with which we have been engaged in combat.

We are having successes today, successes that are brought about because of sacrifices—in a lot of cases the ultimate sacrifice. That has always been the American way. While we grieve for those families who have made that ultimate sacrifice, they are going to be satisfied only when their ultimate sacrifice is rewarded with full and complete victory in the war on terror.

I believe it is important that we have this debate. It is important that the American people understand we truly are winning this war and that the wins are not measured by victories on the battlefield every day, but the victory is being measured by winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. The victory is being measured by the folks who are achieving success inside Iraq, from a military standpoint, from a governmental standpoint, and from an economic standpoint.

I urge my colleagues to look at these motions very carefully, both of them, and that we defeat both motions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the majority has expired. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Georgia. He is a very valued member of the Armed Services Committee, as is Senator THUNE, who spoke earlier, as was Senator SESSIONS.

I think we have had a good debate. We are prepared to continue that debate as long as it is desired. We are here to stay. We feel very strongly about these issues, you know. I do not want to invade the time of my good friend.

I yield the floor at this time, and I will follow him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I wonder if it will be possible to let the Senator from New Jersey speak for about 15 minutes and then I resume the floor?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if that is with no objection, the next 30 minutes is under the Senator's control.

Mr. KERRY. I understand I have unlimited time at this time, Mr. President? There is no time limit on me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit.

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. KERRY. I just yield him 15 minutes. I don't intend to talk all night, but I hope to have the chance to speak.

Mr. WARNER. I hope we have a rotation.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, to decide our future in Iraq, we must first understand our past in Iraq.

Frankly, I never believed this administration's false arguments about why we should go to war in Iraq. And I believe this administration has never had a strategy for success in Iraq.

That's why I voted against the war in Iraq.

The Bush administration led us into this war based on false premises and false promises.

The Bush administration invaded Iraq without the troop numbers needed to complete the job.

The Bush administration failed to provide the troops with the equipment they needed letting them go into Iraq without proper body armor or properly armored vehicles.

The Bush administration failed to create a real international coalition so that the United States wouldn't have to bear the highest cost in blood and national treasure.

And President Bush went into the war without a plan to win the peace.

This was a war of choice, not a war of necessity.

The Bush administration's record in Iraq represents a massive failure of leadership—a massive failure of Presidential leadership.

Let me be clear. While I did not support the war, I have always supported the troops on the battlefield. Our troops have succeeded in the tasks they were given. They have fought for freedom and security in the most difficult of situations. They have risked their lives to protect ours. And the Nation is indebted to them for their service.

In New Jersey, over 3,169 New Jerseyans are serving in Iraq or Afghanistan and 71 service members with ties to New Jersey have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country in Iraq or Afghanistan and our thoughts and prayers are with them and their families. Obviously, our troops are committed to this call to duty. They have not questioned the why, or the wherefore, they have simply, honorably, and valiantly answered the call of their country.

But we are all living with the consequences of this failure in Presidential leadership today:

Iraq continues to explode with sectarian violence.

Reconstruction efforts have not restored Iraq to prewar levels of oil production, security concerns continue to impede progress, while accusations of contractor corruption continue.

We have not been able to internationalize the effort of training and security in Iraq because of the administration's closed-minded decision to keep countries from helping with reconstruction unless they supported the administration's decision to go to war.

On top of the other failures, the administration refused to engage in real diplomacy to create regional security with Iraq's neighbors.

The United States has spent nearly \$319 billion in Iraq. Our monthly burn rate is over \$8 billion. Over 2,500 American lives have been lost, over 18,500 soldiers have been wounded—many of them severely.

And we were all horrified to hear the news just yesterday that two U.S. sol-

diers, PFC Kristian Menchaca from Houston, TX and PFC Thomas Lowell Tucker, from Madras, OR, were kidnapped and slaughtered by the insurgents.

My heart goes out to the families of these soldiers and to all who have lost loved ones in Iraq.

I believe we have paid a heavy price for the war in Iraq—in blood and in national treasure.

But we must account for not only the literal cost of the war but also what we have not done because of the war—the opportunity cost of the war in Iraq.

We also cannot forget that our fight against terrorism started where it should have in Afghanistan. But because of the President's war in Iraq, this administration then took our eye off the ball in Afghanistan.

The administration never finished the job in Afghanistan, the birthplace of the Taliban, the home to al-Qaida, the land of Osama bin Laden, and the place where the attacks of 9/11 were planned.

This was the right place to pursue the national security of the United States. It was in Afghanistan that the murderers of September 11 were located. We had Osama bin Laden pinned down in the mountains of Tora Bora. But instead of having a large contingent of the best trained, best equipped, most technologically advanced military in the world go after him, we outsourced the job to Afghanistan warlords. The result? Osama bin Laden got away.

Many of us have been horrified as we have watched the resurgence of the Taliban and strong anti-American sentiment in Afghanistan.

During just the past few weeks, over 250 people have been killed in the upsurge in violence and we see techniques borrowed from Iraq, like the use of improvised explosive devices, now being used in Afghanistan.

According to the New York Times, Pentagon officials say that 32 suicide bombs have been exploded in 2006, which is already 6 more than exploded in all of 2005. Roadside bombings are up 30 percent over last year and the Taliban are fighting in groups triple the size of last year. Just this Monday, we heard reports that the Taliban used women and children as human shields during a fierce firefight with British troops. And after a deadly traffic accident involving the U.S. military, an anti-American riot exploded in Kabul last month. Meanwhile, Bin Laden makes his tapes and remains free.

President Bush's war has also hurt us here at home. The fact is that because of the cost of President Bush's war at almost \$319 billion, we cannot afford to take care of some of the basic needs of our citizens here at home. This administration is cutting funds for firefighters, for education, for our seniors, for healthcare, and for homeland security funding in New Jersey and New York to protect our ports and our transit systems. They are underfunding the very veterans who are securing our

country and who come back from war wounded or traumatized. The Bush administration is cutting funding to all of these people—our nurses, teachers, and seniors—while spending billions in Iraq every month.

As we start a new hurricane season, I look back on Hurricane Katrina and I see the terrible price the people of the Gulf Coast paid when their National Guard troops were away in Iraq and unable to protect them here at home. Our homeland is simply less secure when our National Guard and Reserves are being kept in permanent rotation away in Iraq.

Clearly, it is time to change the course; we need a new direction in Iraq.

That's why I am supporting the Levin and Kerry amendments today.

The Senate has already spoken saying that 2006 must be a year of transition. That is why the Levin amendment says that we must begin transitioning out troops now while still protecting our people and helping with security. With the Levin amendment, we make it clear that the time has come to change the course, rather than stay the course.

I am also supporting Senator KERRY's amendment which takes the first and most important step by setting a date of July 1, 2007 to have all U.S. troops transition except those critical to training Iraqi security forces, working on specialized counterterrorism operations, and protecting our U.S. personnel and facilities, like our embassy.

Let us be clear. This amendment does not say we should remove all of our troops from Iraq right now.

With this amendment, we are saying that it is time for Iraqis to take responsibility for their own destiny.

With this amendment, we are sending a message that over the course of the next year, the Iraqis must take full control of their own country, their own security, and their own future.

With this amendment, we are saying that we respect the message of the Iraqis' own elected, sovereign government. At a time when the Iraqis have put in place the entire cabinet of the elected government of Prime Minister Maliki; at a time when the United States and coalition forces have trained and equipped more than 116,000 Iraqi soldiers and more than 148,000 Iraqi police and other security forces; at a time when sectarian violence has taken over terrorism as the most serious security threat in Iraq; at a time when 69 out of the 102 army combat battalions, are either soon able to take the lead or able to operate independently, isn't it time for the Iraqis to start taking responsibility for their own destiny?

In fact, the Iraqis have made this point themselves. The Iraqi National Security Adviser Mowaffak al-Rubaie

said in a Washington Post article this week:

Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems, with the knowledge that our friends and allies are standing by with support and help should we need it.

He also said that the eventual removal of coalition troops "will help the Iraqis, who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be" and that "the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people." Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki supports a transfer of responsibility for 16 out of 18 provinces by the end of 2006 and his security adviser believes that we can reduce coalition forces to less than 100,000 by the end of this year with most of the multinational force gone. The Iraqis are clearly saying that they are ready for this transition to happen.

A few days ago, Republican Senators made a great deal of Iraqi sovereignty when I, and Senator NELSON, proposed a Sense of the Senate amendment that urged the government of Iraq not to grant amnesty for those who had killed U.S. soldiers.

We heard a lot about sovereignty.

If the Iraqis are to be respected as a sovereign government, as many argued on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, shouldn't we respect their knowledge and wishes as it relates to the very issue of troop redeployment and their ability to sustain their own security?

It is only when the Iraqis and the rest of the world know there is a certain timeframe for a real transition that they will make the hard choices, negotiations, and compromises to maintain a stable government of national unity. It is time for the U.S. to cap the open-ended commitment of U.S. forces in Iraq and to "remove the training wheels" on the Iraqi security forces. The sooner the Iraqi security forces believe they are fighting for their country, the sooner they help stop the sectarian violence. Until that happens, the fledgling Iraqi Government will continue to rely on U.S. forces to keep them from making the difficult decisions and taking tough actions. It is time for the Iraqis to step up to the plate.

Clearly, it is essential to set a date certain for transition so that Iraqis will take responsibility for their country.

It is also essential to set this date certain for transition so that the international community will start to take responsibility for reconstruction and security in Iraq, as well.

The United States cannot go it alone; we must internationalize reconstruction, security, and create an international process to end sectarian vio-

lence. It is in everyone's interest to create a stable and secure Iraq. That is why I support the proposed Summit in Senator KERRY's amendment which brings together all of the players—the EU, NATO, the UN, and Iraq's neighbors—to come up with a plan to solve the political problems, to deal with the militias, and to revive reconstruction efforts.

And this Summit will also deal with a key issue to Iraq's stability—oil. Ultimately, all parties need to be brought in to the process and share the oil profits whether through a national fund or some form of revenue sharing. We cannot forget that Iraq has the fourth largest oil reserves in the world. The goal is to reduce insurgent attacks, improve security along the pipeline and create strong oversight over current pipeline reconstruction. The Iraqis need a stable income stream to restore economic stability and help pay for reconstruction and security so we must get oil production back above prewar levels.

I also believe that our worldwide troop deployment must reflect our priorities in the fight against terrorism. Senator KERRY's amendment creates an over-the-horizon troop presence in case we need to deal with other terrorist issues or regional security issues. With the reduction of troops in Iraq we will be able to redeploy certain troops to other key areas, such as Afghanistan. And we will also be able to bring our National Guard and Reserves home to prevent another terrorist attack on our soil and to help during natural disasters.

Let me conclude by saying that there are those who want to politicize the war to present the American people with a false choice—either stay the course by keeping our troops in Iraq or empower the terrorists by cutting and running. I would ask all of you not to fall into the trap of this false choice or simplistic solutions.

Let me be clear, this amendment is not a simplistic choice to leave Iraq today and to let it fall into the hands of the terrorists.

With this amendment, we will begin to fulfill the transition the Senate voted for and the Iraqis have said they intend to pursue.

With this amendment, we are voting to leave sufficient troops in Iraq at the end of that year to fight counterterrorism, to finish training Iraqi forces, and to protect our people and our embassy.

With this amendment, we are voting to put troops over-the horizon in case of other terrorist activity or regional conflict.

With this amendment, we are voting to create regional stability and get the international community to the table.

With this amendment, we are voting to get our National Guard home to keep us safe and secure in our cities and towns.

With this amendment, we are voting to finish the job in Afghanistan.

With this amendment, we are changing the course of events in Iraq—a change of course that will still meet our objectives, save American lives, and ensure our ability to both protect our people at home and meet the other challenges we have as a nation.

Let us remember that this was a war of choice, not a war of necessity.

Let us remember what this administration has told us about this war.

Let us remember the unfound weapons of mass destruction; remember the missing mobile weapons labs; remember the yellow-cake uranium in Africa; remember Saddam's nonexistent vast stockpiles of chemical weapons; remember when Secretary Rumsfeld told us that, "We know where the WMDs are;" remember the non-existent link between al-Qaida and Saddam; remember the claims that Iraqi oil and other countries, not the U.S. taxpayer, would pay for the cost of reconstruction; remember when the administration told us that the war would cost somewhere between \$50 and \$60 billion; remember when Paul Wolfowitz said that "it seems outlandish" to think that we would need several hundred thousand troops in Iraq; and let us remember when President Bush told us on May 1, 2003 that "Major combat operations in Iraq have ended" while he stood in front of a sign that said "mission accomplished."

Let us remember the lies.

So I ask: Are we willing to continue to sacrifice the lives of young Americans so that this same administration can stay the course, a course without direction, for a cause that President Bush has already said that he will abandon to the next president? I hope not.

I will say again, do not fall into the political trap and rhetoric from those who will try to mischaracterize this amendment.

I voted against the Iraq war when many on the other side tried to falsely characterize those of us who didn't believe the evidence that the administration presented, who thought we should work through the international process, who didn't believe the administration had done any postwar planning. For standing up for what we believed in, they tried to mischaracterize us as anti-American and unpatriotic. I was willing to take a difficult stand, and stand up for what I believed was right for the country and for the people of New Jersey. That is why I voted against the war.

Today, with over 2,500 lives lost, almost \$320 billion spent in national treasure, with \$8 billion used each month, I know I made the right decision.

The Senate has an opportunity to act now, to enact a policy worthy of the sacrifice of our soldiers.

And that is why I am voting for the Kerry and Levin amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for a really excellent summary and a terrific statement about what this is about and what is at stake. I thank him also for in the short time he has been here he has really proven to be indispensable for a number of different debates we have had and for his work in the last few days on no amnesty for those who have killed Americans. It had a major impact on our policy. We thank him so much for that contribution.

Mr. President, I think one of the important things that the Senator from New Jersey just said is let us remember what this amendment is really about.

I have sat here and listened to this nondebate for a little while. When Senators used to be able to question each other, we used to be able to have a dialog on the floor. It seems to me that is the best way to test each other's thinking.

What is interesting to me is that a number of Senators came to the floor to make these grand pronouncements about our country, about war on terror, about our troops. And none of us in the U.S. Senate would disagree that our troops are the best troops in the world and that they have made an extraordinary sacrifice. None of us would disagree. We are a great country and a great democracy. None of us disagree that we don't need to fight against terrorists to win the war on terror. That is not the issue.

A lot of other people are getting tired of that sort of game, of trying to characterize things as they aren't.

The Senator from South Dakota said that we shouldn't telegraph to the enemy and to the terrorists. Of course, we shouldn't telegraph to the enemy and terrorists. What are we telegraphing? We are there. They know it. They are killing our soldiers to some degree but lesser than the insurgency today.

The point that people need to really focus on is the fact that what has happened in Iraq is not what was originally billed. This is the third war. It is a different war from the war we went into.

The war that the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, described was the war against Saddam Hussein as an enforcement mechanism of weapons of mass destruction. And they weren't there. There is a whole history of that being about a war of choice as opposed to a war of necessity.

That then transitioned because Zarqawi and company and a bunch of foreigners were attracted by the fact that we were there. We made a great target. So they started to use that target. And, indeed, it became a haven for some terrorists.

But every single analyst who I have talked to—and I know the chairman

knows this—says that there are about 1,000 or less of the foreign terrorists in Iraq. Ninety-eight percent of what is happening in Iraq today is Iraqi on Iraqi.

When they come to the floor and say to us we are going to telegraph something to the terrorists, who are we telegraphing something to? The Shias who hate Sunnis, the Sunnis who hate Shias who are killing each other?

What are our troops supposed to be about? Drive down the street and find an IED and get blown up? Wait for a suicide bomber to come into an outpost and kill them?

The bottom line is that either the Iraqis are going to resolve the differences between Iraqis or we are going to see people dying for a long, long time.

When we talk about the war on terror, let's talk about the real war on terror which never was in Iraq. Yes, it is now part of the war on terror. It has been made part of the war on terror because foreign terrorists have been attracted there because the American target is there and because they know they can feed into the sectarian violence and use it against us.

What is smart if you are going to try to deal with that? How do you win? Do you think I want to win any less than the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Georgia? I believe in winning. I believe in winning for America and I believe in winning for our troops, and I don't think this is a winning strategy. It is not a winning strategy in Iraq, and it is not a winning strategy in the war on terror.

All you have to do is look at al-Qaida and what they are doing in 60 to 80 countries around the world. Look at what happened in Somalia the other day? Are we dealing with that? Are we dealing with Darfur? Are we dealing with North Korea? It took us until this year to sit down with our own allies, Great Britain, Germany and France, and actually try to do the diplomatic work of dealing with Iran.

