

right for the greatest country in the world, not a privilege. Too many things have been given to the privileged in this country while working families are trying hard every day to make ends meet.

So I wish to thank all our colleagues who have worked so hard on this legislation. It is something we can all be very proud of, and I ask the President to take another look. This body together, 68 Members who voted, were not playing politics. We were coming together in a bipartisan way to be able to give more children, American children, the ability to get their health care needs taken care of. It is time we had the President join with us in the right set of priorities for American families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader is recognized.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for coming to the Senate floor. Occasionally, there are debates in this Chamber that really matter. The debate on the war in Iraq certainly leads that list. We have a deadly war underway. A hundred American soldiers are killed, on average, every single month. Almost 4,000 have died, with 30,000 having been injured. At least 10,000 have been seriously injured, with amputations and burns and traumatic brain injury. That should be the focal point of what we do on the floor of the Senate, and it is.

Yesterday, sadly, an important amendment by Senator WEBB of Virginia, an important amendment for soldiers and their families, was defeated, defeated on a vote of 56 to 44. The average person might say: It sounds like you won. Not by Senate math. By Senate math it takes 60 votes on controversial issues, and this required 60, so that wasn't enough. We were defeated in an effort to say something very straightforward: If you are going to ask our soldiers to be deployed in combat, risking their lives for 12 months, you should at least give them 12 months afterward to rest, be reunited with their family, retrained and reequipped, before they go back into combat. So 12 months on duty, 12 months off duty. That was defeated.

If you meet with these soldiers and their families, if you know the stress they are under, if you read the numbers about the divorce rate among our soldiers, the suicide rate, the post-traumatic stress disorder which they are battling as they return from the stress of battles, it is hard to imagine the Senate would not give that kind of consideration to our soldiers and their families. That is a critically important debate.

Now, we will soon move to another very important debate. It is about health insurance. Everybody in Amer-

ica knows there is something that needs to be done on health insurance. There are 47 million of our neighbors in America, people who live with us in our communities and go to church with us, who have no health insurance. In my home State of Illinois, I went back in August in deep southern Illinois, near Harrisburg, in Saline County, and a woman came to me and said: I am 63 years old. I am a realtor. I have never had health insurance 1 day in my life. It is hard to imagine, but that is the reality many working Americans face every single day. They are one diagnosis, one illness away from bankruptcy. Those are the people with no health insurance.

Now, let us speak about those who have health insurance but it isn't good enough; it costs more each year and covers less. We know the story. Businesses tell you, labor unions tell you, families tell you: I don't have the kind of coverage I want, and it costs a fortune. That is the reality.

We also know that in our great Nation there are 15 million children—of the 47 million I mentioned earlier, 15 million are children—with no health insurance. These are kids from families not poor enough to qualify for Medicaid and not fortunate enough to have a parent with a job that has health insurance. There are 15 million kids for whom the only opportunity for health care is a trip to an emergency room.

We wanted to change that 5 years ago, and we passed this CHIP program, Children's Health Insurance Program, and said let us do something about it. So we covered 6 million of the 15 million kids, but now the program is going to expire in a few days. Our hope with this new Congress was we could expand health insurance to cover more children, at least 3 million more. We want to make sure all 15 million are covered, but we are not going to quite reach that goal. We want to at least get closer, with 9 million covered.

We had a bipartisan agreement to do that. The Senate came together, cooperated, compromised, and reached an agreement to expand health insurance protection to another 3 million kids. This morning, the President of the United States had a press availability and announced he would oppose this bill expanding health insurance for children. At the time, the spokesman for his administration said: We don't want to give health insurance to families who are well off. They defined a family that is well off as one that makes \$60,000 a year.

Now, I have to tell you, \$60,000 is more than the average wage in my hometown of Springfield, IL, but not by much. And \$60,000 a year, after you pay your taxes, doesn't leave a lot of money for your mortgage payment, for your utility bills, for your property taxes, and for the kids' school expenses. If you happen to not have health insurance where you work, \$60,000 doesn't leave much of a cushion to turn around and buy health insur-

ance. That insurance is going to cost you \$60 or \$80, maybe \$1,000 or more a month.

We think those families, with kids who don't have health insurance, making \$60,000, deserve a helping hand so they can at least have the security of health insurance and know their kids are covered. But it is going to be a battle. We are going to pass this bill and send it to the President. He is going to veto this bill—at least he promises to. I hope he reconsiders. But if not, we will then get a chance to override his veto.

This is the kind of debate which matters. For millions of Americans and their families, this debate gets down to one of the real issues that keep parents awake at night, worrying about their kids.

Some of us in our lives have been through this experience. I was a law student when my wife and I had a little baby and were without health insurance. We had some medical issues with our baby. I didn't have health insurance to turn to. That happened many years ago. My daughter is now 40 years old. But let me tell you, I will never forget it. There was a sinking feeling that my girl was not going to get the best doctor and the best care because, as a father, I didn't have health insurance to cover her. It was only for a short period in my life, but I will never forget it. I can't imagine people living with that feeling every day, every week, every month, and every year. Shouldn't we, as a great and giving nation, care about our own first?

This President will not even blink when he sends us a bill in a week or so asking for \$198 billion more for the war in Iraq—\$198 billion. Yet he is unwilling to spend \$6 billion for health insurance for children. That is about what it is each year over a 5-year period of time. He will spend \$198 billion for the war in Iraq but not \$6 billion to make America stronger, to make America's families stronger.

This is a debate worth waging. This is an issue worth fighting for. This Senate will return to that issue in a week or two, and I hope the American people, on a bipartisan basis, as this bill is bipartisan, will join us in urging the Senate to pass the bill and to override the President's veto.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

## NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1585, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1585) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Nelson (NE) (for Levin) amendment No. 2011, in the nature of a substitute.

