Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to proceed on my leader time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

BURMA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have come to the floor every day this week to highlight the plight of the Burmese citizens who have bravely protested for democratic reform. I have also tried to focus attention on the brutal actions that the ruling military junta, the State Peace and Development Council, or SPDC, has taken to crack down on its own people.

The whole world watched with horror as Buddhist monks, armed with nothing but prayers for peace, met uniformed thugs armed with rifles sent to do their Government's bidding. Untold numbers have been slaughtered, more are unjustly imprisoned, and the Burmese citizens who are left are afraid to step outside of their homes. The SPDC's swift and barbaric punishment of the Burmese people seems like a relic from another era. But what we have seen on our television sets is all too real.

I thank my fellow Senators for shining a spotlight on the actions of the SPDC this week to reveal them for the despots they are.

I was encouraged when, on Monday, my colleagues adopted a sense-of-the-Senate resolution we offered with Senator KERRY condemning the SPDC for its violent crackdown against the peaceful protesters. And yesterday, Senators BOXER and MURKOWSKI held a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs on the atrocities in Burma. I appreciated the opportunity to be over there and testify at that hearing, along with others. Democratic reform in Burma is an issue that has received far too little interest for a very long time. But the strong bipartisan support in Congress is encouraging.

To see significant change in Burma, ultimately the U.N. Security Council will have to enact meaningful sanctions on the SPDC. Only then will the Government be pressured to move toward peaceful reconciliation. And for the U.N. Security Council to move, China must be persuaded to move. Many changes need to happen in Burma, but until they do, I will continue to act and to advocate on behalf of the Burmese people on the Senate floor.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Republicans and Democrats have been debating all year long about the troops. This has not been a debate about who wants to bring them home. Frankly, all of us want to bring them home. It has been a debate about whom do you trust to decide when these troops come home, about who has the authority and judgment to make decisions about how to protect our national security interests in the Persian Gulf. Republicans think it should be the Commander in Chief in consultation with his commanders on the ground. We don't think our foreign policy should be drafted by MoveOn.org or CODEPINK.

However, on one thing we have almost all agreed: When we have forces in the field, we ought to fund them. Once they are over there, you do not leave them guessing about whether they are going to eat or be clothed or have the equipment they need to do their jobs, and you don't leave their replacement units wondering whether they will be trained or equipped.

In the heat of the first Iraq debate, we passed by a strong bipartisan vote of 82 to 16 the Gregg resolution expressing the sense of Congress that no funds should be cut off or even reduced for troops in the field which would result in undermining their safety or their ability to complete their mission. We passed, by an overwhelming 96-to-2 vote, the Murray resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that no action should be taken to undermine the safety of the Armed Forces of the United States or impact their ability to complete their missions. And we repeatedly rejected the Feingold amendment as recently as yesterday, once again, that would cut off funds for the troops after a date certain next June regardless of whether they have completed their mission.

Under the Feingold amendment, which forbids U.S. troops from fighting anyone but al-Qaida and its affiliates, we would have to deploy a brigade of lawyers to interview the enemy, and we would lose the ability to gather the kind of intelligence from Iraqis themselves—intelligence that has been an invaluable component of the Petraeus plan so far. The Iraqi people are talking to us now because they feel safer having U.S. troops around. Pulling those troops out of the neighborhoods and replacing them with snipers in helicopters would cut us off from the very people who are helping us find the targets in the first place.

This Senate has argued for months about Iraq, but on this one point almost all of us have agreed again and again and again: You don't cut funds to troops who are already in the field. Yet now it seems even that may be about to change.

All last year, the Democrats complained that the President was hiding his spending requests for the war by leaving them out of the Defense spending bill and putting them into a supplemental instead. So earlier this year, he responded to those criticisms in good faith by making his request in concert with the DOD appropriations bill. He said we would need about $150 billion for 2008.

The majority has been sitting on this request for 8 months, and now they have made a conscious decision to leave it out of the Defense spending bill altogether. Some of them are arguing that the Defense Department has the legal authority to sustain the war on its own. That is right, they could do that, but what the Defense Department cannot do is plan ahead without a future spending commitment from this Congress. They cannot plan for training, equipment, feeding, or protecting our troops until they know the money will be there beyond the immediate future, and they cannot plan to be ready for any other operations that might arise outside of the current conflicts. This is no way to run a Defense Department, it is no way to treat the troops, and it is entirely inconsistent with the expressions of support for the troops that we registered with the Gregg and Murray resolutions and which we reaffirmed repeatedly, including yesterday, by rejecting the Feingold amendment.

All summer, America and its allies waited for GEN David Petraeus to come to the Hill and tell us about the prospects in Iraq. We were encouraged when he told us the military objectives of his strategy were in large measure being met. We were proud when he told us that in the face of tough enemies and the brutal summer heat, coalition and Iraqi security forces had achieved real progress toward achieving their goals, in large part because they dealt what he described as a ''significant blow''—a significant blow—to al-Qaida.

General Petraeus recommended that as a result of these early successes, we can begin to draw down our troops beginning this year. That drawdown has already begun. Last month, the Marine Expeditionary Unit that was deployed as part of the surge left Iraq after a job well done. A combat brigade team will leave in mid-December, with four others and two surge marine battalions to follow in the first half of next year. This was General Petraeus's cautious but expert plan for building on the successes we have made in Iraq. The President accepted that plan, and a majority of Americans, including a majority of Democrats, if we are to believe the polls, think it is a good idea.

