

Name	Location of death	Relationship to MA
Sergeant Justin W. Garvey	Tel Afar, Iraq	Mother from Townsend.
Private First Class John D. Hart	Taza, Iraq	Lived in Bedford.
Specialist Christopher J. Holland	Baghdad, Iraq	Mother in Lunenburg.
Sergeant Pierre A. Raymond	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Lived in Lawrence.
Corporal Brian Oliveira	Al Anbar, Iraq	Lived in Bristol.
Lance Corporal Travis Reid Desiato	Fallujah, Iraq	Lived in Bedford.
Lance Corporal Dimitrios Gavriel	Fallujah, Iraq	Parents in Haverhill.
Sergeant Andrew Farrar	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Weymouth.
First Lieutenant Brian McPhillips	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in Pembroke.
Staff Sergeant Joseph P. Belavia	Karbala, Iraq	Lived in Wakefield.
Lcpl John J. Vangyzen IV	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Bristol.
Sergeant Kurt D. Schamberg	Iraq	Father in Melrose.
Captain John W. Maloney	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Lived in Chicopee.
Specialist Ray M. Fuhrmann II	Samarra, Iraq	Lived in Attleboro.
First Sergeant Alan N. Grifford	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in West Wareham.
Pvt. Michael E. Bouthot	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in Fall River.
Specialist Daniel R. Gionet	Baghdad, Iraq	Father in Lowell.
Sgt. Gregory A. Belanger	Al Hallia, Iraq	Parents from MA.
Private First Class Kerry D. Scott	Iskandiriyah, Iraq	Mother in Worcester.
Sergeant Daniel J. Londono	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in Dorchester.
Corporal David Marques Vicente	Hit, Iraq	Lived in Methuen.
Lance Corporal Jeffrey Charles Burgess	Al Fallujah, Iraq	Lived in Plymouth.
Lance Corporal Alexander Scott Arrendodo	Najaf, Iraq	Lived in Randolph.
First Lieutenant Travis John Fuller	Korean Village, Iraq	Lived in Granville.
Captain Benjamin Sammis	Central Iraq	Raised in Rehoboth.
Chief Warrant Officer Two Stephen M. Wells	Habbiniyah, Iraq	Parents in North Egremont.
Specialist Matthew Boule	Iraq	Raised in Dracut.
Chief Warrant Officer Kyrin E. Kennedy	Tikrit, Iraq	Parents in Boston.
Captain Christopher J. Sullivan	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in Princeton.
Lance Corporal Shayne Cabino	Al Karmah, Iraq	Lived in Canton.
Lt. Col. Leon G. James II	Ar Rustamiyah, Iraq	Mother in Longmeadow.
Capt. Joel E. Cahill	Dawr, Iraq	Lived in Norwood.
Lance Corporal Michael Ford	Al Anbar, Iraq	From New Bedford.
Cpl. Scott Procopio	Al Anbar, Iraq	Lived in Saugus.
Lance Cpl. Patrick Gallagher	Al Anbar, Iraq	Mother and father live in MA.
Corporal Donald E. Fisher II	Kirkuk, Iraq	Lived in Brockton.
Specialist Gabriel T. Palacios	Ba'qubah, Iraq	Father from Lynn.
Sergeant Benjamin E. Mejia	Marez, Iraq	Lived in Salem.
Sergeant Glenn R. Allison	Baghdad, Iraq	Mother in Pittsfield.
Gunnery Sergeant Elia Paietta Fontecchio	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Milford.
Lance Corporal Andrew Zabierek	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Chelmsford.
Lance Corporal Nicholas David Schiavoni	Al Karmah, Iraq	From Haverhill.
Specialist Daniel F. Cunningham	Iraq	Lived in Revere.
Lance Corporal Gregory E. MacDonald	Iraq	Parents from MA.
Specialist Peter G. Enos	Bayji, Iraq	Lived in Plymouth.
Pfc. Norman Darling	Iraq	Lived in Watertown.
Private Cory R. Depew	Mosul, Iraq	Father in Haverhill.
Staff Sergeant Joseph Camara	Baghdad, Iraq	Lived in New Bedford.
Sgt. Charles Caldwell	Iraq	Lived in Attleboro.
Pfc. Markus J. Johnson	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Springfield.
Spc. David J. Babineau	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in Springfield.
Cpl. Paul N. King	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Tyngsboro, Mass.
LC. Geoffrey R. Cayer	Habbiniyah, Iraq	Fitchburg, MA.
Sgt. Mark R. Vecchione	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Eastham, MA.
Staff Sergeant Clint J. Storey	Ar Ramadi, Iraq	Wife/daughter in Palmer, MA.
Spc. Edgardo Zayas	Baghdad, Iraq	Parents in Dorchester, MA.
Lance Corporal Eric P. Valdepenas	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Seekonk, MA.
Specialist Jared J. Raymond	Taji, Iraq	Swampscott, MA (mother).
LCPL Edward Garvin	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Malden, MA.
Lt. Joshua Booth	Fallujah, Iraq	Fiskdale, MA.
Specialist Matthew J. Stanley	Taji, Iraq	Father and Wife in MA.
Sgt. Gregory Wright	Muadadivah, Iraq	Father in Boston, MA.
Sgt. 1st Class Keith Callahan	South of Baghdad	Mother in Woburn.
Sgt. Alexander H. Fuller	Baghdad, Iraq	Wife in Centerville.
Captain Jennifer Harris	Al Anbar Province, Iraq	Lived in Swampscott, MA.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