For 3½ years we sat on the sidelines and allowed Iran to become more of a problem.

Is that winning the war on terror?

What about the 60 percent of the kids in Saudi Arabia and Egypt and Jordan and other countries that are under the age of 25, 50 percent under the age of 18, 40 percent under the age of 14, and the unemployed and uneducated and unemployable? They are going to go down to madrasas and learn how to hate people while the United States remains a big, fat target in the Middle East.

Ask our foreign policy experts. I don't know whether it was Foreign Affairs or another magazine, but one of them did that just the other day.

Eighty-seven percent of the people, when asked, said we are less safe today in the war on terror than we were; 87 percent of the experts of the United States, including people like General Brent Scowcroft and others who I know the chairman has great respect for.

This is not a question of whether we want to beat terrorists. This is a question of whether we are doing it the right way and whether we know how to do this right.

Show me in this resolution, in this amendment, where it says all troops out in 1 year. It doesn't. A lot of people are upset at that. They think it ought to, but it doesn't. Show me where it says we are finished altogether, and we are walking away from Iraq. It does not say it.

It says we are going to leave sufficient people there to finish the training, to go after al-Qaida, over the horizon to have the capacity to be able to protect our interests in the region, and it says we will protect American facilities.

This is not cut and run. This is a smart way to win the war on terror. Our own generals—and I know the chairman has heard it; I know others have heard it—know that they believe our presence is contributing to the problems. It contributes to the sense of occupation. It contributes to the—whether it is Abu Ghraib or Guantanamo Bay or Haditha, those all contribute to the recruitment of terrorists against the United States.

Our intelligence people will tell every Member of the Senate that currently there are al-Qaida-trained operatives leaving Iraq, trained in munitions, trained in IEDs, going to Europe and elsewhere in order to wreak the havoc of the future.

We are not doing the job. We are not doing the job correctly. Let's have a real debate, not a false debate, about something this resolution is not.

Moreover, in listening to my colleagues, one of them talked about what his vote meant and the vote he casts to hold Saddam Hussein accountable. I remember what my vote was. I remember what I said in the Senate when I voted. I voted reluctantly based on what Colin Powell, Secretary of State, and others said they were going to do: Exhaust the remedies of inspections at the United Nations, not cut them short; go to war as a last resort, not as a rush; do the adequate planning, not ignore the State Department plan for what you do to win the peace.

I hear colleagues come to the Senate and say: We shouldn't tell this administration what to do. Their record demands that we tell them what to do. Congress helped get us into this mess, and Congress ought to help get us out of it. We are partly responsible.

I have heard my colleagues talk about troops they talk to. We all talk to troops. We have all talked to families. I will be honest about it, I hear both things. I hear troops whose families have said to me: Make sure my son or daughter did not die in vain. I agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin said earlier about that. I think anyone who serves their country at the call of the Nation never dies in vain.

I have heard troops who have come back and said to me: We are making

progress. We ought to be doing more of this, more of that, more of the PRTs, more of a number of different other projects. But I have also met a lot of troops who are coming back who believe they do not know what the mission is; they think the war is wrong and they think a lot of the troops just want to come home. That is where they are. It is a mixture.

Our question, our judgment, is to try to see through that, try to be intelligent and genuine in trying to work out what is the best policy. I have come to the conclusion that the reason for setting a date—I was not there 2 years ago. Why wasn't I there 2 years ago? Because 2 years ago we didn't have all the elections, we did not have a referendum, we did not have the Constitution, we did not have an elected government, we had not made some of the progress, and we had not transitioned to a civil sectarian struggle. We then still saw things as fundamentally foreign jihadists. Because of all the mistakes that have been made, that transition is now a matter of history.

I believe deeply, based on what I am hearing from military personnel, based on what I see personally, and based on my own experience where I fought with foreigners in another country, where we were trying to stand them up and get them to go out and do the job, that as long as we are there and prepared to do the job for them, they won't do it adequately. You have to push people out into that kind of situation.

The bottom line, can we do it the way we are muddling along? Possibly. I heard a couple of colleagues come to the Senate and say there were some who have decided that this is lost and we just have to go. I haven't. I believe there are ways, hopefully, to pull something together that has a sufficiently stable government that we can go forward to the other issues of the Middle East.

I will tell you this, and this I know for certain: If we make this successful muddling along, as we are doing now, it is going to cost us more lives, more limbs, and more dollars than if we did what is in this plan. That I know to a certainty. I also know to a certainty that unless we are prepared to do the diplomacy necessary, we cannot resolve the fundamental underpinnings of this insurgency.

I talked to General Zinni the other day to ask his advice. He doesn't agree with me setting a date, so I will be upfront about that, but he certainly cited unbelievable dismay at the lack of adequacy of consultation in the region, at the lack of effort to put together a regional security arrangement, at the lack of diplomacy that is trying to resolve the fundamental differences and work bilaterally in an intensive way to pull people to the table to try to deal with this.

One thing I know, when you have a 20-percent minority Sunni population who for 200 years has run the country

and now suddenly they are not, but some of them are still committed to doing it, if you do not give them a sufficient stake, you are not going to resolve this problem. And, at the same time, you have the Shias who are 60 percent of the population who for 200 years have been oppressed by this 20 percent minority, and they won at the ballot box because we gave them at the ballot box the opportunity to have power, and they want to hold on to it. That is natural.

But if they want to go the full distance of what they want to do, we have a serious long-term problem. That is what we are supposed to resolve in the next few months.

The Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct in his description of the tensions that have to be resolved. I disagree with the Senator with respect to the question of whether there is a plan. This amendment is a plan. It is a plan for standing up the Iraqis. It is a plan for creating accountability. It is a plan for shifting responsibility to the Iraqi Government to bolster their sovereignty and empower the Government in the eyes of the Iraqi people. It is a plan for how to begin to redeploy troops to protect our interests in the region at the same time as you stand up their military. And, most importantly, it is a plan for what you do with the Arab League, with the Secretary General of the United Nations, with the neighbors and with the factions in Iraq in order to resolve the fundamental differences. It specifically requires reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that engenders the support of Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds and ensures equitable distribution of oil, strengthens the internal security, disbans militias, revives reconstruction efforts, fulfills related international economic aid commitments, secures Iraq's borders, and provides for a sustainable Federalist structure in Iraq.

That is a plan. And the only way to arrive at any plan, whether it is the Senator from Delaware or anyone else, is to pull the parties together and do the diplomacy necessary. Never in the 21 years I have been here have I seen as significant an issue of war and peace, life and death, as significant an absence of fundamental diplomacy as there is here. Never. It does not come close to the efforts of other generations.

There is 200 years of American history being turned topsy-turvy. It is hurting us on the war on terror. When September 11 happened, the whole world was with us—the whole world. Newspaper headlines said: We are all Americans now. That was the atmosphere after September 11. And the whole world understood why we had to go to Afghanistan. And every single one of us voted for that, understood it, and supported it.

But Iraq is different. Iraq had nothing to do with Afghanistan at the time, nothing to do with September 11, and everyone knows it.

So why are we here talking about requiring this administration to do something? Why don't you think about the history. When they could have demanded and relied on accurate information instead of manipulated intelligence, they made a willful choice not to do that. They were wrong. Instead, they sacrificed American credibility at home and abroad. The result of that is the "We are all Americans now" was squandered. It disappeared.

Ask any American citizen who travels abroad now how comfortable they feel as they travel. Ask any American businessman what happens to them when they travel in other parts of the world.

When this administration could have given the inspectors additional time to discover whether Saddam Hussein actually had weapons of mass destruction, when they could have taken time to exhaust the patience of our own allies and hold them accountable to the U.N. resolutions, instead they just broke off and said, OK, you go your way, we will go ours, and they exposed America to greater cost and greater sacrifice.

When they could have paid attention to Ambassador Wilson's report, they chose not to. And they were wrong. Instead, they attacked him and they attacked his wife to justify attacking Iraq.

But the mistakes were not limited to that decision to invade. They mounted, one upon the other. When they could have listened to General Shinseki and put in enough troops to maintain order, they chose not to. When they could have listened to Larry Lindsey and others who said it is going to cost \$200 billion, they not only chose not to listen, they fired him. They were wrong.

When they could have learned from George Herbert Walker Bush, Jim Baker and General Scowcroft and built a genuine world coalition, they chose not to. And they were wrong.

When they could have implemented a detailed State Department plan for reconstructing post-Saddam Iraq, they chose not to. And they were wrong.

When they could have protected American forces by guarding Saddam Hussein's ammo dumps where there were weapons of individual destruction, they exposed our young men and women to the ammo that now maims and kills them because they chose not to act. And they were wrong.

When they could have imposed immediate order and structure in Baghdad after the fall of Saddam Hussein, Secretary Rumsfeld shrugged his shoulders and said, "Baghdad was safer than Washington, DC," and he chose not to act, he was wrong.

When the administration could have kept an Iraqi Army selectively intact, they chose not to. And they were wrong.

When they could have kept an entire civil structure functioning to deliver basic services to Iraqi citizens, guess

what. They chose not to. And they were wrong, and we are paying the price today.

They could have accepted the offers of the United Nations and individual countries to provide on-the-ground peacekeepers and reconstruction. Guess what. In their arrogance about doing it alone, they chose not to, and so we are alone. They were wrong.

When they should have leveled with the American people that the insurgency had grown, they chose not to. Vice President CHENEY even absurdly claimed that the insurgency was in its last throes, and he repeated that again just a few days ago. He was wrong.

Now, after all these mistakes, the administration likes to accuse anyone who proposes a better course of wanting to cut and run. Well, Mr. President, we are in trouble today because of the policy of cut-and-run—cutting and running from common sense, cutting and running from history, cutting and running from cultural realities, cutting and running from the truth, cutting and running from the best advice of our military. And we are paying a huge price for that today.

Mr. President, every single one of us is determined to win the war on terror. But we have to ask ourselves some tough questions about where we find ourselves today. I wonder, as we are told by a lot of people that—I think the President, just yesterday or the day before, said it was important to have Members of the U.S. Congress who will not wave the white flag of surrender in the war on terror.

I think the President of the United States ought to stop acting as "Campaigner in Chief" and start being Commander in Chief and start bringing the Congress together and the Nation together around a real policy.

I don't know anybody waving a white flag. We are debating whether or not there is a better way to win the war on terror.

I respectfully say to my colleagues, if we don't begin to pay attention, instead of over \$2 billion every couple of days—every 2 days, I think; it is about \$8 billion a week; 8 billion bucks a week—instead of \$8 billion a week going to Iraq, we could be investing and working on a greater Middle Eastern initiative, working on economic development, working on schools, working on children's issues, working on a future with respect to future terrorists.

The fact is, we are not going to succeed at this if all we do is go out there and alienate people. I have heard from soldiers over the last weekend. I was with three medics who have come back, and they are all against the war, those three medics. They are out there in America right now talking to people about why they are against the war. They said: When you go into a house at night, and you are holding guns, and you are scaring people in that house, and you leave that house, they don't like you. You are not winning their hearts and minds.

I cannot tell you how familiar that is to the same experience we saw and went through years ago in hamlets throughout Southeast Asia. It just does not work the way they are doing it.

We could ask the question, legitimately: How many lives have been lost because of the ineptitude of this strategy? How many lives have been lost? And how many people have been maimed and wounded because we did not provide the body armor to our troops? You want to talk about patriotism? How many troops were killed or wounded by the shells and the weapons that came from the ammo dumps that we were not smart enough to protect? How many lives have been lost and how many limbs have been amputated because there were not enough troops in the beginning in order to provide people with the support and safety and the control of the country? How much bigger and more dangerous is al-Qaida today because we outsourced the job of capturing him at Tora Bora to Afghans instead of using the First Marines or the 10th Mountain Division or even the SEALs who were there?

We are where we are today in this war on terror because of misjudgments. And I believe those misjudgments continue.

How many times have we heard that we are turning the corner or that this is a moment of turning the corner, and yet momentum was lost? Momentum was lost after the elections. Momentum was lost after the passage of the Constitution. Momentum was lost in the last months while we waited and waited and waited for Iraqi politicians to stop playing around and form a government.

I do not think our soldiers deserve that interim period, personally. And the question now is, how do you best protect our troops? How do you best secure our objectives? How do you best deal with the problem of an Iraq where Iraqis need to defend their own rights and interests?

Americans cannot do it for them. Yes, we can provide backup. Yes, we can provide insurance against a total implosion. Yes, we can provide security with respect to the efforts to go after al-Qaida. And our amendment contemplates all of that. But it also contemplates a transition based on experience.

The Iraqis needed a deadline for the transfer of authority to the Provisional Government. The Iraqis needed a deadline for the Constitution. They needed a deadline for their elections. They needed a deadline for their own formation of a government. They even have a self-imposed deadline for the transition of the Constitution in these next months.

Why then, when the Iraqis themselves are saying they can take over their security, when the Iraqi Government itself says withdrawing American troops would be helpful, would we not coordinate with the Iraqi Government a drawdown that makes it clear that we are standing them up?

Now, speaking of the stand-up, I thought the policy of our Government—how many times have we heard it from the President: “As they stand up, we will stand down.” He announced that in a speech to the American people. He has announced it in press conferences.

Well, here we are. In the trips I made to Iraq, General Petraeus, and his now successor, showed us charts that indicated 272,000 was the goal to train and equip. We are now at 264,600. That is as of June 14, 2006. The goal was 272,000.

Now, I think they moved the goal out to 325,000. But notwithstanding, how many have stood down? If the goal is to stand down as they stand up, and we have stood up 264,000—incidentally, in addition to the 264,000, there are 144,000 facilities protection service personnel working in 27 ministries. So you have a total of almost 400,000 Iraqis trained and equipped. And where is the stand-down?

I believe it is essential to accelerate this transition. That is the only way to reduce the targeting of our troops. It is the only way to invest other countries in the reality that the United States will not always be there, and they need to take a stake in their own region.

Right now, because of the way they feel about this administration, and because we are simply there “staying the course,” they have no compulsion whatsoever to come to the table. The only way you are going to bring them to the table, in my judgment, is to change that equation.

So we have a very significant, broad-based plan for an international diplomatic effort, beginning with bilateral, and working up, ultimately, through the bilateral to a summit that we know can be successful. That is the way in which we will invest in a new security arrangement for the region and protect the United States of America’s long-term interests more effectively.

Mr. President, I see that another colleague has come and would like to speak now. I just close by saying that—

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before the Senator closes, I would like to say a word or two with him.

Mr. KERRY. I would be delighted to do that.

Mr. WARNER. You finish your closing and I will wait.

Mr. KERRY. I would be happy to do so. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. President, I heard the Senator from South Dakota say that there are occasions when a generation faces a struggle between good and evil. I agree with that. There is good and there is evil in this world. And what radical fascist extremists are doing in the name of religion is evil. I know as well as anybody here in the Senate that we have to stand up to that. But we have to stand up to it in the best traditions and values of our country. We have to stand up to it in a way that brings people to our side and does not alienate them.

It is incomprehensible to me that after these several years, where we started with “we are all Americans” post-9/11, and the world was at our side, that we have now seen radical, extreme terrorists isolate the United States of America in that particular part of the world. That is a failure of policy. And it is a failure that makes the United States of America less secure, not more.

Some people have said: Well, if you tell the terrorists that we are leaving in a few days—whatever period of time—I remind them, we are not leaving altogether. We are going to leave our special forces personnel who are capable of taking out the terrorists.

But the bottom line is that they are not waiting for anything today. We just lost two troops in the most brutal, horrible manner. They are not waiting now. And the fact is that unless we get Iraqis to resolve those issues I talked about, this will continue or even get worse.

So ignoring all the warnings of history itself, in a moment of total ideological excess, this administration has managed to make the ancient cradle of civilization look a lot like Vietnam.

I think there is a path forward. I think there is a better way to secure our interests. There is a better way to fight the war on terror. There is a better way to stand up to Iraq. There is a better way to respect their sovereignty. There is a better way to protect our troops.

I hope the U.S. Senate will look carefully at that.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, I would say this has been a good debate. Say what you want. I listened very carefully to what you said, and there are certain elements with which I agree with you. You and I have known each other a long time. I have great respect for your military career, the accomplishments you have had. I think you often shared that with regard to my modest career.

But I must say, I kind of bit my tongue here a few minutes ago when you said in our old days we used to have a colloquy and talked. I arrived on the floor of this Senate at around 9:30, when I first got here. It is exactly 12 hours now that I have been on this floor. And the first thing I said—and I don’t want to personalize this—to the other side of the aisle was: Now, let’s try to engage in a colloquy and exchange some views. I did say that since we were under a time constraint my questions would be charged to me, the replies from the other side charged to your side. It seemed to me fair enough. We had 5 hours before us at that time. But I have to tell you, I was flatly turned down.