We have a new strategy in Iraq, according to the general in charge. It is working, and we owe it to the men and women in the field, first of all, to keep a commitment we have already made to fund them while they are carrying out that strategy. We cannot, we must not close this session without providing the funding these troops need.

We also owe it to them to bring them home in a way that reflects the best judgment of their commanders. General Petraeus gave us a rare and valuable glimpse into the minds of our soldiers and marines when he testified on Capitol Hill last month. General Petraeus said:

None of us want to stay in Iraq forever. We all want to come home. We all have days of frustration and all the rest of that. But what we want to do is come home the right way, having added to the heritage of our services,

accomplished the mission that our country has laid out for us.

That is what General Petraeus had to say. Then he gave us an idea of the caliber of the men and women who are serving our country in Iraq. Talking more about the commitment they have to their task, here is what General Petraeus said:

I think that that's a very important factor in what our soldiers are doing, in addition to the fact that, frankly, they also just respect the individuals with whom they are carrying out this important mission, the men and women on their right and left who share very important values, among them selfless service and devotion to duty. And that, indeed, is a huge factor in why many of us continue to serve and to stay in uniform, because the privilege of serving with such individuals is truly enormous.

The Defense Department is currently revising its spending requests for the current fiscal year, but that is no reason to deny the funds it already said it needs to get through the spring. The fact that we are waiting on a request for more is not an excuse to deliver nothing.

The men and women who are serving our country deserve better. Let's not pass up the chance to acknowledge their ''selfless service and devotion to duty'' by giving them exactly what they need—before we conclude this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 49, the adjournment resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 49

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns on Thursday, October 4, 2007, or Friday, October 5, 2007, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12 noon on Monday, October 15, 2007, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3093, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3093) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment, which is at the desk, and the text of the Senate committee-reported bill be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order be considered waived by this agreement.

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

The amendment (No. 3211) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted and Proposed.''

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am proud to present to the U.S. Senate the bill to fund the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and our science agencies. I want to thank Senators REID and MCCONNELL for agreeing to bring up the CJS bill, and Chairman BYRD and Ranking Member COCHRAN for the CJS Subcommittee's robust 302(b) allocation. This is a bipartisan bill. Senator SHELBY and I worked hand-in-hand. I thank him and his excellent staff for their partnership.

The CJS bill totals $54 billion in discretionary budget authority. Did we spend more than the President asked for? You bet we did. We are proud that our bill is $3.2 billion above the President's budget request.

Let's talk about how we spent the money. The subcommittee had three priorities:

Security—keeping 300 million Americans safe from terrorism and violent crime.

Innovation—investments in science and technology to create jobs that will stay in the United States.

Accountability—fiscal accountability and stewardship of taxpayer dollars, standing sentry against waste, fraud and abuse.

The subcommittee's first priority is protecting America from terrorism and violent crime. The Justice Department is almost 50 percent of the CJS bill. Funding for Justice totals almost $25 billion, $2.1 billion more than the President's request. The CJS bill funds our major Federal law enforcement agencies, and our State and local cops on the beat.

CJS funds the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI. The FBI is our domestic national security agency. It has a dual mission—disrupting terrorism on U.S. soil—tracking and taking down terror cells and dismantling dirty bombs, as well as fighting violent crime in our communities. The CJS bill provides $6.6 billion for the FBI, $150 million more than the President's budget request. This includes almost $4 billion for FBI counterterrorism. Our bill will put 230 new counterterrorism agents on the beat and give agents new tools to collect intelligence to protect Americans here at home. At the same time, the President's budget cut 100 FBI agents dedicated to fighting violent crime. This is outrageous—because for the first time in almost 15 years, violent crime has increased. Robberies are up 7 percent. Homicides are up 2 percent. Nearly every region of the country has been affected—from large cities to small communities. We've heard from our colleagues that the FBI needs more agents fighting violent crime in their communities. The CJS bill rejects the President's irresponsible cut. We provide full funding to retain 100 FBI agents that the President eliminated.

The CJS bill also funds the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA. The DEA is an international agency—in over 60 countries, with significant local responsibilities. It's fighting a $330 billion annual drug trade in over 60 countries around the world. Drugs finance over two-thirds of all terrorist activity, including the Taliban. The DEA is in Afghanistan fighting narcoterrorism, working hand-in-hand with our military to disrupt the poppy trade that funds terrorist networks. And the DEA is in our communities, fighting the scourge of illegal drugs like heroin and meth that destroy our neighborhoods. We were horrified to learn that the DEA has a hiring freeze. The DEA can't hire new agents. This is outrageous—so we added $50 million to DEA to lift the hiring freeze so DEA can hire up 200 new agents to fight drugs at home and abroad.

The CJS bill funds the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, ATF, which investigates arson and stops illegal firearms trafficking. The ATF is working hand-in-hand with our military to disable the improvised explosive devices, IEDs, that are so perilous to our troops on the battlefield. We provide robust support for our U.S. Marshals Service, keeping our marshals on the beat to track down dangerous fugitives—including sexual predators and drug kingpins—protect