IRAQ

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, first let me thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his moving and sobering words but even more importantly for his leadership and tremendous clarity on this issue over these last few critical years.

Mr. President, we are approaching the 4-year anniversary of one of the greatest foreign policy mistakes in our country's history. In March 2003, with the prior authorization of Congress, the President took this country to war in Iraq. Almost 4 years later, virtually every objective observer and, more importantly, the American people as a whole agree that the President's policy has failed. Even the President acknowledges that his plan has not worked, though his solution is not a new plan but a troop escalation. Of course, sending more troops to implement what is essentially the same flawed strategy makes no sense. The American people agree that it makes no sense, and most

of my colleagues agree that it makes no sense.

So the question becomes, with a President unable or unwilling to fix a flawed policy that is jeopardizing our national security and our military readiness, what should we in Congress do about our country's involvement in this disastrous war? Do we do nothing and hope the President will put things right, when he has shown time and time again that he is incapable of doing so? Do we simply tell the President that we are unhappy with the way the war is going and that we hope he will change course or do we take strong, decisive action to fix the President's mistaken, self-defeating policies?

It is pretty clear which course of action I support. I think it is a course of action the American people called for in the November elections. It is the course of action our national security needs, so we do not continue to neglect global threats and challenges while we focus so much of our resources and our efforts on Iraq. It is the course of action that will support—that will actu-

ally support—our brave troops and their families.

We must end our involvement in this tragic and misguided war. The President will not do so; therefore, Congress must act. So far, Congress has not lived up to that responsibility. Instead of taking strong action in the Senate, instead of considering binding legislation that fixes the President's flawed Iraq strategy, we tied ourselves into knots last week in a convoluted and misguided effort to achieve a consensus that would have essentially reaffirmed congressional authorization for continuing our military involvement in Iraq. Of course, here I am referring to the resolution proposed by the senior Senator from Virginia. This resolution was portrayed, at least at first, by members of both parties as an important symbolic rebuke of the President's Iraq policy. In fact, it really was not a rebuke at all. In parts, it reads like a reauthorization of the war, rejecting troop redeployment and specifically authorizing "vigorous operations" in a critical region in Iraq.

Now, when debate on the Warner resolution was blocked, we had a chance

to get things right. And I am glad our majority leader, Senator REID, has chosen to bring up the resolution being debated in the House today expressing support for the troops and, simply, opposition to the so-called surge. Now, this body—the Senate—should go on record in opposition to, or support of, the President's plan.

I will vote to allow the debate on the resolution to take place. And I hope I will have the opportunity to actually vote for the resolution.