So now, after 12 hours and your invitation to enter into a colloquy, I say to my good friend, you can ask me any question you wish. And I might start off with a question or two for you.

Mr. KERRY. I would be delighted.

Mr. President, let me just say to the distinguished chairman, I don’t have a

question for him because he has not said anything outrageous.

Mr. WARNER. Beg your pardon?

Mr. KERRY. I said, the Senator from Virginia has not said anything outrageous that begs a question at this point.

But I will say this: I do understand the difficulties that the manager was under.

Mr. WARNER. Well, that is history. We are here now. Why don’t we make the best of it?

Mr. KERRY. I know. But he had wanted more than 5 hours, as you know. We are where we are.

Mr. WARNER. We are here now.

Mr. KERRY. And I think he had more speakers than he was able to fit in.

Mr. WARNER. Well, I must say, I shared that on this side, but I was willing to take the heat.

Mr. KERRY. But I would be delighted to answer any questions.

Mr. WARNER. All right. We have the opportunity, Senator. Is there anything you wish to ask of me? And I will ask a few of you.

Mr. KERRY. Would the Senator not agree with me that the fundamental crisis of Iraq today is not particularly with Zarqawi having been killed and the treasure-trove of information we found—which, incidentally, happened because Iraqis gave Iraqis information and F-16s from outside came in and took him out. So there was an Iraqi component of that, which can still function with the setup that we are setting forward. But wouldn’t the Senator agree, Mr. President, that the fundamental problem today is that 98 percent of the insurgency is Shia-Sunni, Sunni-Shia sectarian violence, militias within the military?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I don’t know what that fraction is. But in discussions with senior military, clearly, they have said the insurgents, the foreign invaders, the others who have come in have dropped in terms of—somewhat—numbers of incidents. And, indeed, the sectarian violence—Sunni versus Shia, Kurds to some extent—has grown enormously. So I cannot qualify it. But the Senator is correct.

And that leads me to my first question, because—

Mr. KERRY. Can I just finish the question?

Would the Senator then not agree that there are serious limits on what our troops can do to resolve sectarian violence?

Mr. WARNER. Well, that remains to be seen. They are, right now, for example, in Baghdad, fighting side by side. A very significant number of Iraqi troops, together with the components of our troops, are trying to bring about a greater measure of stability and security in the very capital of this country.

I think we should make known to those following the debate and those who listened to the debate with Senator LEVIN, Senator LEVIN’s amendment was a sense of the Congress. The amendment of our colleague from Massachusetts very explicitly becomes law,

if it were adopted and eventually went into the bill and the bill survived the conference.

The point I wish to make is, you are directing the President. For example, it says: The President shall redeploy, commencing in 2006, this year, United States forces from Iraq by July 1, 2007. So this is law. As we used to say in the old days, we are shooting real bullets with this one, not just a sense of the Congress.

Throughout the debate, not only this one in the past day or two on this bill, but we have always, certainly, on this side, resisted timetables. You talk about putting together a summit. That is on page 2, section (b), Iraq Summit: The President should work with the leaders of the Government of Iraq to convene a summit as soon as possible that includes those leaders, leaders of the governments of each of the countries bordering Iraq, representatives of the Arab League, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—I think that is important to have NATO in there—representatives of the European Union, and leaders of the governments of each permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, for the purpose of reaching a comprehensive political agreement for Iraq that engenders the support of the Sunnis, the Shias, and the Kurds by ensuring the equitable distribution of oil revenues—that is a very important point you make, disbanding the militias—another very important point, strengthening internal security, reviving reconstruction efforts and fulfilling related international economic aid commitments, securing Iraq's borders, and providing for a sustainable federalist structure in Iraq.

Those are all important subjects, commendable goals. But first let's go back. It has taken the Iraqis 18 months since the first election in early 2005, through three elections, through the formation of the first permanent government. And the first permanent government is just, as you and I as old sailors would say, getting its sea legs. You start a conference like this—and I think it is a good idea—but the first question that is going to be asked is, can we proceed to achieve any of these goals if we have overhanging this the redeployment of our forces by July 1, 2007?

Senator, that is a timetable. That is a concept which I and I think the majority in this Chamber have continuously rejected. How could you ask the other nations of the world to come in and begin to put their credit on the line, their dollars on the line, if you have this timetable to pull out the very foundation that is supporting such progress as has been achieved in the 18 months of getting the first government up and testing their sea legs?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is a wonderful question and a very appropriate one. I really appreciate it. It gives me a chance to talk about the viability of this. First of all, may I re-

mind the distinguished chairman what I just said a moment ago. We are at 264,000. We have 144,000 more. That is 400,000 people prepared to go. They are in the streets now. We have 1 year to continue to work with them. Prime Minister Maliki has said himself that by the end of this year, in 16 out of 18 provinces they will be able to take over security. This is contemplated within the framework that the Prime Minister himself has adopted. This respects their sovereignty. It respects their capacity.

Secondly, in my conversations with leaders in the region, as recently as this year, ranging from the President of Egypt to the King of Jordan and others, what I gleaned from those conversations is, they are waiting for a series of kind of diplomatic and business conference efforts that do get them invested and invest the whole region in an understanding that the United States is going to be leaving, and they need to begin to accept that reality.

The longer we stay, the longer we delay their readiness and their need—let alone willingness—to come to the table. I respectfully suggest that it is within the framework of a year.

We did the Dayton Accords in less time. Milosevic did not want to come to the table. President Clinton persuaded Yeltsin to create a pressure point that brought people there. In effect, we made things happen against people's will by creating the pressure. This is the same kind of situation.

I say respectfully to the Senator, we have a far better chance of spending less money, losing less lives and being more effective in the war on terror if we pursue this than if we simply do what we are doing today.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, it might be the case, but I would be willing to make a modest wager with you that if you got this conference under way, the first thing that they would ask would be to suspend this timetable of July 1, 2007.

Mr. KERRY. And if that were the case, and they were prepared to come to the table to resolve these issues and be part of this process, then the President could come back to us and we would respond accordingly. We are not stupid. We want to act in the best interest of our country. The question is, how do you begin to push people to a place where they realize they have to confront these realities?

Secondly, the Senator's question makes a presumption that I just fundamentally disagree with and don't see in this amendment. That is if we pull out the foundation, I think the Senator said, we specifically say we arrive at a schedule coordinated with the Government of Iraq, leaving only the minimal number of forces that are critical to completing the mission of standing up Iraqi forces.

I have asked the Senator from Virginia, what are we there for? What are we there to do? We are there to fight al-Qaida. We allow for that. We are

there to stand up Iraqis for themselves. We allow that. And we are certainly there to protect American facilities. So what is it that is absent from here that would somehow pull out the foundation from anything?

Mr. WARNER. I say to the Senator, I cannot see, for example, the governments of each country bordering Iraq suddenly beginning to rush in if they feel that a civil war could start. The pulling out of the troops, the setting of a timetable will be a signal to all of the various factions. I will concede it is the Shia against the Sunnis that is the major faction. Wait them out. Let's let the troops flow out and then we will topple this government with a civil war.

It seems to me, I say to my colleague, you cannot expect these nations that border Iraq, the Arab League, I can't see that they would step up and say, we are willing to do everything. But wait a minute, coalition forces—

Mr. KERRY. Let me say to the Senator, I know he doesn't want American troops in the middle of a civil war. I know he doesn't think that that is why we sent our troops there.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I share that concern, but—

Mr. KERRY. That is where they are.

Mr. WARNER. It is the presence of our troops today that is probably holding it back from becoming a civil war.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, may I say respectfully, we will continue to be able to do that. Over the course of the next year, with over-the-horizon capacity and with our ability to move in an emergency, we are not going away. We have plenty of troops in Kuwait. We could have plenty of troops over the horizon. That is not going to fall apart. The problem is that the tasks that the Senator is referring to, each of them are civilian tasks. They are political tasks. You don't need 138,000 American troops as targets to complete those tasks when you have 400,000 Iraqis allegedly trained and equipped and prepared to defend their country.

Let me ask the Senator: Did Iraq or did it not fight Iran for 10 years within the last 25 years?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I remember well that conflict because I was then on the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. KERRY. And they lost a million people fighting for almost 10 years for their country. These are the same people. Four years later we are still driving trucks down the street and our guys are taking IEDs. Are you telling me that they don't have people who can drive a truck? They don't have people to go out on patrol? Why aren't our people garrisoned and being held in reserve in case there is an implosion? What are we doing with our troops being the ones that have to go out? I don't get it. I believe there is a better way to wage this effort. That is what this amendment contemplates.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we just disagree. I feel this government hasn't

been given a chance. It has only been 6 weeks. It took 18 months to get to where they are today. If we were to enact this into law, presumably the authorization bill would be signed by the President—there is a question whether if this is in there, he would sign it—this would go into law in a matter of a few months. And then suddenly to try and call on the rest of the world—and by the way, I certainly did not see the European Union trying to help form the coalition forces. Of each permanent member of the Security Council, the only one, Great Britain, stepped forward. I don't see those countries suddenly coming in and making the types of commitments that this paragraph requires, if we are going to pull out the very stability that is holding together this fragile government and preventing a civil war today.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is a legitimate question and it deserves, obviously, an answer.

Those countries, many of them, are reluctant to become engaged with the United States as long as they see us on the status quo path, because they see the same series of mistakes that I have just cited. If you talk to them, they will tell you, they don't have confidence that this administration is going to get it right or move in the right direction. That is why I believe you have to come in and lay out a path.

In my judgment, historically, most Presidents would not want the Congress telling them to do this. If I were President, I wouldn't want them telling me to do this. But at the same time, I would hope that I had consulted with Congress and not been as stubborn and not made the series of mistakes they have so that you wind up having alienated the very people you need to solve the problem. If you don't have some kind of regional security arrangement, the situation with Iran will grow more serious.

Iran loves the fact that we are bogged down in Iraq. This just plays perfect for Iran. And Iran has a much stronger lever over us with respect to its current nuclear path because they know they could wreak havoc with what is happening on the ground in Iraq, and that restricts our choices and options.

We will be stronger in counterproliferation efforts, we will be stronger in our efforts against terrorism in the region, and we will be able to create the credibility to bring these other countries to the table, which they are not willing to do today, if we make this kind of transition. If they understand that we are acknowledging that our presence is a problem, they have to step up because they don't want regional chaos. I believe that is exactly what helps us get it done. That is what changes the dynamics.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think we have covered this point. We will just have to agree to disagree.

I would draw your attention to the clause where you say consultation with

the Congress is required. Here we are, basically on the eve of the August recess which starts the first week in August. We come back here as a Congress for maybe 30 days or 5 weeks in September. Then leave again for elections. You say:

The President shall consult with the Congress regarding the schedule for redeployment and shall submit such schedule to Congress as part of the report required . . .

You know, we know how this institution works. We have been here for two decades apiece. I say, if the President were to devise a redeployment schedule to meet 2007, when do you think the Congress might swing into action and take such responsibility, as implied here, through the consultation process? I presume Congress could take an action to stop it. You are talking about July 1, and I don't see the Congress acting on such a proposal in a timely manner.

Mr. KERRY. Well, if that is all that gets in the way of this, Mr. President, I am confident we can find expediting language or other language that would resolve it.

But I will tell you, Congress is going to be dealing with this issue next year at this time if we don't change this policy. Like it or not, we are going to be here debating it one way or the other.

Mr. WARNER. That may be true, but I will ask another question. Drop down to paragraph 3, "maintenance of over-the-horizon troop presence." "The President should maintain an over-the-horizon troop presence to prosecute the war on terror and protect regional security interests."

Where would those troops, in all likelihood, be put?

Mr. KERRY. Most likely in Kuwait, Qatar, the Gulf States, if you work out a security arrangement.

Mr. WARNER. That would require a substantial amount of installations to be constructed.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we already have—as the Senator knows, we have been there and there are a number of pretty substantial facilities already in Kuwait, and there are others regionally, in my judgment; and that is the purpose of this arrangement, to prepare to work on an accommodation, providing it was in the context of a larger security arrangement. What I have learned—and again, we all talk to people and try to learn as much as we can.

General Zinni was saying to me the other day that he believes the Gulf States are particularly interested in some kind of a regional security arrangement because they are threatened by the instability and by the questions about Iran and the challenge to the oilfields and so forth. That is precisely the kind of issue that has to be arrived at, initially bilaterally and ultimately through this international conference.

I know the Senator was willing to bet something a little while ago. I am not sure we should do that in the Senate, but I would certainly bet my reputa-

tion that, one way or the other, we are going to be ultimately having to engage in this kind of multilateral diplomacy to resolve these issues. The sooner we get about it, the better we will be in fighting this war on terror.

Mr. WARNER. I caution my colleague because that is saying to this new Iraqi Government that you are going to fail.

Mr. KERRY. No, sir. About the regional security, I said we will need ultimately to deal with the question of Iran, the oilfields, the instability in the region. I think the greater Middle East is going to require this kind of focus and attention one way or the other.

As I said during the debate a moment ago, I am not somebody who suggests that we cannot make this still work out somehow. I am not in that school. But I do know that on the current path, it is going to cost more lives, more money, and it is going to cost us prolonged loss of relationship and reputation within the region and is going to set us back in terms of other interests we have. This can be done more effectively, and that is what I am here to argue for. How do we protect our security interests more effectively? How do we advance our safety and security in the world? How do we win the war on terror more effectively and stand Iraq up more effectively? I believe setting the date accomplishes all of those things.

Mr. WARNER. You have to admit that July 1, 2007, is a timetable; am I not correct?

Mr. KERRY. Yes, for the beginning of the transition. But as it makes very clear, if you get to 2 months before the end, or 3 months, and you can see the progress being made, and there is another month or so that a certain number of troops need to be stood up, or whatever, we allow that—the ability of the President to make that determination. If it is done in the best traditions of the Congress, it will be done with the consultation of the various committees and the Congress itself. And then you would have the kind of unity in the pursuit of this policy that is absent today or we would not have had this debate for the last several days. I know the chairman believes this—

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senator is operating on a premise that if this became law and the President issued a timetable, suddenly the level of violence would begin to be lowered considerably.

Mr. KERRY. No, sir, I am not making that presumption, Mr. President. I am saying that unless you resolve the fundamental political tension—the Shia don't have oil revenues. They want a strong Iraq with a central government. The Shia are well taken care of. The Kurds are happy in the north; they want to be left alone. They have oil revenues. So you have Kirkut as a major issue you have to resolve ultimately. But you have this fundamental tension between whether you are going

to have this federal loose-knit structure which the Shia want, with certain individuals with strong designs on future political power in that region, or whether you are going to have a manageable entity. That is why the former counsel for Foreign Relations and Senator BIDEN and others have joined in this idea of partition. The only way you are going to get there—and I don't think it is a particularly viable option—is through this kind of international conference. If you don't ultimately have a resolution by the parties politically, you are going to have a civil war. They have a few months under their own Constitution to try to resolve these things. That is going to be unavoidable.

I am not suggesting that the violence is going to suddenly vanish. The question is, How are you ultimately going to take away the rationale for the folks who are engaging in it? As I said, there are five different groups, and we are not dealing very effectively with it. You have criminal activity, you have Baathists, you have insurgents, Iraqi insurgents, and you have al-Qaida, and you have each of them that requires a different approach. Our military is not the answer to any of them, except al-Qaida. Al-Qaida, we can continue to prosecute with unit 145 operations and other things, and we can make that happen.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if you say the violence is not going to stop if this became law, if this becomes law, we have to make a movement in reduction in 2006. That is in there. There has to be a commencement. You would not wait and send out a platoon on Christmas Eve. You mean a significant draw-down, leaving only 6 months in the following year to get the bulk of the forces out. And if we start moving those troops, I tell you that will engender a higher level of violence and lead possibly to a civil war.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully disagree. We have a civil war today, to begin with. We have a civil war today. People are being killed in the dead of night, shackled in handcuffs, beheaded, found in basements; kids are being hauled out of buses every day. The number of sectarian incidents is many times what it was just months ago, a year ago, 2 years ago. Now, how are you going to resolve it?

I don't think there is any Member of the Senate who voted to send our troops to be in the middle of a civil war. Our troops are there to bolster the Government. We are there to support that Government's ability to make it on its own. How are they going to do that? By standing up these 400,000 security people. The faster they understand they have to go out and do it, the faster the violence is going to subside. Either they make it or it "ain't" makeable because we cannot make it for them. That is the bottom line that people have to understand.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my colleague that I agree fundamen-

tally with the premise that the Iraqi people, in the final analysis, are the ones who are going to be able to bring about their own measure of democracy and enable this Government to exercise sovereignty.

