

there was a story this morning on television about how marines were held up for about 2½ hours by the TSA at one of the places they landed in the United States. They refused to allow the marines to go into the terminal because I guess they provided some kind of threat. In any event, the marines are now coming back to face additional challenges—not just the challenges of the TSA that we all undergo, but, regrettably, too many of them have mental health problems, TBI and PTSD, and in the Defense authorization bill we have passed provisions to assist the wounded warriors coming home. But they have been successful, and return on success means al-Qaida is no longer able to exercise control over Al Anbar.

For those who think this is a diversion in the battle in the war on terror, all they have to do is listen to the leaders, Osama bin Laden and Zawahiri, who have said the headquarters of the caliphate from which they are going to conduct worldwide operations is the land between the two rivers. That is, of course, Iraq. If they win there, they are stronger, and they will establish their headquarters there.

The intelligence community leaders, in January of this year, spoke in open session before the Intelligence Committee. They said if we withdraw before we have established relative peace and stability in the area—in other words, if we withdraw on a political timetable dictated by this body—there will be chaos. Three things will happen. There will be increased killing among Shia and Sunni, genocide and bloodshed. Two, that will bring in the other states in the region to protect their co-religionists, and we will see the potential of a regionwide sectarian war. Three, most frighteningly, al-Qaida will establish the safe haven they have sought in Al Anbar and elsewhere from which to embolden their efforts and attack the United States and United States persons abroad, and our allies.

All you have to do to get an idea of the effectiveness of our new counterinsurgency efforts, led by General Petraeus, is to pay attention to what was found in the pocket of Abu al-Tunisi, the Tunisian al-Qaida leader in Iraq who was responsible for bringing foreign fighters into Iraq—the ones from Iran, Syria, Yemen, and others, with all of the resources they had. Al-Tunisi had written letters to his leader, saying: I am suffering. They are strangling us. I cannot get support.

We have hurt them and we have hurt them badly. Yes, al-Qaida is a threat, but al-Qaida is not basing that threat from Iraq. Their leaders are probably in the mountains of Pakistan or Afghanistan. I can assure you we are doing everything we can—and we obviously cannot discuss what we are doing—to capture and kill those leaders. Right now, we have taken advantage and the counterinsurgency strategy is working. I commend our troops and General Petraeus.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, we worked together on this, and I ask unanimous consent to have 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my understanding is that the Republican side is going to extend its request for morning business.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I intend to ask unanimous consent that the time spent on the Intel bill not be deducted from our time.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Missouri spoke for approximately 10 minutes, is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority side be given 10 additional minutes in morning business, 2 of those to be allocated to the Senator from West Virginia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, does that include 10 minutes for my colleague from Texas? I will ask for 10 additional minutes for the minority side, which may have other subjects to talk about.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object. I was protecting your side for the 30 minutes initially allocated.

Mr. BOND. In that case, I withdraw my request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the request there would be an additional 10 minutes on the Republican side?

Mr. DURBIN. It is my understanding that 30 minutes was allocated to the Republican side for morning business. The Senator from Missouri spoke for approximately 10 minutes on an issue and asked that that not be deducted from the Republican morning business time. I am happy to acknowledge that, and I ask that we be given 10 minutes, 2 of which will be given to the Senator from West Virginia. So that protects those still here for the 30 minutes originally allocated for Republican morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the time will be so adjusted.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank the Senator from Illinois.

All I wanted to say is that I think the unanimous consent agreement which has been reached is the start. I want to use every fiber in my body to thank the distinguished vice chairman, Senator CHRISTOPHER BOND, from Missouri, for the enormous role he played in making this happen. It was objected to only a few days ago. It was cleared

last night, and I think it exemplified the partnership the Senator from Missouri and myself are trying to bring to the Intelligence Committee. This is an example of our work.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Is it now the appropriate time for us to begin our 30-minute allocation for morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. There is additional time on the Democratic side, but nobody is seeking recognition.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks for up to 10 minutes, Senator BENNETT be recognized for up to 10 minutes, and then Senator KYL be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

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

TAXES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, more than 1 month ago, I spoke on the floor regarding the need for the Senate to confirm Jim Nussle as the head of the Office of Management and Budget and about my constituents' concerns that are regularly voiced to me about the runaway Federal spending in Washington, DC, and its impact on their ability to earn a living or run a business, and their concern about the direction of the economy for the future if the Federal Government continues to occupy more and more space when it comes to their hard-earned tax dollars.

I mentioned my fear that the tax-and-spend season was upon us here in Washington, DC, and there seemed to be some early indications that some of the progress we have made as a result of progrowth, low-tax policies was going to be reversed under the new management in Washington.

In my State of Texas, to give you a snapshot, unemployment is near its lowest level in 30 years, while more than a quarter of a million new jobs have been created over the past year. That is out of the 8.3 million new jobs created in this economy since August of 2003. Instead of talking about how we can preserve these hard-won gains for the American people and my constituents back home in Texas, we hear more and more talk about raising taxes and expanding the size of the Federal Government. Instead of talking about how can we help support and nurture the entrepreneurial spirit in America, we are hearing more folks talking about how can we grow the bureaucracy and Federal programs and the size of the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, we are beginning to see a trend when it comes to raising taxes. Yesterday's suggestion by some members of the House is a disturbing example of that. Yesterday, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee unveiled a proposal that would

require taxpayers to add anywhere from 2 percent to a 15-percent surcharge to their income tax bill.

In the Senate, the majority leader declared that nothing should be off the table. I am glad to see that the Speaker of the House of Representatives quickly voiced her disagreement with this tax surcharge proposed by Congressman OBEY. His proposal would amount to an annual tax increase of \$150 billion a year, or three-quarters of a trillion dollars over the next 5 years—a bad idea, in my view.

