



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2006

No. 82

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable John E. Sununu, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, open our hands today. Help us to use them to relieve suffering, to convey friendship, and to serve others. Open our eyes, O God, to see Your plan. Teach us Your precepts so that we will honor Your Name. Open our minds, Lord. Make us relentless in searching for Your truth.

Strengthen our lawmakers for today's challenges. Infuse them with patience and give them a vision of Your purposes for our world. Keep them from making judgments without examining the facts and weighing the evidence.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JOHN E. SUNUNU led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 22, 2006.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable John E. Sununu, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. SUNUNU thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

### SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning we will be resuming debate on a couple of pending amendments to the Defense authorization bill. Under the agreement, we will have 60 minutes of debate and closing remarks in relation to the Levin amendment and the Kerry amendment related to Iraq. Following that 60 minutes, the two leaders will have up to 30 minutes total for final remarks. After those statements, we will proceed to three rollcall votes. The first vote will be on the Levin amendment, to be followed by the Kerry amendment, to be followed by a vote on cloture on the bill.

If cloture is invoked, the two managers will then be in a better position to indicate how much work remains on the Defense bill. It is our intent to continue to work toward final passage, and therefore Senators should expect votes throughout the day and into the evening. I will have an update for Members early this afternoon after we conclude the votes and I consult with the Democratic leader and the bill managers.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

### WOMEN SENATORS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the night before last, I went home and my wife told me: You have to be home tomorrow—that is, Wednesday night—because at 9 o'clock all nine Democratic women Senators will be on "Larry King." I did get home in time to watch the nine Democratic women Senators on "Larry King."

When I came to the House of Representatives, there were 22 women in that huge 435-Member body. Now I think there are 62 or something like that. I don't know the exact number.

I was elected to the Senate in 1986 with BARBARA MIKULSKI. As indicated last night, she is the dean of the Senate women. She is certainly the dean of those nine Democratic Senators there.

Having experienced the Senate, a body of 100, with hardly any women, I know how much better the Senate is because of having women in the Senate. It has improved the Senate. It has improved our country.

I was so proud of those nine women last night, proud of what our country has done and what it has come to. These women have not made the Senate better simply because they work on issues relating to women. That has only been part of their talent. They have worked on wide-ranging issues. Senator MIKULSKI, for example, spent tremendous time on health. The National Institutes of Health are located in her State. Senator FEINSTEIN, for example, was the ranking member and chair of the Military Construction Subcommittee responsible for billions of dollars. She has done an outstanding job.

I am not going to run through the talents of all nine, but they have made the Senate a much better place. Even though I, as the Democratic leader, was so very proud of those nine women last night, it didn't matter what their party affiliation was. This was good for the country to see these women there on national television, talking about

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S6323

issues they believe are important. The Senate will get better with more women. It is a unique body, and we are all very fortunate to be able to serve in the Senate. But just speaking from personal experience, the Senate, I repeat, is a much better place because of the women who serve in the Senate.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

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

The 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.

Levin amendment No. 4320, to state the sense of Congress on the United States policy on Iraq.

Kerry amendment No. 4442, 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 60 minutes for debate, divided as follows: Senator WARNER, 30 minutes; Senator LEVIN, 15 minutes; and Senator KERRY, 15 minutes.

Who yields time? The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator WARNER, would the Chair please advise me when I have consumed 10 minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, since last Tuesday, scores of my constituents have called my office and otherwise communicated with us, asking a very poignant question. Since last Tuesday, this country has mourned the deaths of two brave soldiers who were kidnapped and mutilated and killed, both Army PFC Kristian Menchaca, from Texas, and Thomas Tucker, of Oregon. The question my constituents are asking me is, How on Earth could the Senate be debating resolutions of withdrawal from Iraq in the same week that we discovered the mutilated bodies of these two American soldiers? Shouldn't our debate, rather, recall the famous words of Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysburg address, "That they shall not have died in vain," and motivate us to redouble our efforts to support our

troops in carrying out the unfinished business that remains in Iraq?

There is unfinished business there, to bring to justice the people who committed these heinous acts and to rid that country and the region once and for all of the evildoers who support that kind of violence against both Americans and Iraqis and who promise in the future to commit that same kind of violence against us until they have become victorious. These are the terrorists.