Other Senators want to participate, so I will soon yield. I know both of us have had the opportunity to serve in the military. There is nothing more painful than the loss of a brother member of the service. I don't know about you, but it has been difficult for me today to contain my absolute outrage about what happened, Mr. President, to these two young soldiers who raised their right arms and volunteered for this service in Iraq, to have been captured and brutally mauled and executed.

You know, I would say a rough calculation is that we probably have had about a million and a quarter Americans—that is, our brave men and women in uniform and many civilians from the departments and agencies of our Government, including a number of American contractors—who have contributed to where we are today in this new Government standing up and beginning to exercise the powers of sovereignty.

I say to my good friend, given that heavy investment, the risks taken by over a million and a quarter of our citizens, to send out a signal now—and it is a timetable, Senator—that July 1, 2007, barely 12 months from now that we would probably have under your formula—I ran a calculation—you are going to leave some behind for training and some for logistics, but basically I would say the fighting forces are out. Some may be pre-positioned in other countries nearby. There is a clause in here requiring a report as to how soon they can come back to the continental limits of the United States. That is going to send a signal, and that worries me, that all these people who made these risks and contributions are going to sit back and say, right at the threshold of really the first rays of hope to get this problem solved, we send this type of signal.

What did you feel when we lost these two individuals? I know you felt it probably as badly as I did. I cannot understand why they could be saying over there that, see what we did, we beheaded two, and what did the Congress do? It passed this law that said our troops would be redeployed by July 1, 12 months from today.

Senator, timing in life is everything. The timing for this concept you have has not arrived, I say to my good friend.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, there are few people in the Senate for whom I have more respect and affection than the Senator from Virginia. We have known each other a long time, and we have traveled together. I am grateful to him for the respect and consideration he has shown for this debate this evening.

When I heard those two guys were captured, my heart sank because I im-

mediately envisioned the worst. The worst happened. I thought about them throughout that time period, until they were found. I was not surprised that they were brutalized in the most horrific, disgraceful way, and may I add—and I know the Senator knows this—in ways that contravene every law of warfare. But I believe we have a better chance of honoring what they went there for and what all of our soldiers have died for, given something for, if we adopt a policy of reality.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I went to serve in Vietnam in 1968. There was turmoil in this country. Remember the Chicago convention, remember McCarthy, and Bobby Kennedy had been killed in June. In fact, I arrived back in Long Beach, CA, at the dock after the first deployment in the Gulf of Tonkin the night he was killed. It was the first radio words we heard. I remember that turmoil over the war. I remember Richard Nixon running for President with a secret plan for peace. I remember how people invested in the concept of peace. Years later, we read in Robert McNamara's book how he knew, as Secretary of Defense, while he was sending troops over there, that we weren't going to be successful. Now, from 1968 until 1975, when we left in that dramatic helicopter moment off the embassy, almost half of the people who died were lost in that period of time—for a policy that our leaders knew wasn't working.

I am not going to be a Member of the Senate in good standing and in good conscience and support a policy in Iraq that I believe is going to add people to whatever Iraqi memorial will be created, at a time where I am convinced this isn't going to work for them and it is not going to work for the Iraqis. I believe we have a moral responsibility to those soldiers who died to do our best to get it right, and I just don't believe staying the course, more of the same, is getting it right.

If you don't resolve the differences between Shia and Sunni where 98 percent of this fight is taking place, we are stuck. And I believe it is only by pushing the process, by demanding something of everybody in the region, by demanding something of the Iraqis who are in uniform that we are going to properly defend the honor of those who served. We defend it by getting it right.

And may I add, we also defend it by honoring those who come back. There is a \$6 billion shortfall in current services in our VA budget. That is just unacceptable.

We have a big job to do. I look forward to working with the Senator to do it.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will conclude. The Senator from Massachusetts and I have had this conversation about that period of history before. We will have it again and again. I recall, I went to the Pentagon in February 1969 and was there for 5 years in the Navy Secretariat. As the Secretary of the

Navy, the Senator always said I was his boss. He has been very respectful about that.

I remember when his Silver Star came through our Secretariat at that time. I went back and checked for accuracy, and it was accurate, I say to the Senator. He knows that, and I know that.

I thought many times about that period, and I recall that the then-Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, came to the conclusion that we had to begin a program of Vietnamization and begin to look toward bringing our troops home. I remember that, and the rest is history.

I share those concerns. I, like the Senator from Massachusetts, every day, particularly in my responsibility as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, worry about these men and women in uniform. Like the Senator, I visit the hospitals, go to the funerals when it is appropriate for me to do so. I share that burden. I think most of our colleagues do. I happen to know that our President shares those burdens.

Mr. President, I say to the Senator, my friend, there is a time for everything, and I feel ever so strongly that we have to give this new government more time to try and exercise that sovereignty before we take the very dramatic steps that the Senator from Massachusetts has set forth in this amendment, which I say not as a buzzword, but there is that timetable.

I do not think the other nations will come in. I do not think we could bring to bear the resources elsewhere in the world in the timetable that is laid down here.

There is one other point that we should consider, and that is we are there with a coalition of forces. I see no mention—maybe I didn't read it carefully—but no mention of what would Great Britain think if we were to take this somewhat unilateral action as the Senator proposes? What would Poland, what would the other nations think? They don't have the measure of the troops of quantity and so forth, but they are there in spirit.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, they are drawn down. There is a huge debate in Great Britain. They are prepared to draw down. They are ready.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I admire the courage of the Prime Minister of Great Britain. The Senator from Massachusetts has seen it, and I have seen it. We are political figures, he and I. We understand when we see another leader. He has stood with our President and our President has stood with him, unlike any two leaders of the United States and Great Britain since really Roosevelt and Churchill. It is remarkable what those two men have done.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, if I can just say, again, I repeat, this plan is a plan to be successful. It is a plan to strengthen all of our efforts in the war on terror. I have been to Great Britain. I have met with the leaders there. I know there are people there who be-

lieve we can do a better job in the war on terror, and I know they know the price they are paying for standing by us at this moment.

I believe this is a better way to actually fight the war on terror than we are doing today. If you accept that premise, you approach this differently. I think a lot of other countries believe it, too. All you have to do is look at the record of what is happening with respect to countries in the region, the number of incidents, the number of terrorists, the increase of al-Qaida. You can run down the list. Al-Qaida is in 60 to 80 countries. Osama bin Laden is still running around the mountains of northwest Pakistan or Afghanistan.

The fact is, one of the reasons we saw happen what happened probably is that it is a quick statement by the folks out there that: You may have got Zarqawi, but we are still around.

The fundamental problem remains the same. The Iraqis will not tolerate foreign jihadists—jihadists, actually I have been told, is not a great way to refer to them because it actually confers more of a God-given effort to them, and they don't deserve it. They are terrorists, they are just foreign terrorists, and we ought to quit giving them jihadists. But the fact is, they are not going to survive in Iraq if these security forces take hold and the Government stands up.

I believe, as the Senator does, that we want that Government to stand up. I think the best way to stand it up is shift the responsibility to it. And from all indications, they believe that, too. National Security Adviser al-Rubaie wrote in the Washington Post that we ought to withdraw the American troops; it will help us in the streets of Iraq. Prime Minister Maliki says they are prepared to take over.

He said: You could probably have well under 100,000 troops by the end of this year, and we are talking about a year from now.

This is reasonable beyond compare, and besides, it allows the President to make the decision of what we need to finish standing them up. A lot of people object to that, but I think it is smart. And it allows us to continue to use special forces against al-Qaida. That is exactly how we got Zarqawi.

I think this is, as I said many times—incidentally, Secretary Melvin Laird broke a 30-year silence and wrote in "Foreign Affairs" that we have to get our forces out of there and reduce the numbers because they are contributing to the occupation and to the insurgency. All you have to do is talk to any leader in the region and they will tell you we are working as our own worst partner by this large presence of American troops which is acting as a poster recruitment for terrorism.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we will conclude. I just say if we had more time, I would want to enter into another chapter of debate with the Senator on what would be the consequences if we saw failure; if this pro-

gram of his, no matter how well conceived and how conscientious, were to trigger that failure, what would be the consequence.

The fact that this country could revert to a haven for further training of al-Qaida and terrorists from all over the world—

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is why we maintain over-the-horizon capacity. That is why we allow the finishing of the training of the Iraqis to stand up.

Look, whether it is the plan of the President or this plan, both of them are operating on some element of faith that hopefully the Government is going to stand up. If it doesn't, we all got a problem. What we have here is one resolution—I keep hearing people come to the floor and saying they are definitely against an indefinite presence in Iraq, but they are indefinitely against being definite about it. You can't have it both ways. Either you are going to push this process or we are locked in the current paradigm.

Does my colleague think the current paradigm is going to do it? It may, but I am saying this for the last time: If it does, it will be at a greater cost in American life; it will be at a greater cost in dollars; it will be at a greater cost to the war on terror; it will be at a greater cost to our reputation in the region; and I believe there is a better way to get this done.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to my colleague, I think this has been a very worthwhile colloquy between us. I must say on this side, there are 55 who are going to stand tall and unify with no dissension on tomorrow at the time of the vote.

At this time, can I inquire as manager of the bill if there are other Senators desiring to speak?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, there are. Senator HARKIN wants to speak for a few minutes. I know Senator FEINGOLD wants to speak.

Mr. WARNER. I am prepared to remain here as long as is necessary.

Mr. KERRY. Senator FEINGOLD, I understand, will not, but Senator HARKIN wishes to speak.

Mr. WARNER. On this side, I see my colleague from Alabama, although he has had some opportunity, but very limited opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor.

Mr. WARNER. I am trying to accommodate Senators. I ask my friend, if he desires to speak, can he advise the manager of the bill how much time he would like?

Mr. HARKIN. I am not certain how much time I want. Who is next in line? Are we going back and forth?

Mr. WARNER. We are going back and forth, and I am about to relinquish the management of the bill to my good friend from Alabama.

The parliamentary situation is we remain on the bill, and debate can continue on the bill. We are not going to try and have time constraints. We are trying for the benefit of this infrastructure that has to remain in place and such Senators who may be listening to determine who would like to speak and for what period of time. That is all I am trying to ascertain.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I think the only speaker remaining on our side now is the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. WARNER. Can the Senator from Iowa advise the chairman as to how much time?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I looked over my remarks, and I say to the chairman, probably 20 minutes, I suppose. It depends if I go off.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alabama desire some time also?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I say to the chairman, 20 to 30 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Good. I relinquish the management of this bill to the Senator from Alabama and such time that Senator SESSIONS and Senator HARKIN may require. I thank all for their participation.

Mr. KERRY. Can we enter into a unanimous consent agreement so we know what is happening?

Mr. WARNER. I think that will be advisable.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the final, concluding comments this evening be made by the Senator from Alabama, followed by the Senator from Iowa, at which time I believe the Senate will adjourn; is that accurate?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think that is a reasonable request.

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

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, before the chairman leaves, I want to tell him how much I appreciated his analysis and summary of where we are. He noted that we may have had as many as a million or more people at one time or another investing their very lives in a successful operation of this country, and we have just gotten a government up and they have just elected a Defense Minister a few weeks ago and an Interior Minister.

Based on the long chairmanship and leadership of the Senator from Virginia in the Senate and as former Secretary of the Navy, let me ask the Senator again: Does he think that we would be creating grave risks that are not necessary by a precipitous withdrawal at this time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think this chairman has resonated with debates for months on this issue of timetables. I say to my good friend from Massachusetts, as I stated in our colloquy here, clearly by setting forth a terminal date there is a timetable, and that, in my judgment, is a very destabilizing thing. It sends a signal that perhaps the United States has less than

the will and the commitment, as clearly expressed by our President many times, most recently upon his return from his trip to Iraq just days ago, that we are there to help the Iraqi people achieve their goals.

Now we expect from them a level of cooperation to move, hopefully, most swiftly to establish a full range of sovereignty and the responsibility that goes along with that. All I have asked repeatedly is give them a chance to do that. We have 18 months in the making of this permanent unified Government. Give them a chance. I think that is the President's desire—I know it is.

Mr. SESSIONS. I remember when we were there just a few months ago.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. SESSIONS. Before this permanent government was in place, and I remember you and Senator LEVIN, along with Senator SALAZAR and others—

Mr. WARNER. The Senator from Wyoming, and Senator BINGAMAN was with us.

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes. And I remember you telling the leader of Iraq at that time that they were being challenged and they had to step up and assume responsibility.

Mr. WARNER. That is right.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is not as if they haven't been told that. And they assured us at that time that they understood that, and they felt that responsibility deeply. Is that the impression you got?

Mr. WARNER. That is absolutely correct. I will even go a step further. I said: The American people have a strong voice in this, and the elected representatives in Congress listen to those voices. You need only look at the expressions being put forth today.

But leadership requires reassuring our people, reassuring the Iraqis, reassuring the consortium of nations of the coalition, reassuring all others that this fight in Iraq portends the next half century of the history of that region. If it fails, who knows where the end of the strife will come in that region—the possible destabilization of one of the largest concentrations of energy in the world, which suddenly begins to impact in many ways on the quality of life here at home and throughout the world. That whole infrastructure could be challenged if this Nation devolves into a vicious civil war and anarchy follows and a haven for terrorism follows. We cannot let that happen.

I just said to my good friend, timing is everything. The time for this amendment has certainly, in my judgment, not come, and a timetable is not a good signal to send out. I yield the floor, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have one more question I want to ask my colleague. I remember—I personally have a vivid recollection of being in a meeting, our delegation was, just a few months ago in Baghdad, with the Sunni leader. Do you remember the insecurity he felt about whether our Nation would remain in Iraq? He made a com-

mitment to join with this Government, and some of his Sunni people didn't agree with that. He realized that a precipitous withdrawal which he had heard something about in the media could jeopardize the ability of that country to hold together, and maybe even jeopardize his own life because he had stepped up and invested himself in trying to create a good and decent democratic government. Do you remember that discussion?

Mr. WARNER. I remember it very vividly. Senator LEVIN was there. He questioned these individuals quite thoroughly, as did I, and as did you. And it is clear there is an unfortunate dichotomy that the Sunni people are, in large measure, responsible for those areas—al Anbar and Baghdad—where this great instability and insurrection takes place today. At the same time, I think the Sunnis should recognize that it is the participation of the United States and the other coalition partners that gives them the security against the majority of the Shiites who could revolt in such a way and challenge them and their future.

So let us hope that this government, which is a unity government with Sunni representation, can take hold. But it must be given the opportunity to send its roots down, to gain its stability and give it a chance. This amendment, in my judgment, would send the wrong signal and strip them of that chance.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for his comments and his leadership. It has been a privilege to be a part of this debate. I listened to this debate that has gone on tonight, this discussion between he and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is most eloquent. But I would just say to Senator WARNER that your remarks tonight are worthy of the valor and the courage and the fidelity of the troops we have sent forth into harm's way, and I am honored to serve with you on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, looking at the resolution that Senator KERRY has proposed, I would just make a couple of summary comments. No. 1, he has a date in which the vast majority of our troops, virtually all combat forces, under this amendment would be out by next summer, whether or not that is the right thing militarily. At the same time, he proposes that we have some sort of regional conference, and that this regional conference would meet somewhere while we are pulling out troops. And it is going to meet and decide what is going to happen in Iraq. I would just say that is not the way the world works.

Does anybody here think if we get a group of nations in that region to gather somewhere and meet and talk about Iraq, while we pull out troops, and violence escalates, that they are just going to pass a resolution, and somehow these terrorists, these Baathists are going to stop their fighting? Does anybody think that? I wish it were so.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could just get the nations in that region to go off somewhere and have a conference in Rome or London or Paris and have a vote about Iraq and the war would all end and there would be peace and we could just take our soldiers out and these other nations who are concerned about it, and if things get bad in that country of Iraq, they are just going to send their troops in and fix it? We really have to be more clear in our thinking about these issues.

That is not going to happen. That is fantasy land, let me say, with all seriousness. I wish we could do that. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could. Would it were so, they would just step up, the other nations in the region, and take over and fix this problem for us. And wouldn't it be nice if we could just have some sort of conference in Iraq and bring in the hostile parties and sit them down at a table and just reach an agreement? Wouldn't it be nice if we could do that? I wish it were so. I wish the enemy we faced was not the kind of enemy that when their new top leader captures two American soldiers, he personally brags about brutalizing them as he kills them. Wouldn't it be nice if the enemy we faced were more principled than that? Wouldn't it be better?

But I am afraid the reality is different. I am afraid the reality is that we are facing a radical terrorist enemy that knows it can't win a war conventionally, knows it can't win a vote of the people so therefore they have settled upon an asymmetric method of warfare to utilize whatever destructive capacity they can generate, even the suicide of women and children to carry out their diabolical ends, and they are going to continue that. Mr. President, it is the kind of threat that we are just going to have to face, and we are going to have to strengthen this Iraqi Government.