At the same time, with this chart, I will document some of the proposals that have been made, because it helps to see them in one place and add them up because you only then begin to understand the full impact of these discrete proposals that are being made, all of which would result in increased taxes.

First, the budget that was passed earlier this year, of course, is where the Federal Government says how much it intends to spend and where that money is supposed to come from.

The disturbing thing to me was that it contemplated the spending levels in that budget that passed—without my support, by the way—contemplated an increase of \$916 billion in additional revenue. The problem is, my concern is, frankly, that the revenue they are talking about—in other words, increased tax revenue—would come from not making the tax relief we passed in 2001 and 2003 permanent. In other words, it would result in a huge tax increase if allowed to go into effect without actually having Congress vote on increasing taxes by the mere expiration of those taxes.

Then there are some who say we want to tax the rich and don't worry about it because we are only going to tax the rich. I ask how many times we have heard that before. The alternative minimum tax is the latest example. We know that from roughly 4 million taxpayers who will be hit by this so-called alternative minimum tax this year. According to the Wall Street Journal, that number in 2007 could soar to 23 million Americans, from 4 million to 23 million Americans. In other words, the tendency all too often of the Federal Government is once a tax is created to see that tax expand and grow and to gobble up more and more taxpayers' dollars.

Certainly, that is the case where we see new Government programs created to provide for a larger and larger Government which, of course, has to be paid for, and guess where that money comes from. It comes from the beleaguered American taxpayers.

In a counterintuitive mood, this second provision of \$70 billion, actually rather than tax the rich, what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who recently voted for this new State children's health insurance expansion of 140 percent over the current program, they have actually targeted a regressive tobacco tax to fund expansion of Washington-run health care.

The President has vetoed the so-called SCHIP bill not because any of us disagree about the core mission of the SCHIP program, which is to provide health coverage for low-income kids, but the fact is that program has been hijacked and used as a Trojan horse to take an additional step, a huge incremental step toward a Washington-run health care system, which I believe is bad for the American people.

Three things one can say about Washington-controlled health care: No. 1 is, free health care isn't free because it is going to have to be paid for by the American people. No. 2, we can say Washington-controlled health care will be inevitably bureaucratic and some bureaucrat will be deciding what kind of health care you get and what kind of health care you don't get. And No. 3, we can be assured the way the Federal Government will control cost, to the extent it can, in this new program will be as a result of rationing and deciding who gets access to care and who does not, and that means more care programs, as we see currently underway in Canada, where people have to wait months and years for the kind of diagnostic care and treatment they get in a matter of days in America.

The third item, \$11.4 billion, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have proposed a massive increase on energy producers in the United States. We recently had a so-called Energy bill on the floor. The only thing was it didn't produce one drop of additional energy. What we saw happen was a proposal that actually would have increased taxes on domestic energy producers which would have made us more dependent on imported energy, something we have all said is a bad idea. We know it is a bad idea for us to be as dependent as we are on imported energy. So why in the world would we want to raise taxes and increase the burden on domestic producers in a way that would make us more dependent on that imported energy?

We see there are additional proposals about which we have heard: \$6.1 billion in additional taxes on oil produced in the Gulf of Mexico, additional taxes on investing and creating jobs in America by foreign businesses that want to invest in the United States, that we benefit from, that actually creates jobs here, but our friends on the other side of the aisle have proposed an increased tax on that as well. We can see the other proposals that have been made.

This is a disturbing chart, at least to me. When we look at the cost for the average American taxpayer and how many days a week they have to work to pay their Federal taxes, that will invariably go up. Right now, American taxpayers have to work 79 days out of the 365 days in the year to pay Uncle Sam, to pay their taxes. That is more than 1 out of every 5 days of the year, and that is more than the average that taxpayers will spend on food, housing, health care or any other category.

Of course, working parents face challenges every day when it comes to

making sure their children get what they need and deserve in terms of health care and education. So why would Congress continue to increase and add to their burden by increasing taxes?

I ask: Is this how Washington should be working for the American taxpayer? To me the answer is clearly no. We should not force American citizens to work even more days each year for Uncle Sam. I am sad to say, disappointed to say that the tax-and-spend season is indeed upon us in Washington, DC.

Our country faces a number of challenges when it comes to the war on terror, making health care more accessible to more Americans, and making sure we remain competitive in a global economy. But it seems that every day that passes, some spend their time thinking about more ways to raise taxes and grow the size of Government. I wish we would reconsider and not do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The Senator from Utah is recognized for 10 minutes.

IRAQ

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, last week a group of us, both Senators and Members of the House, Republicans and Democrats, had the opportunity to sit down with Frederick Kagan, who is a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, and listen to his comments about where we are with respect to Iraq.

At the end of that very illuminating session, he gave us each a copy of a new report that he has authored called "No Middle Way, The Challenge of Exit Strategies from Iraq." The report is too long for me to ask consent that it be printed in the RECORD, but I recommend it to all my colleagues. It is one of the most thorough and thoughtful examinations of where we are in Iraq I have seen. I will be quoting from it, but I wish to make a few observations about the situation in Iraq before I do.

The Iraq debate seems to be mired down in arguments about past decisions and whether they were right. These kinds of arguments are useful, and they are particularly useful in the hands of historians who are reviewing an entire situation from a vantage point of years afterward, but they are not necessarily that valuable as we are addressing the question of what do we do now.

If I can play the historian for a moment and give examples of how we have entered into conflicts and seen the situation on the ground change and, therefore, strategies change, let me go back to the Revolutionary War. At the time of the Revolutionary War, the original strategies the Commander in Chief, George Washington, applied didn't work. Indeed, the Continental Army was defeated again and again and