I found it interesting that one of our colleagues was arguing, wrongly, that there were no terrorists in Iraq before we invaded the country and eliminated Saddam Hussein. The evidence is overwhelming that is not true. But in any event, of what importance is it, given the fact that they are there now, mutilating and killing American soldiers and Iraqi citizens? What do the terrorists have in mind if we pull out?

The President recently and succinctly described the plans of the terrorists, directly quoting from a letter that Ayman al-Zawahiri, who is the second in command of al-Qaida behind Osama bin Laden, wrote to Abu Mus'ab al-Zarqawi, who recently, of course, was brought to justice by American troops and was bin Laden's designated leader of al-Qaida in Iraq:

Their objective is to drive the United States and coalition forces out of Iraq, and use the vacuum that would be created by an American retreat to gain control of that country. They would then use Iraq as a base from which to launch attacks against America, and overthrow moderate governments in the Middle East, and try to establish a totalitarian Islamic empire.

In that same letter, Zawahiri stated that the battle in Iraq "is now the place for the greatest battle of Islam in this era."

It doesn't matter if we are fighting them. They are going to fight us. The point is, they are going to fight us wherever the point of the battle is, based upon their choosing. Today they chose that battle to be in Iraq. In some respects, given the quality of American forces, that is a better place for us to be confronting this enemy, these evildoers, than waiting for them to come back and attack us in the United States. That is why we owe so much to the soldiers and to the sailors and to the airmen and to the Marines whom we have sent into harm's way to confront the enemy there. We owe them not just the best training and the best equipment and the best planning in the world to enable them to carry out their missions but support here at home.

The question my constituents are asking me is, What message does it send to our troops, to our allies, and to our enemies, when we begin talk of withdrawal? You can sugarcoat it all you want. You can call it phased withdrawal, you can call it timelines, but whatever you call it, it pretty much amounts to the same thing.

The distinguished minority leader, as a matter of fact, said just a couple of days ago, and I am quoting:

I think that even though we have at least two positions, I think if you look at them closely, they're both basically the same, that there should be redeployment of troops. It's a question of when.

Indeed. One resolution says: Right away; it has to be done this year. That is a time certain, this year. And another one talks about submission of a plan with estimated dates. Dates, of course, are times certain. Whenever they are established, you have a specific time within which the withdrawal is to occur, whether it is in a phased way or all at once, right next door or 1,000 miles away. The bottom line, whatever you want to call it, is withdrawal of American troops within certain timeframes to no longer be able to perform their mission there.

Why would you take that kind of position when there is work yet to be done? It has to be based upon the guess that by the time that time comes the work will be finished, that we will have done sufficient work in Iraq and training up the Iraqi soldiers and performing, ourselves, that we will no longer be needed. But nobody supporting these resolutions knows that. The military commanders on the ground will tell you that they do not know it. No one can know what the circumstances on the ground will be by the end of 2006 or by the middle of 2007.

All wars are based upon the circumstances at a given time on the ground. It would have been folly, for example, simply because we were losing significant numbers of American soldiers in World War II, for the U.S. Congress to pass a resolution, sending it to President Roosevelt, saying you have to be out of Germany by a date certain and you have to begin a phased withdrawal of our Pacific troops by a date certain.

At that time, America was committed to performing the mission, to getting the job done, to winning the war. What should the condition for withdrawal be? Victory; the ability to say we have accomplished our mission, we have pacified the country to a sufficient extent that we can leave without creating a power vacuum into which the Iranians and the Syrians and perhaps the Turks or others might come into Iraq because of their interests in the area, not sending a message to our allies in the region that, instead of being on the winning side, it turned out that they chose the wrong side, the side that wanted to leave the battlefield before the battle was won.

Think about the Iraqis who are supplying intelligence to us right now. They have calculated that we are the winning side and that they can give us information to help get these evildoers without fear of retribution—that when we leave they are going to be vulnerable to attacks by the insurgents and the terrorists who remain. They calculate that we will stay long enough to do the job. The same thing for the 12 million Iraqi people who elected their Government and the same thing for the