I heard it said that we can never be involved in a civil war. Well, we were there and we talked about whether there was a civil war, and I think those of us who understand in terms of the United States of America what a civil war is, that is not a civil war in Iraq. But there is a high level of violence, a higher level of violence than we cannot accept and the Iraqi people cannot accept. We know that. It is not quite the same thing as a civil war. But that conflict can be brought under control. I believe we are on the verge of bringing it under control, but it will not be easy.

Some say we haven't done anything like this before. Well, how about Bosnia? Wasn't that a brutal sectarian war that we had to send forces into? What about Kosovo? Wasn't that basically a civil war that we sent our troops into? It hasn't been settled perfectly today, but both of those countries are having some stability. They don't have strong governments, frankly. I have been somewhat disappointed in how Kosovo's Government has come together, but at least it is a peaceful

country and operating in a fairly decent way. So to say that we can't help make a difference when there is sectarian violence by the utilization of American forces, I think, is wrong. We have done it before, and we can do it again.

I would say to my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, he has just had a litany of criticisms of the conduct of this war. I wonder what he would have said were he in the Senate during the Civil War. With all the problems and the years that went by, and General Lee with smaller forces defeated repeatedly the larger forces, what would the Senator from Massachusetts be saying about that? Would he be saying: We need to pull back our troops? And what about World War II and all of the problems we had, and World War I for example? Senator WARNER just gave me on the trip I referred to recently a book about World War I, and I just completed it. We lost 18,000 people killed in 1 day at the Battle of Meuse, Argonne, in World War I—18,000 in 1 day.

I have talked to Alabama families who lost children in Iraq. We have lost 2,500 in Iraq in the time that we have been there, and that is a grim number. Every one of those losses represents the best kind of people this country can produce, and my heart breaks for those families. But the cost of freedom has always been high, and our interests in fighting a war on terrorism is high, and we have to be smart about it. We have to be careful about it. We have to have a debate in this country, and that is all right. But I would say again that I was very proud of this Senate when we voted a few days ago on the original Kerry amendment to have the troops out by the end of this year, and it was voted down 93 to 6. Presumably, he may have accumulated some more votes now for moving the date to 6 months later, but I suspect he will not have a whole lot of votes for that because it is just not good policy.

We have a country that has only really formed on a permanent basis in the last few weeks. The Prime Minister was elected just a couple of months ago. His last Cabinet members were just recently selected. They were voted on by the Parliament, elected by the people. Millions of Iraqis have gone out and voted three times now.

So this Government, the real Government, not a transitional or interim government, but the real Government, fully elected by the people, has only been in office a few weeks. And the enemy knows that if this Government is successful, their message of violence and hatred, extremism, oppression of women, they know those visions, those ideas they have that they want to impose on the people will be lost, and they don't want that to happen. And they are doing everything they possibly can to win the war in Iraq.

The Iraqi Army and the Iraqi police are taking far more casualties now than the Americans are. They are out

front in many provinces in Iraq. They are conducting military operations on a regular basis by themselves. Sometimes we go together; sometimes we have embedded Americans with the Iraqi forces. They are stepping up. But they are not ready yet. Their military is not there yet. It is not as fully equipped and it is not as fully trained. They don't have the confidence and the chain of command, their logistics are not where we would like them to be compared to a modern American Army. And they can be vulnerable to these kinds of terrorist attacks by which small groups of the military can be overrun or attacked and it can destabilize that country right now.

So I think the best course is to listen to our military leaders as we decide how and whether to conduct our military operations there.

I remember being with GEN John Abizaid, commander for CENTCOM, the combatant commander for this region of the world. He has been involved in this closely. He speaks Arabic. He grew up for a number of years in the Middle East. He understands this area. He has been a student of it. He is a brilliant general. He told me on an airplane back when people were saying: We need to send in more troops—he said: No, we don't need—in his opinion—he said: We don't need to send in more troops. We need to train up the Iraqi forces so we can reduce our presence.

I say that to you, Mr. President, because I want the American people to know that the combatant commander, the one who is giving the advice to President Bush, does not believe in excessively maintaining forces in Iraq. He understands that it would be better if we could reduce them.

But he also understands the challenges that exist in Iraq today.

That is why his recommendation is that we not have a resolution like this. And General Casey likewise, it is his recommendation that we not have a resolution like this.

I thought about the idea that somehow we can have, as one Senator said, an accelerated redeployment, or really a date for withdrawal, under Senator KERRY's amendment. Will this pullout, cut-and-run mentality, help us and help the Iraqis defeat al-Qaida? Really? If we pull out right now, will that help the Iraqis defeat the al-Qaida forces? Will it help reduce sectarian violence?

I wish it were so. I wish we could pull right out and they would all be nice and we wouldn't have any more fighting.

Would it help reduce the criminality in the country? Would it help strengthen and provide confidence to those members of the new Iraqi Government? Or would it increase their nervousness, would it increase their insecurity, at a time when we need to get that government off to a good start and, as Senator WARNER said, send their roots into the soil for stability?

Would it help establish the police force if we just pulled out? A lot of

Iraqis are signing up every day to be policemen. They have become targets of the terrorists on a regular basis. But I think they are provided confidence and comfort to know the American military is there to support them. Right now I do not believe there is enough strength in the Iraqi military, in the context of the Iraqi people, to survive a precipitous withdrawal. I think it could destabilize them. Maybe not, but I think there is a real likelihood of it.

I just would say we ought to think carefully about what our generals have told us.

The amendment submitted by Senator KERRY, I think, goes too far. I do not believe a conference, a meeting in any capital city anywhere in the world is going to settle the conflict in Iraq. I do not believe pulling our troops out is going to reduce the threats in Iraq. I believe what we have to do is do what General Abizaid and General Casey have told us; let's maintain our presence, let's draw it down as rapidly as we can, but let's do it consistent with the raising up of a legitimate military and police force in that country. And let's do what we can to strengthen and create credibility in the Iraqi Government.

You should never tell your enemy what your plan is. You should never give him a guaranteed plan of withdrawal or any other plan that you are going to execute, particularly when you are dealing with an asymmetric enemy like these terrorists.

Clausewitz warned of this type of war planning and making your intentions known. He said this "the essence of the defense"—think what these terrorists are about. They are defending their dream of a terrorist-dominated state.

Clausewitz says:

The essence of the defense is waiting: waiting until the attacker clarifies his own intentions; waiting until the balance of forces shifts; waiting for any improvement in the defender's situation, whether from the culminating process described above, from outside intervention, from mobilization of his own resources, or from some chance development. Time is almost always on the side of the defender.

Our Nation is on the offensive in the war against terror and we have been blessed that, since 9/11, we have not had another attack on our homeland. Who would have thought that possible? Certainly people were afraid to get on an airplane for weeks afterwards. They wouldn't go to shopping malls. We have been blessed to have gone this far without another attack.

The terrorists are using every desperate act they can to break the will of the Iraqis and our U.S. forces and our U.S. political system. This would undercut the foundation of our military efforts. So victory must be tied to results and victory is what we must have—not an amendment calling for redeployment measured in days or hours.

President Bush has established a strategy for a victory in Iraq that is condition-based, not based on arbitrarily selected dates.

Why not December 31? Why not April 1? Why not July 4? It is not a way to make a strategy in a military situation. The President's strategy focuses, rather, on the accomplishment of specific objectives.

President Bush has said:

Victory will come when the terrorists and the Saddamists can no longer threaten Iraq's democracy, when the Iraq security forces can provide for the safety of their own citizens, and when Iraq is not a safe haven for terrorists to plot new attacks on our Nation.

The President knows Iraq must stand up and do its part. In his most recent visit to Iraq the President urged the Iraqis to "seize the moment and we, the United States, will help them succeed. When America gives a commitment, America keeps its word."

He said:

If the United States of America leaves before this Iraqi government can defend itself and sustain itself and govern itself, it will be a major blow to the war on terror.

I certainly would agree with that, as Senator WARNER has so eloquently stated.

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld explained why a time-phased plan for redeployment is wrong. He said:

Once you start doing that, then you are stuck with a number and a date and it just doesn't do any good. The decision to withdraw is based [must be based] on conditions on the ground.

Some supporting this amendment and others who are calling for this exit strategy of time-phased withdrawals stake their claim on past experiences in other conflicts. This global war on terror is different. The enemy here has not surrendered. He does not wear a uniform. He is not sequestered in a country bounded by borders. He has not signed a peace accord and he has not given up his arms.

He, unlike Vietnam, is sworn to attack this country if he is successful and emboldened and gets his hands on the wealth of the Iraqi oil. Will our country be safe? Will they stay in Iraq and not continue to attack us, as they have, if the terrorists take over their country? He fights in an asymmetric fashion unlike any we fought before, and we cannot put our people and our allies at risk by shirking our responsibilities in any way that will undermine the opportunity that we have to have a victory and a stable government in Iraq.

Our generals on the ground understand this and have offered their perspectives on what impact this type of time-phased redeployment would have on the Iraqi situation. I know we have had people here who have served. Senator WARNER has served in World War II and Korea. Senator KERRY served in Vietnam. But what about General Abizaid, Commander of the U.S. Central Command? He has given his life to the service of the military and in that region of the world. He has overall responsibility for Operation Iraqi Freedom, and he recently spoke to Prime Minister Maliki and said:

The Iraqi people don't want to go back to the 6th century. The Afghans don't want to live under the rule they experienced under the Taliban. They don't want bin Laden to win. There is clear preference expressed by the people in both Iraq and Afghanistan to vote. The fact that they voted is their way of reaching out to the future.

General Abizaid warns of leaving the region without proper conditions on the ground with respect to the terrorists in that all they, the terrorists. He says:

All they do is destroy and kill and try to grab headlines. They believe by doing that they can gain time and eventually the coalition will leave. And when we leave there will be states vulnerable to their ideology.

General George Casey—he is the commander of all our forces in Iraq—recently said this:

I think as long as the Iraqi security forces continue to progress and as long as this national unity government continues to operate that way and move the country forward, I think we are going to be able to see continued gradual reductions of coalition forces over the coming months and into the next year.

That is his prediction. Somehow I have the vision of, out in the country, the dogs we used to have. You would get in the car and drive down the road and the dog would chase after the car, thinking somehow, I guess, that it made the car run off, that the car was afraid of it. I think sometimes some in this body are afraid we are actually going to be able to draw down troops in the next year or so. They think if they can just pass a resolution mandating it, then they can claim credit for it.

General Casey's comments do mention the force reduction, but he ties the reduction to the status of the development of the Iraqi security forces and the national unity government's success.

This amendment, the Kerry amendment, calls on the President to begin a deployment, beginning in 2006, in stark contrast to the best judgment of the most senior United States commanders in Iraq. Who should we listen to? General Abizaid and General Casey, I submit.

U.S. Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, whom we met in Iraq a few weeks ago, said the formation of the government, with crucial involvement from Saddam's once dominant fellow Sunnis is a great sign of progress. He states:

I believe that with the political changes taking place—the emphasis on unity and reconciliation, with effective ministers . . . that conditions are likely to move in the right direction that would allow adjustment in terms of the size, composition and mission of our forces.

In closing, I would like to highlight the recent comments by the man entrusted with advising Prime Minister Maliki on the national security of the new Iraqi democracy and what his items are concerning a time-phased reduction in U.S. forces.

Mowaffak al-Rubaie, the recently approved Iraq minister for national security, expressed his concerns in the Washington Post. I believe it was today or yesterday. He stated:

There has been much talk about a withdrawal of U.S. and coalition troops from Iraq, but no defined timeline has yet been set. There is, however, an unofficial roadmap to foreign troop reductions that will eventually lead to total withdrawal of U.S. troops. This roadmap is based, not just on a series of dates but, more important, on the achievement of a set of objectives for restoring security in Iraq.

I want to conclude by saying how proud I am of our military. I was pleased that the original Kerry amendment was voted down 93 to 6. I think by moving that date forward 6 months, the vote is not going to change very much.

I know Senator LEVIN has offered an amendment. I will just say this about it. I serve with Senator LEVIN on the Armed Services Committee. I am sure he is trying to reach some sort of compromise, some sort of unifying amendment for the Democratic side. I am really sort of disappointed at it, because I don't think, if adopted, it will serve any purpose and could cause much mischief and be misinterpreted.

I urge my colleagues to vote against both amendments, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the President. I apologize to the President for having to sit there at this late hour. It wasn't my doing. But I did want to speak on this issue. It is one of major importance, and one about which I have not spoken on the Senate floor previously. So I beg the indulgence of the Chair at this late hour.

Mr. President, on May 3, I introduced a resolution in the Senate that offered a clear break from our current counterproductive course in Iraq allowing our Armed Forces to return to their focus to defeating the terrorists who attacked us on September 11, 2001.

The resolution would do three things. First, it states that the United States should not maintain a permanent military presence or military bases in Iraq.

Second, it states that the United States should not attempt to control Iraq's oil.

And, third, it states that the United States Armed Forces should be redeployed from Iraq as soon as practicable after the completion of Iraq's constitution-making process, or December 31 of 2006, whichever comes first.

My resolution is identical to the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative MIKE THOMPSON of California with at least six Republican cosponsors. As far as I know, it is the only Iraqi resolution introduced that has bipartisan support. So I introduced the same measure here in the Senate.

I continue to believe that only this resolution offers a clear, unambiguous, principled stand—a stand that can produce the results that we all want.

Only when the Iraqi Government faces a firm timetable for U.S. redeployment will it have the incentive to

resolve its internal differences and stand on its own two feet.

And only when our government faces a firm timetable will it make urgent policy changes necessary to right our course in Iraq.

President Bush has it exactly backwards. He said that our Army will stand down only as the Iraqi Army stands up. The truth is that the Iraqi Army and government will stand up only when it is clear that the American military is committed to standing down by a date certain.

My resolution is a clear, unambiguous statement of our intention to move beyond the strategic blunder of Iraq which has distracted us from the fight against those who attacked us on September 11. Only such a clear break will allow us to recommit our military and intelligence resources to the unfinished task of crushing al-Qaida and capturing or killing Osama bin Laden.

We need this new decisive direction because President Bush is unwilling to change his current policies in Iraq which are manifestly a failure.

Let us be clear. Staying the course effectively means stay forever. It means to stay and pay and stay and pay and stay and pay.

Already we have paid with more than 2,500 dead and more than 18,000 wounded. We will continue to pay a terrible price in terms of lives and treasure, not only to the end of President Bush's term but well into the term of his successor and beyond. And for what? For a failed approach in Iraq that in the judgment of a large majority of national security experts is damaging America's national security and making us less safe.

Because I believe we need a new direction, I will vote for both the Levin-Reed amendment and the Kerry-Feingold-Boxer amendment.

I commend my friend and my colleague, Senator KERRY, for his leadership on this issue. I was here this evening listening to him. I listened to his colloquy with the Senator from Virginia. I think it is clear that Senator KERRY is on the right course. Also, Senator LEVIN, I believe is also on the right course. So I will support both, and I do so because I believe that both are better than what we have now.

But I also want to be clear that neither one is going to pass. We know that. So we shouldn't agonize over which one we can support. It doesn't matter what we do; it won't become law.

So why are we doing this? We are doing it because we must put pressure on the President. We do it because we need to speak for the American people who are way ahead of us, way ahead of the President, way ahead of the White House, and way ahead of the Congress on this issue. They know what we are doing in Iraq—costing \$7 billion a month, \$9 million an hour, 2,500 dead, 18,000 maimed and injured—they know it is wrong. They know we have been misled into this war.

My position is simply that anything we can do to give voice to the American people that will hopefully pull the President back to a more rational, reasonable and sane policy, anything that will do that I will support.

I realize that some, including the President's top political adviser, are eager to politicize this issue in an election year. They can't wait to frame this as a debate between those who support our troops and those who want to retreat, between those who want to fight and those who want to surrender.

This is outrageous, and it is false. It is the same inflammatory demagoguery that tore our country apart during the Vietnam war. Just as we were misled into the Vietnam war, so we were in Iraq. All you have to think is weapons of mass destruction equals the Tonkin Gulf. Weapons of mass destruction is to Iraq what the Tonkin Gulf was to Vietnam. Both misled us into a drastic, terrible war.

Just as the Nixon administration was bent and misused intelligence to fit a preconceived belief on Vietnam, so would President Bush in Iraq. Just as we heard the arguments in the early 1970s about Vietnam, that we have to fight the Communists there or we will be fighting them here, now we hear that we have to fight the terrorists in Iraq before we fight them here.