I have yet to hear any convincing argument that sending 21,500 more troops to Iraq will bring about the political solution that is needed to end violence in that country.

The President's decision to send more troops is based on two flawed assumptions. It assumes, first, that the presence of even more of our servicemembers will help Iraqi troops improve security in Baghdad and, second, that with improved security, Iraqi politicians can then achieve national reconciliation. The recent declassified NIE, or National Intelligence Estimate, shot holes in both of those assumptions. It said that Iraqi security forces "will be hard pressed in the next 12-18 months to execute significantly increased security responsibilities" and "even if violence is diminished, given the current winner-take-all attitude and sectarian animosities infecting the political scene, Iraqi leaders will be hard pressed to achieve sustained political reconciliation in the time frame of this Estimate."

Obviously, those were direct quotes, not me characterizing the NIE. In other words, in the best case scenario, U.S. forces provide a little security that Iraqi forces can't sustain on their own and that Iraqi politicians won't use to settle their entrenched differences. That doesn't sound to me like a plan for success.

Some of my colleagues, even those who don't support sending more troops to Baghdad, have spoken in favor of continued and even increased U.S. military operations in Al Anbar Province. Some of them even suggest that our troops should be directly combating an insurgency there. This, apart from everything else, is a recipe for disaster. Al Anbar Province is where a majority of U.S. troops have been killed in Iraq. The insurgency there, as well as general opposition to the U.S. presence and to the Shiite-dominated Government in Baghdad, is fueled by the Sunnis' political and economic grievances. Conducting targeted missions to take out terrorists makes sense, but using U.S. troops to put down an insurgency doesn't. Maintaining or, worse yet, increasing a substantial U.S. presence in a primarily Sunni area without a political solution means nothing less than a continuation of unending and self-defeating policies in Iraq. Clearly, the President's decision to send more troops makes no sense. But I have to say that simply passing a nonbinding resolution criticizing it

makes no sense, either, if we just stop there. So we need to go further, and we need to do it soon.

Let me remind my colleagues, when the voters rejected the President's Iraq policy in November, they weren't rejecting an escalation. That option wasn't even on the table then. Who was talking about an escalation during that campaign? Certainly, the Presiding Officer knows well what was being discussed. They were rejecting the President's policy of trying to achieve a political solution in Iraq with a massive and unlimited military presence. After delaying action for a couple of months, the President just plain ignored overwhelming public sentiment, the advice of Members of both parties, and the views of the military and foreign policy experts when he proposed an escalation. The administration turned its back on the American people.

We in Congress should not follow suit. We have a responsibility to our constituents and to our men and women in uniform. If no one will listen to and act on the will of the American people, then there is something seriously wrong with our political system. After almost 4 years of a disastrous policy, we must bring our troops out of Iraq. To do otherwise is to ignore public outrage over the war and to ignore the many other pressing national security priorities we are neglecting in favor of a myopic focus on Iraq. The American people recognize there is no U.S. military solution to Iraq's civil war. And as long as we focus disproportionate attention and resources on Iraq, we will not be able to counter the full range of threats we face in places such as Afghanistan and Somalia and many other places around the world. So Congress must use its power. It must use its power of the purse to safely redeploy our troops from Iraq.

Let's not be intimidated by the intentionally misleading rhetoric of the White House and its allies when they try to prevent any discussion at all of real action by the Congress to end the war. This isn't about cutting off funds for troops; it is about cutting off funds for the war. Every Member of Congress agrees that we must continue to support our troops and give them the resources and the support they need. By setting a date after which funding for the war will be terminated, as I have proposed, Congress can safely bring our troops out of harm's way. That is how you get them out of harm's way, by getting them out of there.

There is plenty of precedent for Congress exercising its constitutional authority to stop U.S. involvement in armed conflict. Last month, I chaired a Judiciary Committee hearing entitled "Exercising Congress's Constitutional Power to End the War." Without exception, every witness, those called by the majority and the minority, those who have had a career more focused on the executive branch than the legislative branch—all of them did not challenge

the constitutionality of Congress's authority to end the war.