Warner (for Graham/Kyl) amendment No. 2064 (to amendment No. 2011), to strike section 1023, relating to the granting of civil rights to terror suspects.

Cornyn amendment No. 2934 (to amendment No. 2011), to express the sense of the Senate that General David H. Petraeus, Commanding General, Multi-National Force-Iraq, deserves the full support of the Senate and strongly condemn personal attacks on the honor and the integrity of General Petraeus and all the members of the United States Armed forces.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after Senator BOXER offers an amendment related to the subject matter of the pending Cornyn amendment, the Boxer and Cornyn amendments be debated concurrently for 20 minutes, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators BOXER and CORNYN or their designees; that no amendments be in order to either amendment; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Boxer amendment; that upon disposition of that amendment there be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the Cornyn amendment; that each amendment be subject to a 60-vote threshold, and if the amendment does not achieve 60 votes, the amendment then be withdrawn, with the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I wonder if my friend would modify that to have the second vote for 10 minutes rather than 15 minutes?

Mr. LEVIN. I so modify the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I think the distinguished chairman and I have had a conversation that, following that, for the benefit of our colleagues, we would move to the Feingold amendment and with it we will seek a time agreement. Then with the cooperation of our colleagues, we will at least try as much as possible to dispose of Iraq amendments today, if we could.

I remind my colleagues we still have the basis of this bill, which has Wounded Warriors, pay raises, housing, training, and equipping of the men and women of the Armed Forces. We do have a number of pending amendments on the bill. I think, in fairness, we

should try to dispose of the Iraq issue as soon as possible so we could move on to the rest of the bill and pass it so we can get to conference and get it signed. There are vital parts of this bill on which the chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee have worked literally months, and I hope we could get to that aspect of the legislation as well.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield for a moment, on that point I agree totally with what he just said about the importance of this bill. We are circulating a request to our Members on this side that no amendments be in order to this bill—that no amendments be filed after a certain point this afternoon, which I believe we have tried to identify as 3 o'clock. I don't know, I didn't have a chance to talk with my friend from Arizona about that, but hopefully on your side something similar could be hot-lined so we could bring this to an end.

We have literally 250 amendments already. We have disposed of a lot. We disposed of 50. We can dispose of more today at some point, but we can't have more amendments coming in than we are able to work out.

I hope on both sides we can get a unanimous consent agreement that no amendments will be in order to this bill in the first degree if they are filed later than a fixed time this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the initial unanimous consent request, as modified, by the senior Senator from Michigan?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time? The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2947 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2011  
(Purpose: To affirm strong support for all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and to strongly condemn attacks on the honor, integrity, and patriotism of any individual who is serving or has served honorably in the United States Armed Forces, by any person or organization)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2947 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 2947:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

**SEC. \_ SENSE OF SENATE**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The men and women of the United States Armed Forces and our veterans deserve to be supported, honored, and defended when their patriotism is attacked;

(2) In 2002, a Senator from Georgia who is a Vietnam veteran, triple amputee, and the recipient of a Silver Star and Bronze Star, had his courage and patriotism attacked in an advertisement in which he was visually linked to Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein;

(3) This attack was aptly described by a Senator and Vietnam veteran as "reprehensible";

(4) In 2004, a Senator from Massachusetts who is a Vietnam veteran and the recipient of a Silver Star, Bronze Star with Combat V, and three Purple Hearts, was personally attacked and accused of dishonoring his country;

(5) This attack was aptly described by a Senator and Vietnam veteran as "dishonest and dishonorable."

(6) On September 10, 2007, an advertisement in the New York Times was an unwarranted personal attack on General Petraeus, who is honorably leading our Armed Forces in Iraq and carrying out the mission assigned to him by the President of the United States; and

(7) Such personal attacks on those with distinguished military service to our nation have become all too frequent.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to reaffirm its strong support for all of the men and women of the United States Armed Forces; and

(2) to strongly condemn all attacks on the honor, integrity, and patriotism of any individual who is serving or has served honorably in the United States Armed Forces, by any person or organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the clerk for reading those words. I hope Members of the Senate heard them well because in this amendment, what we are doing is saying that there is essentially a terrible trend in America today: to launch attacks on honorable people who serve in the military. By the way, it isn't just folks who were mentioned or alluded to. I have an article I would like to have printed in the RECORD from the San Diego Union Tribune, April 16, 2004, and another from the Seattle Times of May 13, 2007.

I ask unanimous consent to have two articles printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the San Diego Union Tribune, Apr. 16, 2004]

RETIREMENT GENERAL ASSAULTS U.S. POLICY ON IRAQ

(By Rick Rogers)

Retired Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni wondered aloud yesterday how Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld could be caught off guard by the chaos in Iraq that has killed nearly 100 Americans in recent weeks and led to his announcement that 20,000 U.S. troops would be staying there instead of returning home as planned.

"I'm surprised that he is surprised because there was a lot of us who were telling him that it was going to be thus," said Zinni, a Marine for 39 years and the former commander of the U.S. Central Command. "Anyone could know the problems they were going to see. How could they not?"

At a Pentagon news briefing yesterday, Rumsfeld said he could not have estimated how many troops would be killed in the past week.

Zinni made his comments during an interview with The San Diego Union-Tribune before giving a speech last night at the University of San Diego's Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice as part of its distinguished lecturer series.

For years Zinni said he cautioned U.S. officials that an Iraq without Saddam Hussein would likely be more dangerous to U.S. interests than one with him because of the ethnic and religious clashes that would be unleashed.