Just as we said in Vietnam we will have to support the government because it is a free government elected by 80 percent of the people, so now we hear the same thing about Iraq and terrorists.

The echoes are resounding about what we hear from this administration and their policies for Iraq and what we heard for Vietnam.

Let us be clear about what I think this debate is really about. It is about charting a smarter, more focused offensive against the terrorists who attacked us on September 11. It is about acknowledging that Iraq did not attack us on September 11, but that our invasion and occupation of Iraq has been a costly distraction from our fight against those who did attack us.

It is about giving the government in Iraq incentives to get its act together; to overcome sectarian divisions and stand up a viable, self-sustaining army.

This debate is about acknowledging that staying the course is no virtue if the course we are on is demonstrably wrong. Indeed, it is about acknowledging that staying the course means stay and pay. Stay and pay. It means that our Armed Forces will continue to stay and pay dearly with more than 20,000 already killed, maimed, and wounded. For our beleaguered taxpayers, it means stay and pay more of their hard-earned tax dollars and the debt that is being piled on for our children and grandchildren to pay—\$350 billion already on Iraq and counting.

The men and women of our Armed Forces deserve better than this.

Instead of putting bumper-stickers on our cars saying "support our

troops," let us actually support our troops. Let us give them some hope for a way forward from the current stalemate and quagmire.

They have brilliantly completed the task they were sent to Iraq to accomplish. Saddam Hussein's dictatorship has been deposed. We are certain that Iraq does not possess weapons of mass destruction—and never did. And the Iraqi people have a constitution and a democratically elected government.

To our troops goes great credit. They have achieved these things despite a series of disastrous decisions by their civilian leaders here in Washington.

President Bush himself has acclaimed the installation of a permanent Iraqi Government as a historic "turning point."

So the question is, why aren't our troops returning? Why are we still in Iraq with no commitment whatsoever even to a graduated redeployment?

Why has President Bush stated that we will be in Iraq at least through the end of his administration and into his successor's administration?

Why are we building what appears to be permanent military bases?

Why are we in the process of building a gigantic new United States embassy in Baghdad that will span 104 acres, the size of nearly 80 football fields?

What message does it send when the House Republican leadership 2 weeks ago insisted on stripping from the emergency supplemental appropriations bill Senate-passed language asserting that we will not build permanent bases or attempt to control Iraq's oil? We passed that in the Senate. The House Republicans took it out.

What message does that send to the insurgents and al-Qaida and the terrorists who would do us harm? None of these things give the impression that the United States plans on winding down our military and civilian presence or relinquishing our grip on Iraq.

To the contrary, it is easy to see how ordinary Iraqis as well as people across the world view this as the behavior of a conquering power that has no intention of leaving. Unfortunately, this perception creates continuing resentment. It feeds anti-Americanism. It continues to give powerful fuel to the insurgency, both in terms of motivation and recruitment, and it puts our American Armed Forces at greater risk.

It has now been more than 3 years since President Bush's speech on the flight deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln*. On that occasion, with a giant banner behind him claiming "Mission Accomplished," President Bush said triumphantly, "Major combat operations in Iraq have ended."

But today, 133,000 troops remain on the ground. President Bush again and again has signaled that the U.S. military presence in Iraq is open-ended and of indefinite duration.

This has given rise to suspicions that the United States has long-term designs on Iraq and its oil and deprives

the Iraq Government of the incentives to resolve its internal divisions and stand on its own feet.

With the war in Iraq now in its fourth year, it is clear that the present course is not a strategy for success. It is a strategy for continued stalemate and stagnation.

As I said, stay the course means stay and pay. Stay and pay. One-third of a trillion dollars we have spent so far and counting.

Indeed, I fear that stay the course also means stay forever—and this sends exactly the wrong signal. It stokes the insurgents who believe that the U.S. wants a permanent military presence in Iraq.

Don't think for a second that they do not know and they aren't putting out the word that the Republican leadership in the House 2 weeks ago stripped the language out of the Senate bill which stated that we were not going to have permanent bases and we will not control their oil. Don't think for a minute that they haven't broadcast that, that they aren't using that as a recruiting tool. Of course they are.

When President Bush says it will be through his administration and into his successor's administration before we decide what to do in Iraq, that is a powerful recruiting tool for the insurgents and the terrorists.

Our open-ended commitment to stay in Iraq as long as it takes has had the effect of taking away any incentive for the Iraqi Government to resolve its internal division and get its act together.

Parliamentary elections were held way back in early December. Has Baghdad descended into vicious sectarian violence? It took the Iraqis nearly 7 months to chose a prime minister and to fill all the ministries.

Now, as the Iraqis face a deadline for U.S. redeployment, there is no way they would have squandered 6 months before forming a government, nor would the Iraqis be dragging their feet in standing up a viable, self-sustaining army and police force.

I just heard the Senator from Alabama quoting a general. A lot of generals have been quoted around here. I guess I can quote a general too. How about General Casey, our commander in Iraq, who told the Senate last September. He said:

Increased coalition presence feeds the notion of occupation, contributes to the dependency of Iraqi security forces on the coalition [and] extends the amount of time that it will take for Iraqi security forces to become self-reliant.

Last September, General George Casey said that.

BG Donald Alston, the chief U.S. military spokesman in Iraq, put it this way:

I think the more accurate way to approach this right now is to concede that . . . this insurgency is not going to be settled . . . through military options or military operations. It is going to be settled in the political process.

Nor, I must add, is there a military solution to most of the critical prob-

lems confronting Iraq—sectarian strife, out-of-control crime, rampant corruption, widespread unemployment, chronic shortages of electricity and water and gasoline, and on and on. There is not a military solution to that; it is a political solution.

The Iraqi people also believe that a redeployment of U.S. forces would give a boost to the political process. According to a recent poll conducted by the University of Maryland, more than 80 percent of Iraqis want U.S. forces to leave Iraq. When asked what the impact of a withdrawal of U.S. troops would be, large majorities of Iraqis believe that insurgent attacks will decrease, sectarian violence will decline, and the sectarian factions in Parliament will be more willing to cooperate. That is what a majority of Iraqis believe. Yet somehow this administration believes differently.

We all hope the Sunni, Shia, and Kurdish leaders are sincere in their stated desire to avoid an all-out civil war. Prime Minister Maliki has formed a national unity Cabinet. As I said, President Bush has hailed this new Government as a turning point. We hope that is the case. But whether or not Mr. Maliki is willing or able to make good on his pledges, it is certainly time for a turning point in U.S. policy in Iraq.

The coming months must be a period of transition to full Iraqi sovereignty. It is time to hand off security responsibilities to the Iraqi Army and police, to redeploy most of our U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq by the end of this year. This strategic redeployment must involve converting our vast military presence on the ground in Iraq to a quick reaction force, staged in countries bordering Iraq, countries that share our interest in a stable Iraq and that view our military presence in the region as a stabilizing force.

This substantial over-the-horizon force would be used to strike at al-Qaida and its affiliates whether in Iraq or elsewhere. These forces would be able to respond in a timely manner, as they did 2 weeks ago in targeting and killing Al-Zarqawi.

I would expect, as our troops withdraw from Iraq, this would free up U.S. forces to combat the resurgence of the Taliban in Afghanistan. Other troops would be available to send to the emerging terrorist threats in countries such as Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen, which threaten to become major breeding grounds for terrorists.

The harsh fact is that the Iraq war has led to a decline in the overall readiness of U.S. ground forces. It has decimated our capacity to put large numbers of boots on the ground were we to face an emergency elsewhere, such as on the Korean peninsula.

At a Senate hearing last year, GEN Richard A. Cody, Army vice chief of staff, said:

What keeps me awake at night is what will this all-volunteer force look like in 2007?

He stated this in the context of a discussion about whether we could sustain

the operational tempo of deployments at the rate we have had since the beginning of the Iraq war. For all the military superiority we displayed in the invasion of March 2003, 3 years later, a guerilla conflict is grinding away at our military manpower and equipment.

We need to redeploy from Iraq in order to reset and reequip the force—ground forces in particular—so they are prepared for a more focused campaign against the terrorists who attacked us and continue to threaten us.

At the same time we are redeploying our Armed Forces, we need to foster sustained diplomatic engagement, working with Middle Eastern nations to facilitate rival Iraqi factions in reaching a political settlement. Iraq's neighbors have a profound stake in this stability, but they currently have no incentive to get involved. Once it is clear that the United States is leaving, those nations will be highly motivated to facilitate a coming together of the factions within Iraq.

Some say that U.S. forces in Iraq are the only thing that stands between the Sunnis, Shiites, the Kurds, and all-out civil war. I disagree. It is the ongoing presence of U.S. forces and the prospect that we will be in Iraq as a babysitter for years to come that has delayed progress on the political front. It is the ongoing presence of U.S. forces and statements by this President that we will be there for as long as it takes, it is actions such as were taken by the House Republicans in stripping that language out we put in that said we are not going to have permanent bases, we are not going to control the world, it is those actions which have delayed progress on the political front and have given the insurgents the narrative, the story, the recruiting tool they need.

Our presence in Iraq is a propaganda victory and recruiting tool for the insurgency in Iraq and for Islamic extremists around the world. The insurgents and jihadists are threatened by the overwhelming perception in the Arab world that the U.S. military is an occupying force, that we are building what appears to be permanent bases, that our continuing presence in Iraq is all about controlling oil.

Meanwhile, let's be clear on what continuing our current policy of stay and pay will entail. The Congressional Research Service reports that we are now spending \$6.4 billion a month in Iraq, up sharply from last year. That is \$9 million an hour every hour of every day. And we are doing so at a time when our budget, the budget put through by the Republicans who control the Congress, is slashing funds for education, cancer research, health care, other essential needs at home. The budget this year will mean we have 1,100 fewer research grants from the National Institutes of Health than we had 3 years ago. That is the path we are on. We have spent a grand total of about \$350 billion in Iraq.

As I have said, more than 2,500 troops have been killed, 18,000 wounded. More

than 8,500 of the troops are wounded so seriously they were listed as wounded in action, not to return to duty. Are we going to stay and pay for another 3 years, spending another \$300 billion, sacrificing more American troops, with more killed, more maimed and injured for life? Is that what we mean by supporting the troops? Is that what we mean, to stay more, with more killed, more maimed? Why in the world would we want to stay on a course that is so clearly counterproductive, so clearly a failure?

Last week, the Center for American Progress and Foreign Policy Magazine released the results of their survey of more than 100 of America's top terrorism and national security experts from across the ideological spectrum. The results show fewer than 2 in 10 believe the United States is winning the war on terror; 87 percent believe the war in Iraq has had a negative impact on our national security. So 87 percent of the top 100 national security experts around America say Iraq has had a negative impact on our national security.

Last Thursday, the Department of Defense issued a highly partisan "debate prep book," designed to help Republicans defend the war in Iraq. Likewise, the President and Vice President are staying the course with their endless happy-talk about progress in Iraq, about how democracy is on the march. But the facts on the ground tell a different story. I believe we should base our policy choices not on happy talk but on facts on the ground.

Clearly, by preemptively attacking Iraq, we have committed a major strategic error in the larger war against the terrorists who attacked us. Simply put, we took our eyes off the ball. We deferred our military and intelligence resources away from Afghanistan, away from the hunt for bin Laden. The consequences were plain to see. It is no coincidence today the Taliban has powerfully resurfaced in southern Afghanistan despite President Bush's claim on September 27, 2004, that "the Taliban no longer is in existence." Say again? As fighting in Afghanistan has intensified over the past 3 months, the United States has conducted 340 airstrikes in Afghanistan, more than twice as many as the 160 airstrikes carried out in the war in Iraq during the same period.

Meanwhile, while we have been distracted in Iraq, al-Qaida-like Islamic fighters have retained control of the Somalia capital of Mogadishu and have dealt a major blow to our counterterrorism efforts in the horn of Africa. Nor is it a coincidence that Osama bin Laden is still at large, still directing al-Qaida operations, still encouraging jihadists around the world.

Nearly 5 years ago, before a joint session of Congress, President Bush pledged he would "bring Bin Laden to justice or bring justice to bin Laden." That was 5 years ago. President Bush has done neither. Instead, he allowed bin Laden to escape and has gotten the U.S. military bogged down in a civil

war in Iraq—a huge strategic gift not only to bin Laden but also to Iran. Not only has our open-ended Iraqi entanglement taken the heat off the terrorists who attacked us on September 11, it has given them a propaganda victory and, as I said, a major recruiting tool. The sooner we acknowledge the strategic blunder and take steps to reverse it and the sooner we redeploy our military and strategic assets to confront our real enemies, the better off we will be.

The resolution I introduced setting a firm timetable for redeployment of U.S. troops from Iraq is about accelerating the emergence of Iraq as an independent nation willing to stand on its own feet. But it is also about the unity and security of the American people. This misbegotten, misguided, mismanaged war is dividing our Nation. I already mentioned how the President's top political strategist is planning to inflame passions in the war on Iraq in the months between now and the election. Again, I state, it is eerie, eerie how defenders of the Iraq policy, of our policy in Iraq are sounding exactly like defenders of Nixon's policies in Vietnam.

It is eerie how the defenders of Bush's policies in Iraq are sounding like the defenders of Nixon's policies in Vietnam in the early 1970s. Back in 1972, Nixon and his defenders were saying that we were winning the war, that we must stay the course. And guess what. They were saying we must not cut and run, that we must prop up the "democratic government" in Saigon, which was, of course, elected, as you know, by 80 percent of the people, and on and on and on.

I can remember a time when I sat in a room with a group of Congressmen in Saigon, listening to then-President Thieu tell us that we must stay in Vietnam and fight the communists there or we would be fighting them in the Philippines and in Japan and on our doorstep.

What do we hear now? We have to fight them over in Iraq or we will be fighting them here. Eerie, as I said. Eerie.

Quite frankly, I say today President Bush is saying almost the exact same things that Richard Nixon said, and he has no more credibility than Richard Nixon did.

Likewise, back in 1972, President Nixon and his supporters were arguing that withdrawal would undermine U.S. credibility in the world. But as LTG William Odom, Director of the National Security Agency under President Reagan, states in a current issue of Foreign Policy magazine—I want to quote him—

A rapid reversal of our current course in Iraq would improve U.S. credibility around the world.

I am going to repeat that. LTG William Odom, Director of the National Security Agency under President Reagan, in the current issue of Foreign Policy magazine, said:

A rapid reversal of our current course in Iraq would improve U.S. credibility around the world.

General Odom went on to say:

[Invading Iraq was not in the interests of the United States. It was in the interests of Iran and al Qaeda. For Iran, it avenged a grudge against Saddam [and left Iran as the strongest power in the Persian Gulf]. For al Qaeda, it made it easier to kill Americans.

That is not me. That is LTG William Odom, Director of the National Security Agency under President Reagan.

Beyond dividing our country, our endless, open-ended presence in Iraq has distracted our Government from urgent priorities, as I have said, in health care, education, law enforcement, and even a smarter approach to the very real terrorist threats of today and tomorrow.

The men and women of our Armed Forces have sacrificed greatly. I don't know why it is that because they have sacrificed so greatly—and the fact is, the Commander in Chief told them what to do, and they did it. So what. So to honor them, to honor what they have done in Iraq, we stay longer? We sacrifice more of our young people? We have more who are maimed for life? To honor them, we drain the Treasury of more of our dollars from taxpayers? Is that what it means to support our troops? I don't think so. I do not believe so.

I believe to support our troops is to do exactly what LTG William Odom said: A rapid reversal of our current course in Iraq.

It is time to allow the political process to go forward in Iraq. It is time to give Iraqi politicians greater incentive to bridge their differences and take responsibility for their country's future.

It is time to bring home as many troops as possible, consistent with force protection requirements.

It is time to redeploy as many as necessary to successfully pursue and crush bin Laden and al-Qaida and to protect our vital interests around the world.

President Bush tells us to be patient. He says Iraq will become a flourishing democracy that will spread the flame of freedom across the entire Middle East. But, with due respect to President Bush and to Vice President CHENEY and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, they have been consistently wrong—disastrously wrong—in all their predictions with regard to Iraq.

Before the invasion, Vice President CHENEY said that Iraq had “reconstituted nuclear weapons.” Secretary Rumsfeld said he knew exactly where Saddam was storing his weapons of mass destruction. And, as I noted 3 long years ago, President Bush said that major combat operations were over, mission accomplished.

Many of President Bush's people assured us that the war would be self-financed thanks to Iraq's oil—Paul Wolfowitz.

Vice President CHENEY said, more than a year ago, that the insurgency was “in its last throes.”

Just yesterday, at the National Press Club, Vice President CHENEY defended and repeated his claim that the insurgency is in its last throes.