Lou Fisher of the Library of Congress is acclaimed as one of the foremost experts on the President's war powers. In fact, he literally wrote the book on this topic. He testified that Congress does not simply have the power, he said it has the responsibility to exercise it, when needed.

He said:

... is the continued use of military force and a military commitment in the Nation's interest? That is the core question. Once you decide that, if you decide it is not in the national interest, you certainly do not want to continue putting U.S. troops in harm's way.

The argument that cutting off funding for a flawed policy would hurt the troops and that continuing to put U.S. troops in harm's way supports the troops makes no sense. By ending funding for the war, we can bring our troops safely out of Iraq.

Walter Dellinger of Duke Law School made this point when he testified about my proposal. He said:

There would not be one penny less for the salary of the troops. There would not be one penny less for the benefit of the troops. There would not be one penny less for weapons or ammunition. There would not be one penny less for supplies or support. Those troops would simply be redeployed to other areas where the armed forces are utilized.

Instead of allowing the President's failed policy to continue, Congress can and should use its power of the purse to end our involvement in the Iraq war, safely redeploying the troops while ensuring, as do I in my bill, that important counterterrorism and training missions are still carried out. We should be coming up with a strategy for a postredployment Iraq and the region that is squarely within the context of the global fight against al-Qaida. That means replacing a massive and unsustainable and unlimited military mission with a long-term strategy for mitigating the mess left behind by this war. With such a strategy, we can redirect substantially more resources and attention to the fight against al-Qaida and other affiliated or sympathetic international terrorist organizations.

As long as this President goes unchecked by Congress, our troops will remain needlessly at risk and our national security will be compromised.

Let me tell my colleagues, regardless of what happens with this resolution, this is just a first step—worthwhile but just a first step. And the first step must be followed by stronger steps, and it must be done quickly. I intend to keep pushing until the Senate votes to end our involvement in the Iraq war, and eventually this will happen because this is what a strong majority of the American people want. Congress may be able to put off its day of reckoning temporarily, the administration can continue down the same failed path a while longer, but all of us ignore the will of the American people at our peril. So let's have this debate. Let's do it openly and honestly. Let's not pretend anyone wants to deny our troops

the equipment and resources they need. Let's not suggest that opposing the President's strategy is unpatriotic and that it would give aid and comfort to the enemy, that it would somehow weaken the resolve of our troops. Those claims are outrageous. They are offensive, and they are untrue. Do my colleagues believe the American people gave aid and comfort to the enemy when they rejected the President's Iraq policy in November? Are the overwhelming majority of our constituents who oppose this war trying to undermine our troops? Of course not. So how could anyone suggest that Congress actually acting on the will of the American people undermines the troops or emboldens the enemy?

Our troops are undermined by a policy that places them in harm's way unnecessarily. And our enemy, our true enemy, al-Qaida and its allies, is emboldened by a U.S. strategy that neglects global challenges and instead focuses on a single country. It is unfortunate that those who wish to defend this strategy would resort to these kinds of charges.

Let's do the job of the Senate and have full, open debate and votes on fixing our Iraq policy. Let's not pretend that such a debate would harm our national security. Let's not tell ourselves that it is up to just the President to fix the horrible situation his failed policies have created. It is our responsibility to act, too. Congress made the tragic mistake of authorizing this war over 4 years ago. Now Congress also has the job of bringing it to a close so we can refocus on the terrorists and other global threats that have been neglected way too much over the past 4 years.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, when the roll is called tomorrow on the motion for cloture with regard to the resolution the House is expected to pass tonight on Iraq, I will vote no. I will vote against cloture. I will do so not because I wish to stifle debate. The fact is that debate has occurred, it is occurring now, and it will continue to occur on our policy in Iraq.

I will vote against cloture because I feel so strongly against the resolution. It condemns the new plan for success in Iraq. I support that plan. It does something that, from all of the research my staff and I have done, including asking the Library of Congress, we have found no case in American history where Congress has done what this resolution does, which is, in a nonbinding resolution, oppose a plan our military is implementing right now. Congress has ex-

pressed nonbinding resolutions of disapproval before a plan of military action has been carried out.