I guess if you repeat something often enough—will people believe it? Listen to what Abraham Lincoln once said: You can fool some of the people all the time. You can fool all the people some of the time. But you can't fool all the people all the time.

Mr. CHENEY, you may have fooled some people. The American people are not buying it any longer.

I could go on and on with this litany of false assertions—prediction after prediction that turned out to be 100 percent wrong.

There are those who say: But if we leave, there may be civil war in Iraq. As I have stated, I think the longer we stay, there will be more sectarian strife, more insurgency. But to be honest, I can't tell for sure what the likely outcome will be. How can anyone tell what the likely outcome will be, when we can't trust what the administration is telling us, when we can't trust, any longer, the intelligence as it is being given to us by the administration? We can't tell for sure.

So at this point, President Bush has not only spent his political capital, I think he has squandered the last shred of credibility when it comes to Iraq. Specifically, as I said, with regard to America's departure from Iraq, I think the President has it backwards. He says our Army will stand down only as the Iraqi Army stands up. The truth is that the Iraqi Army and Iraqi Government will stand up—make the hard political decisions—only when it is clear that the American military is committed to standing down by the end of this year.

So I repeat, I will vote in favor of both the Levin-Reed amendment and the Kerry-Feingold amendment. As I said, anything is better than what we have now, even though I think both could go further in setting a clear, decisive new direction. I stand by my conviction—and the wording in my resolution, the same as was introduced in the House by Representative MIKE THOMPSON, with at least five if not six Republican cosponsors—that it is time to set a firm timetable for redeploying our troops from Iraq and redoubling our fight against those who attacked us on September 11. Only this new course will produce the results we all want, both on the ground in Iraq and in the campaign against al-Qaida and rebuilding, reconstituting our forces and rebuilding and reuniting the people of our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, I thank the Senate for allowing me to explain briefly, this evening, why I will be voting to stay the course in Iraq until the progress we are making there now ripens into complete victory. And I want to put that conflict in context.

The United States is in a war against a transnational army of fanatical extremists who routinely use terror against civilians its a weapon. The terrorists began attacking us before September 11. They attacked us in the 1980s and in the 1990s, when they bombed Khobar Towers, attacked the USS *Cole* and our embassies abroad, and first tried to bomb the World Trade Center. Our government did not recognize the threat and did not respond vigorously until after they escalated the war by the attacks on September 11.

We know who the terrorists are—an interlocking network of highly trained, deadly, and adaptive terrorist organizations funded largely by the Saudi Wahabbists and Iran. We know what their goals are from the al-Zawahiri letter which was intercepted in July of 2005. They want, first, to radicalize Islam by converting, suppressing, or killing those Muslims who resist their twisted and extreme interpretation of that religion. They want to exclude the principles of enlightenment thought from Islamic countries and set up a series of Taliban-like caliphates throughout the Muslim world. Those regimes would be run by religious thought police who would ruthlessly suppress free expression, religious dissent, social pluralism, political activity, and women's rights. We know that such regimes are possible; one existed in Afghanistan before America intervened, and another exists in Iran today.

We know the tactics they will use. The terrorists are patient, in the sense that they think generationally. They infiltrate mosques and they feed off the discontent and hopelessness many young Muslims feel. They see Western democracies as weak and feckless; they hope that with time and intimidation they can control the policies of these countries. They hope to gain control of sources of energy on which the West depends. And, the terrorists want to acquire weapons of mass destruction. Since they have no national base and no concern whatsoever for innocent human life, traditional means of deterrence—the threat of a counterattack—would be unlikely to prevent the terrorists from using such weapons should they get them.

The point is that the terrorists are trying to achieve these goals, and they are not going to stop voluntarily. There is no conceivable acceptable accommodation we could reach that would cause them to leave us alone. We must therefore counter their efforts, and to be effective we must fight on three “fronts,” as it were, at once: we must rebuild our intelligence and covert operations capability, we must deprive the terrorists of national bases of support, and we must work with mainstream Islam around the world to show Mideast Muslims in particular that there is a future for them in the principles of liberal democracy.

The operation in Iraq is a central part of all three of these “fronts.” Our

goal there was, first, to remove Saddam Hussein. His regime was an organic threat to world peace; he had twice invaded his neighbors and was systematically violating the commitments he made after Desert Storm. He had harbored and trained terrorists; more fundamentally, he was a tyrant who wanted weapons of mass destruction and was obstructing the war against the terrorists.

Second, the United States, in cooperation with mainstream Iraqi leaders from all parts and ethnic groups in the country, is building a multi-ethnic democracy in Iraq that will be a strong ally in the war on terror and will confront and confound the vision of the terrorists for the Muslim world.

The terrorists know how important the struggle in Iraq is to the overall war. That is why they are trying so hard to disrupt the new government. Yet they are not succeeding. The sacrifice and hardships endured by all the soldiers and families whose loved ones are serving in Iraq have resulted in major achievements for the Iraqi people.

In the 3 years since Iraq was liberated, the Iraqi people have assumed sovereignty over their country, held free elections, drafted a democratic constitution, approved that constitution in a nationwide referendum, elected a permanent representative under the new constitutional framework, and formed a government with representatives from all sections and religious groups within the country.

The Iraqi Government has become more capable of providing essential services to its people. The 2005 per capita GDP was more than double the 2003 amount, and exceeds the prewar 2002 amount by more than 30 percent. There are over 100 independent newspapers and magazines, 44 commercial television stations, and 72 commercial radio stations now operating in Iraq.

America continues to actively fight the terrorists, while building and training capable and effective Iraqi security forces, which eventually will take the lead in the fight and take responsibility for the safety and security of their citizens. Over 250,000 Iraqi security forces have been trained and equipped, which is an increase of 123,500 troops from January 2005. In addition, there are now more than 100 ground combat battalions of Iraqi military and special police forces conducting operations against the insurgency.

I do not begrudge anyone their discontent with how some of our operations have been conducted in Iraq. There have been mistakes.

The administration underestimated how long it would take to stabilize the Sunni triangle; our active duty army is too small and this has strained Reserve components; we have relied too much on technology and not enough on intelligence in counteracting the improvised explosive devices. Wars are messy and failures are inevitable; yet the Bush administration has had the au-

thority for the last 5 years, and I do not blame anyone for holding the administration accountable for the operational mistakes that have been made.

Yet I do ask everyone to recognize that this war is serious and necessary and must be won. I believe the decision to invade Iraq was, whatever mistakes have been made operationally, the only possible strategic choice. President Clinton was, quite properly, building the case for action against Saddam during his last years in office, even before the attacks on 9/11. I was in the House at the time and I remember clearly that Secretary Albright, Vice President Gore and the President himself repeatedly warned that Saddam was a major threat. In short, the war in Iraq, like the global war on terror of which it is a part, is America's war, which we must fight and win to protect our safety and freedom and to preserve from violence and oppression hundreds of millions of innocent people around the world. And we will win it, despite the mistakes, provided that we do not let strategic incoherence, partisan politics, or personal disaffection with the administration divide or discourage us.

For many of us, the hardest thing about war is not the physical or monetary sacrifice. It is the burden of having to confront unpleasant realities, choose consistently from unpalatable options, and sacrifice objectives that apart from the war would justifiably claim a priority. But if we really do value freedom, safety, pluralism, and justice, we must all resolve that we will shoulder this burden for as long as it takes. Our service men and women are doing their duty magnificently, and will continue doing it until they have won. They have shown by their sacrifice how much they value the safety of their families and the freedom of their country. We need to back them up.

That means, among other things, resolving to stay and fight in Iraq until the battle is won. To pull out now or to set an artificial timeline on withdrawal—especially after the victories of the last few weeks—would imperil everything the sacrifice that our service men and women has gained. It would encourage the enemy to struggle even more tenaciously and ruthlessly in the hope that America could be made to quit. It would demoralize our friends and it would convince those who have yet to take sides that the United States cannot be trusted to keep its commitments.

I want to encourage everyone about the progress we have made. We are winning, not just in Iraq, but in the larger global war on terror. We have allies now we didn't have 5 years ago—in Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iraq—and we have cooperation and support throughout the Muslim world that a few years ago would not have been possible. The operation against Zarqawi shows the value of our alliance with the new Iraqi Government and the increasing sophistication of our intel-

ligence. In short, there is no question that the United States, with its coalition partners, has the power to win in Iraq. The question is whether we have the resolution to win.

Most wars are combat operations with psychological components. Wars against terrorists might better be described as psychological operations with combat components. They are struggles between leaders, peoples, and "narratives" of the world. By that, I mean ways of looking at or judging the worth of human beings and the fundamental principles of human society. I know the American people have the strength and resolution to prevail, as they have prevailed in similar struggles for freedom throughout our history. I know our "narrative" of the world—our belief in the inherent dignity and equality of all human beings—is right and strong. I trust our leaders will be resolute in the struggle as well, and that by its votes tomorrow, the Senate will signal that we too have confidence in the success of our efforts, the worth of our sacrifice, and the justice of our cause.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today, as we resumed consideration of the Defense authorization bill, we have debated two very important amendments on U.S. policy in Iraq.

After the votes on the minimum wage amendments offered by Senators KENNEDY and ENZI, there were 5 hours of debate on the amendment on Iraq offered by Senators LEVIN and REED. Following this debate, Senator KERRY offered his amendment.

These amendments would call upon the United States to cut and run from Iraq, just when the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people need us the most. It is important for all of us to fully understand the dangerous implications of a premature withdrawal from Iraq.

If we withdraw from Iraq before the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi people are capable of defending their new democracy, the terrorists would see this as a vindication of their strategy of intimidation and violence. This would only embolden them to challenge us, as well as our friend and allies, elsewhere in the Middle East, around the world, and even right here at home.

While the new Government in Iraq is making substantial progress every day, it is not fully ready to defend itself and provide security for the Iraqi people. If we were to cut and run before Iraq can defend itself, the violence in Iraq would certainly increase. The terrorists could be expected to mount even deadlier attacks against the new Iraqi Government and innocent Iraqi civilians. Chaos would result. Bloody civil war would almost certainly follow, as terrorists and rival militias tore the country apart. In the process, they would kill thousands of innocent Iraqis.

In addition, the very unity of Iraq—a unity that we along with our coalition partners and the Iraqi people have worked so hard and sacrificed so much to secure—would be destroyed.

Sectarian violence would tear the country apart. It would split Iraq into segments controlled by terrorists or ethnic and tribal militias. This would allow the terrorists to achieve one of their highest priorities: to turn Iraq into a safe haven for terrorists and a base from which to launch attacks against our friends and allies in the region and even the American homeland.

The terrorists affiliated with bin Laden and Zarqawi have clearly stated their aim of overthrowing moderate governments throughout the Middle East. We therefore would have to worry about close friends that have cooperated with us in the global war on terror, such as Jordan, being transformed into terrorist regimes. The violence and instability that the terrorists seek to sow in Iraq would spread throughout the Middle East.

The terrorists have also demonstrated a strong interest in acquiring weapons of mass destruction for use as the ultimate terrorist tool. They seek to obtain these weapons and use them against innocent civilians. Given the presence in Iraq of many of Saddam Hussein's former weapons scientists, an Iraq under the control of terrorists likely would become a safe haven for the covert production of chemical and biological weapons.

President Bush has repeatedly stated that the potential combination of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction poses the greatest threat to the United States. The destruction of 9/11 would pale in comparison to the devastation terrorists could inflict with weapons of mass destruction produced in Iraq and covertly slipped across Iraq's porous borders.

Cutting and running from Iraq would allow the threat posed by the combination of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction to materialize. This is an unacceptable risk to the American people, and we simply cannot allow that to happen.

It is clear that those calling for an early withdrawal of American troops from Iraq fail to understand the potentially catastrophic implications of their proposal. Cutting and running before Iraq can defend itself would pose unacceptable risks to all Americans.

We, our coalition partners, and the Iraqi people have come too far. We cannot turn back now. We must stay until the job is done.

I look forward to today's debate on these amendments, and I urge my colleagues to speak out against the strategy of cutting and running from Iraq. It is a strategy that guarantees failure. And failure in Iraq is not an option.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague Senator BOND in discussing S. 2658, the National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006. A version of this groundbreaking legislation has been adopted by the Senate as an amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Defense authorization bill.

Our amendment would tangibly strengthen our national security by

giving the National Guard more of a voice in decisionmaking and in ensuring that our Nation is able to optimally tap the enormous experience and capabilities that exist within the National Guard.

Today's Guard is a 21st century military organization that is carrying its weight and more in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as here at home, whenever disaster strikes. But today's Guard is needlessly frozen in a 20th century Pentagon organization chart. The implications of that show up in everything from the Guard's depleted equipment stockpiles, to training and staffing and mission decisions. Our amendment clears away some institutional cobwebs to let the National Guard be the best it can be.

The Bond-Leahy amendment specifically increases the rank of the chief of the National Guard from lieutenant general to full general. It will ensure that the deputy commander of U.S. Northern Command come from the ranks of the National Guard. Additionally, the bill makes the National Guard a joint activity of the Department of Defense, giving the National Guard greater latitude to talk around the Pentagon. Finally, the Guard would be given greater ability to identify gaps in capabilities in our States' ability to respond to emergencies at home.

This amendment differs somewhat from the baseline legislation that Senator BOND and I introduced earlier this year. The amendment does not include a requirement that the chief of the National Guard sit on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and we also removed the provision that would give the National Guard separate budget authority. We heard some strong objections from other members about these two provisions, and, as chairs of the wide-reaching Senate National Guard Caucus, we wanted to do the best we could to accommodate every Guard supporter.

However, we still strongly believe in the importance of opening to the chief of the National Guard Bureau a position on the Joint Staff and of giving to the Guard more general flexibility in procuring equipment to match the needs of its missions. We will fight for these provisions another day.

Given that we have dropped the core objections that some have raised against Guard empowerment, there was absolutely no reason that any member of the Senate could oppose this legislation. This amendment is about fairness and effectiveness. It is about fairness in that it makes sure that the National Guard is not treated like a stepchild in key budget and policy deliberations. Giving greater institutional standing to the Guard makes it a lot harder for the Guard to get short-thrift in these discussions.

Our amendment is about effectiveness in that it will improve the use of the Guard in homeland security matters, which is becoming quite a regular phenomenon. The National Guard is being used regularly in a so-called title

32 status to increase security and provide military disaster response. Under this status, the Guard serves under command and control of the Nation's Governors, with Federal financing. In addition to the recent Southern Border mission, the National Guard served spectacularly during Katrina in this way, providing one of the most effective responses to that disaster. By allowing the National Guard to talk regularly across the Department of Defense and to work closely with the States to identify gaps, our amendment takes advantage of the knowledge of the members of the National Guard to help plug holes in our homeland defense. And we make this whole process for activating the Guard in title 32 far smoother.

The National Guard is critical to the Nation's defense on a number of levels. We must have the trust and confidence in this force to give them more responsibility. At the same time, we simply cannot have a repeat of the ill-advised recommendations from the Army and the Air Force that sought to slash the National Guard personnel levels. The Army wanted to cut the Army Guard by more than 17,000 troops and the Air Guard by almost 14,000. These proposed cuts made absolutely no sense.

We need to turn this dynamic around. We cannot keep asking the Guard to do more for the country, and then force it to justify its existence. The National Guard needs institutional standing and leadership commensurate with its missions and capabilities.

Our National Guard stands willing to do even more to protect the country, and this amendment will give them a key tool to help them contribute to the Nation's defense.

I thank my colleagues and friends, the chair and ranking members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, for their support of this amendment. We cannot afford to let our Guard down.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Levin-Reed amendment on U.S. policy in Iraq. Before I continue, I would like to say a word about our troops and their families. We owe our brave servicemembers and their families a debt of gratitude for their selfless service and great sacrifice in Iraq, over the last 3 years. Members of our Armed Forces are at this moment deployed in harm's way, many on their second or third deployment. They and their families should know they have our wholehearted support and gratitude, with deeds, not just with words. Our troops need to know, what is our exit strategy?

In October 2002, as the Senate debated giving the President authority to invade Iraq, I asked whether our troops would be greeted with land mines or parades. Three years later, we know the answer. Our forces have faced a violent insurgency and terrorist attacks that have claimed the lives of 2,500 brave American servicemembers. We went to war with Iraq, but today we find ourselves at war in Iraq. After 3 years, it is time for a new approach.

Mr. President, 2006 must be a year of transition in Iraq. We want Iraqis to lead, so we can leave. It is important for Iraqis to take ownership of Iraq. They must provide for their own security, take charge of economic development, and restore civic order. Iraq is beginning to move in the right direction, but our open-ended presence is keeping them from making faster progress.

That is why I am proud to support this amendment, which calls on the President to begin reducing U.S. troop levels in Iraq by the end of 2006. This amendment gives us a plan for a phased, structured withdrawal of our troops so Iraqi forces can take control of their country in an orderly way.

This is not about cut and run. This is about getting out of the way so Iraqis can run their own country. Iraqi security and police forces are getting stronger by the day, and the U.S. commander in Iraq, General George Casey, thinks it will be possible to reduce the U.S. presence in Iraq by as many as 30,000 troops by the end of 2006.

Iraqi National Security Adviser, Mowaffak al-Rubaie, has said that the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's Government in the eyes of its people. In an excellent article in the June 20, 2006 Washington Post, he details the "road map" for restoring security in Iraq and reducing the presence of foreign troops. The road map's objectives are similar to the benchmarks for withdrawal of U.S. forces outlined last year in legislation offered by Senator WARNER and Senator LEVIN, which I supported.

Here is what Mr. Rubaie said can be done: "With the governors of each province meeting these strict objectives, Iraq's ambition is to have full control of the country by the end of 2008. We envisage the U.S. troop presence by year's end to be under 100,000, with most of the remaining troops to return home by the end of 2007." He went on to say that ". . . the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people. . . . [T]he draw-down of foreign troops will strengthen our fledgling government to last the full four years it is supposed to." Mr. Rubaie concluded, "Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems, with the knowledge that our friends and allies are standing by with support and help should we need it." We salute and support the position the Iraqis themselves are taking. This is what the Levin-Reed amendment does. Iraqis want full control of their country by the end of 2008, and we should help them toward that goal.

We need to ensure that an adequate number of Iraqi Army battalions can operate independently to defeat the insurgency and protect Iraq's borders, and we must ensure an adequate number of Iraqi police and security units

are trained and equipped to maintain law and order. The Iraqi Government is committed to meeting these benchmarks as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, our brave men and women are serving with great honor in Iraq. Their service has paved the way for democratic elections and for the formation of a new unity government. We are all tremendously proud of their accomplishments and grateful for their sacrifice. It is time for the Iraqi Government to stand up, so our troops can begin to stand down.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an amendment that I intended to offer to the Defense Authorization bill to address the situation in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The amendment would have required that the United States charge, repatriate, or release individuals held at Guantanamo within 180 days of the enactment of the Defense Authorization bill. If for some reason the Government failed to comply within the timeframe provided under the amendment, the Department of Defense would have to provide a report regarding why they have not complied. The amendment would not have closed Guantanamo, and nothing in the amendment would have required the Government to release individuals who are a threat to our national security.

I think this is a reasonable approach. These are all options that the President has said that he is moving forward on. I have decided, however, not to offer my amendment at this time for a number of reasons. First, given the looming cloture vote, it is clear we will not have time to have a full and open debate on this issue. I believed that this is an important issue that deserved more time. I have also been advised by other Senators that they need additional time to study the proposal.

I strongly believe that the indefinite imprisonment of persons without charges is inconsistent with the traditions and values of the United States, and that it will continue to cause difficulty in our relations with other nations, including the allies that we rely on in confronting the threat of terrorism.

As President Bush said on June 14, 2006:

No question, Guantanamo sends a signal to some of our friends—provides an excuse, for example, to say the United States is not upholding the values that they're trying to encourage other countries to adhere to.

I think the President is right.

According to an article in today's Miami Herald, Retired Army GEN Barry McCaffery, who recently visited Guantanamo, said: "We are in a political and legal mess that is beyond belief" and political leaders need to fix the "legal schizophrenia" that exists by continuing to hold individuals at Guantanamo.

I completely agree, and it is my hope that the Senate will afford time to debate this issue in the near future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, America has long been a beacon of human

rights and democracy in the world. But Guantanamo demonstrates the administration's disrespect for the rule of law.

The administration is trying to have it both ways. They claim the detainees at Guantanamo are prisoners of war and thus should be held until the end of hostilities. At the same time they refuse to treat them as prisoners of war under the Geneva Conventions.

In the first gulf war, the International Committee of the Red Cross said that our Nation's compliance with the Geneva Conventions was the best of any country in any conflict in the history of the conventions. Sadly, this administration has presided over the steepest and deepest fall from grace in our Nation's history.

The administration did not give the detainees the field hearings required under article 5 of the conventions, when the information relating to their capture was most readily available. Over 2 years later, the administration created combatant status review tribunals to substitute for the field hearings they should have held.

It is no surprise that it is often very difficult to find the necessary evidence. Yet the administration doesn't even try. The Boston Globe recently reported that 34 detainees convinced officials that overseas witnesses would provide relevant testimony. But in every case—every case—the administration said the witnesses could not be found. Yet in three days, Boston Globe reporters found three out of four witnesses—one of whom is teaching right here at the Pentagon's own National Defense University.

The shocking ease with which the Boston Globe located these witnesses suggests that the Government didn't make an effort to find them and raises serious questions about the administration's good faith in dealing with the detainees at Guantanamo. We have an even greater obligation to make sure we have a strong case now, since we have already kept these people for so long.

The administration not only ignored the law when it came to ensuring that these people were properly classified, but it also failed to give them the proper treatment.

The Geneva Conventions clearly state the standard for humane treatment of prisoners of war:

No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind.

This administration threw out the golden rule that had served us so well for so long. Instead, they adopted new rules that allowed cruel tactics such as waterboarding, use of military dogs, and stress positions. The administration consistently overruled the objections of experienced military personnel and those who represent American interests abroad, including Alberto Mora, the former general counsel of the Navy.

As Secretary of State Colin Powell warned the White House, "It will reverse over a century of U.S. policy and practice in supporting the Geneva Conventions and undermine the protections of the law of war for our troops." Senior Defense officials were warned that changing the rules could lead to so-called "force drift," in which, without clearer guidance, the level of force applied to an uncooperative detainee might well result in torture.

But these wise words fell on deaf ears. Officials at the highest levels of the administration viewed the rule of law as inconvenient and quaint. As Lawrence Wilkerson, former chief of staff to Secretary Powell, said, "I don't think, in our history, we've ever had a presidential involvement, a secretarial involvement, a vice-presidential involvement, an attorney general involvement in telling our troops essentially *carte blanche* is the way you should feel."

There is little doubt that some of those detainees are cold-blooded killers intent on harming Americans. They should be charged for their crimes and locked away. But far too many were swept up in raids by the Afghans and turned over to the Americans for reward money. Some were seized from the streets of Africa, Thailand, or Europe. As Jay Hood, the former commander of Guantanamo, said, "Sometimes we just didn't get the right folks."

The terrorists don't obey the Geneva Conventions. But we can't win the war on terror by stooping to their level. We do not win by repudiating the very ideals our soldiers are fighting for. We win by setting an example—by doing unto others as we would have them do unto us.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have argued that we need to hold these people until the end of the war on terror.

We have created legal and literal black holes where detainees are being held without hope of receiving due process or fair and humane treatment, and that is nothing short of a travesty. We criticize such tactics in repressive regimes for doing exactly that. It is the height of hypocrisy. It violates the basic principles on which our Nation was founded. Indefinite detention is not the American way. We need to restore our standing in the eyes of the world as a beacon of human rights, and the best way to start is by closing Guantanamo.

I understand the Senator from New Mexico was unable to get sufficient time to debate his amendment and will not insist on a vote. I hope that he will continue to fight for its adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support the Bingaman amendment when it is offered again.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a matter that has tremendous potential to decrease cancer deaths among the millions of military dependents and retirees served by the

TRICARE health program. I am talking about colonoscopy, a medical procedure used very commonly to screen for colon cancer. Medical specialists tell me that colonoscopy is the most accurate test for detecting colon cancer at the very earliest stages, when it is highly treatable.

As my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee are aware, I have been very concerned that DOD's TRICARE medical plan hasn't covered colonoscopy to screen for colon cancer in average-risk beneficiaries over age 50, even though both Medicare and the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program did so. Instead, DOD's policy has been to pay for screening colonoscopy to detect colon cancer only for a very narrow group of high-risk individuals. This limitation meant that many of our military retirees and dependents have not been able to get access to this sensitive cancer screening test, and as a result, they may well have been subject to adverse health consequences from delayed cancer detection.

I called this omission to the attention of the committee and introduced legislation to rectify the situation. I was pleased to be joined in these efforts to fix this problem by Senators MIKULSKI and BINGAMAN.

Mr. President, I am pleased to say today that DOD has done the right thing by modifying the TRICARE criteria for screening colonoscopy so that all average-risk TRICARE beneficiaries over age 50 have access to this important cancer screening test. This new policy, which is retroactive to procedures performed since March 15, 2006, is good news in the ongoing battle against colon cancer, and I would hope that DOD would disseminate widely the news of the availability of this important preventive service.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senators BOXER and BINGAMAN in introducing an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Act concerning the Park Service's management of Santa Rosa Island within the Channel Islands National Park.

I remain deeply concerned about a provision in the House version of the Defense authorization bill regarding the future use of Santa Rosa Island.

Under a binding court settlement, non-native deer and elk must be removed from the island by 2011. The House language would prohibit the Park Service from eliminating this non-native herd by providing for a 4-year period of intensive hunting beginning in 2008.

The Park Service is firmly opposed to the House provision. Nor, to my understanding, did the Department of Defense ask for the language.

I am particularly concerned that the House provision would waste taxpayer dollars and deny public access.

The taxpayers paid approximately \$30 million to acquire Santa Rosa Island in 1986 to restore its native ecology and provide public access.

In addition to the \$30 million, the previous owners agreed to what would seem to be a fair deal: they were permitted to keep hunting and grazing on the land through 2011. A court settlement in the late 1990s removed the cattle immediately but reaffirmed that the non-native deer and elk would have to be removed by 2011.

Now, under the House provision, the prior owners will be able to continue charging \$16,000 or more for their privately operated hunting trips. Even though the Government purchased the island from them for \$30 million in taxpayer money, they would get to keep essentially everything they had before and that is simply not in the public interest.

As I said earlier, I strongly oppose the loss of public access to the island. This is the public's land. It is a national park, and the public should be able to visit it.

But these privately operated hunting trips require the closure of 90 percent of the island to the public for 4 to 5 months of the year, even sometimes during peak season.

Now while the House language doesn't specifically say this, I understand one of its purposes was to provide hunting opportunities for disabled veterans. Yet it should be pointed out that in California today, there are already nine military installations that permit hunting five that can accommodate disabled service members.

Two of these military installations, Camp Pendleton and Vandenberg Air Force Base, are adjacent to the Channel Islands National Park, and allow disabled veterans to hunt a variety of animals including deer, waterfowl, quail, feral pigs, small game, and coyote.

All together there are over 100 U.S. military installations where hunting is permitted, over 70 of which are currently accessible to disabled service members and veterans.

Consequently, I strongly believe that the Park Service should continue managing this National Park for the benefit of the general public.

It is simply unfair to the taxpayers to allow a provision in the House version of the Defense authorization bill to impede on the public's right to access the island.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, in offering the Military Family Support Act as an amendment to S. 2766, the fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill. This amendment would bring a small measure of relief to the families of our men and women in uniform as they seek to maintain a sense of normalcy here at home while their loved ones are deployed in service to our country. Our ongoing large-scale deployments in Iraq continue to demand so much from our men and women in uniform and their families. Passing this amendment is the least we can do.

As part of the predeployment process, military personnel with dependent

children or other dependent family members, such as elderly parents who require care, designate a caregiver for their dependents. This person will act in the deployed personnel's place to provide care for these family members during the period of deployment. The caregiver could be a spouse, parent, sibling, or other responsible adult who is capable of caring for, and willing to care for, the dependents in question.

The Jeffords-Feingold amendment would create two programs to provide additional leave options for persons who have been designated as caregivers. The first program would require the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, to create a program under which Federal employees who are designated as caregivers could use accrued annual or sick leave, leave bank benefits, and other leave available to them under title 5 for purposes directly relating to or resulting from their designation as a caregiver.

This amendment would also encourage the Secretary of Labor to establish a voluntary program under which private sector companies would create similar programs for their employees and to solicit participation from private sector companies. I commend the many employers around the country for their understanding and support when an employee or a family member of an employee is called to active duty, and I hope that companies in Wisconsin and around the country will participate in this voluntary program.

In addition, our amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to report to Congress with an evaluation of both the OPM program and the voluntary Department of Labor program. It is my hope that this evaluation will demonstrate the utility of such a leave program for designated caregivers and that these pilot programs could then be expanded to the designated caregivers of additional deployed military personnel.

This amendment builds on a measure that I introduced last year, S. 798, the Military Families Leave Act. That bill would provide a similar benefit to military families by allowing eligible employees whose spouses, parents, sons, or daughters are military personnel who are serving on or called to active duty in support of a contingency operation to use their Family and Medical Leave Act, or FMLA, benefits for issues directly relating to or resulting from that deployment. These instances could include preparation for deployment or additional responsibilities that family members take on as a result of a loved one's deployment, such as child care. I also introduced this bill during the 108th Congress.

Let me be clear, that the Jeffords-Feingold amendment does not amend the FMLA in any way. In fact, FMLA benefits are specifically exempted from the types of leave that can be used by designated caregivers for purposes directly related to or resulting from their caregiver responsibilities. While I

believe that the FMLA could serve as the basis for providing additional leave opportunities for designated caregivers, opposition in some quarters to the original FMLA makes this a difficult proposition. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of this landmark law, and I believe that the FMLA continues to provide much needed assistance to millions of workers around the country as they seek to care for their own serious health condition or that of a family member or as they welcome the birth or adoption of a child. I will continue to support this law and efforts to ensure that the vital benefits that it provides are not eroded.

The Military Family Support Act is endorsed by the National Guard Association of the United States, NGAUS, the National Military Family Association, NMFA, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, EANGUS, the Military Officers Association of America, MOAA, and the National Partnership for Women and Families.

I thank the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his work on this important measure, and I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee for agreeing to accept this amendment.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in support of this amendment to the 2007 Defense authorization bill which I cosponsored with my esteemed colleague from California, Senator BARBARA BOXER. I also thank my other colleagues who have joined us in cosponsoring this amendment.

It is my strong belief that all prisoners of war who die in captivity should be eligible for the Purple Heart, regardless of the cause of death, for they all will have paid the ultimate price. Approximately 17,000 prisoners of war—including fine servicemembers from my own great State of Maine—have died while in captivity since December 7, 1941—the start of World War II. More than 8,100 Korean war servicemen—46 from Maine—and more than 1,800 Americans—14 from Maine—remain unaccounted for from Vietnam.

In rightful honor of all our prisoners of war, I am proud to be co-offering this amendment to the DOD authorization bill that would bestow the Purple Heart upon those Americans who perished while held captive as a result of starvation, disease, or maltreatment. Currently, only prisoners of war who die during their imprisonment of wounds inflicted by an instrument of war—such as a gunshot wound or intentional poisoning—are eligible for posthumous Purple Heart recognition. Those who die of starvation, disease, or other causes during captivity are not.

How can we say that anyone who dies at the hands of our enemy doesn't deserve this mark of respect and honor from a grateful nation—whether they make the ultimate sacrifice on the battlefield or behind barbed wire? They fought for America and died at the hands of our enemy—what more do we

need to know and what more could they have given than their very lives? They and their families have earned this honor.

The intent of this amendment is to correct this injustice by requiring the President, our Commander in Chief, to review the current circumstances establishing eligibility for the Purple Heart and advise Congress on modifications to the criteria for the Purple Heart award, which I strongly believe should take into account such inhuman war tactics as the deliberate withholding of medical treatment for injury or disease by enemy forces.

Last month, the House Armed Services Committee adopted their version of the Honor Our Fallen Prisoners of War Act—which had 216 cosponsors—during committee markup of the Defense authorization bill. The Honor Our Fallen Prisoners of War Act has been endorsed by a number of prominent military and veterans organizations, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Korean War Veterans Association, National League of POW/MIA Families, and the Tiger Survivors.

The posthumous awarding of the Purple Heart Award to members of the armed services who died while in captivity or died due to injury or illness incurred while in captivity would be of only some comfort to the next of kin of these fine service men and women. I sincerely hope that the Senate Armed Service Committee will follow suit by taking similar action as the House and adopt this legislation.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DAY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, yesterday, my colleague and friend, Senator SANTORUM, hosted a bipartisan, bicameral event to evaluate the status of religious freedom in America and around the world. I thank Senator SANTORUM for his passionate commitment to the cause of religious liberty, as well as my colleagues NORM COLEMAN and SAM BROWNBACK for their participation.

Religious freedom is the bedrock of our founding principles. Indeed, it is the very first clause of the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

As George Washington wrote in his letter to the United Baptist Chamber of Virginia, May of 1789: “Every man, conducting himself as a good citizen,