Congress has obviously taken much more direct steps, authorized to do so by the Constitution, to cut off funds for a military action or a war in progress. But never before has the Congress of the United States passed a nonbinding resolution of disapproval of a military plan that is already being carried out by American military personnel. I believe it is a bad precedent, and that is why I will do everything I can to oppose it. In the immediate context, that means I will vote against cloture.

Mr. President, more broadly, we are approaching an important moment in the history of this institution and of our Republic, a moment I fear future historians will look back to and see the beginning of a cycle that not only damaged the remaining possibilities for success America has in Iraq but, more broadly, established political precedents that weaken the power of the Presidency to protect the American people over the long term.

The nonbinding resolution before us today, we all know, is only a prologue. That is why the fight over it, procedural and substantive, over these past weeks has been so intense. It is the first skirmish in an escalating battle that threatens to consume our Government over many months ahead, a battle that will neither solve the sprawling challenges we face in Iraq nor strengthen our Nation to defeat the challenges to our security throughout the world from Islamist extremists—that is to say, in our war against the terrorists who attacked us.

We still have a choice not to go down this path. It is a choice that goes beyond the immediate resolution that will be before the Senate, a chance to step back from the brink and find better ways to express and arbitrate our differences of opinion. I hope we will seize the moment and take those steps.

Mr. President, as we meet in this Chamber today, the battle for Baghdad has already begun. One of our most decorated generals, David Petraeus, whom this Senate confirmed 81 to 0 a few weeks ago, has now taken command in Baghdad.

Thousands of American soldiers have moved out across the Iraqi capital putting their lives on the line as they put a new strategy into effect. We can now see for ourselves on the ground in Iraq, in Baghdad, where it matters what this new strategy looks like. And we can see why it is different from all that preceded it.

For the first time in Baghdad, our primary focus is no longer on training Iraqi forces or chasing down insurgents or providing for our own force protection, though those remain objectives. Our primary focus is on ensuring basic security for the Iraqi people working side by side with Iraqi security forces, exactly what classic counterinsurgency doctrine tells us must be our first goal now.

Where previously there were not enough troops to hold the neighborhoods cleared of insurgents, now more troops are either in place or on the way. Where previously American soldiers were based on the outskirts of Baghdad unable to secure the city, now they are living and working side by side with their Iraqi counterparts on small bases that are being set up right now throughout the Iraqi capital.

At least six of these new joint bases have already been established in the Sunni neighborhoods in west Baghdad, the same neighborhoods where a few weeks ago jihadists and death squads held sway. In the Shiite neighborhoods of east Baghdad, American troops are also moving in with their Iraqi counterparts, and Moqtada al-Sadr and his Mahdi Army are moving out.

We do not know if this new strategy for success in Iraq will work over the long term, and we probably will not know for some time. The Mahdi Army may be in retreat for the moment, but they are not defeated. They have gone to ground, and they are watching. Our hope, of course, is that our determination and that of the Iraqi Government will lead them now to devote themselves to politics instead of death squads, but only time will tell.

The fact is any realistic assessment of the situation in Iraq tells us we must expect there will be more attacks and there will be more casualties in the months ahead as the enemies of a free and independent Iraq see the progress we are making and adapt to try to destroy it with more violence.

The question they will pose to us, which is the question that is posed every time a fanatic suicide bomb goes off and that person expresses their hatred of everyone else more than love of their own life by ending their own life, is: Will we yield Baghdad, Iraq, the Middle East, our own future to those fanatical suicide bombers?

We must also recognize we are in a different place in Iraq from where we were a month ago because of the implementation of this new strategy. We are in a stronger position today to provide basic security in Baghdad, and with that, we are in a stronger position to marginalize the extremists and strengthen the moderates, a stronger position to foster the economic activity that will drain the insurgency and the militias of their public support, a stronger position to press the Iraqi leaders to make the political compromises that everyone acknowledges are necessary.

John Maynard Keynes famously said: When the facts change, I change my mind.

In the real world, in the past month, the facts in Iraq have changed, and they are changing still. I ask my colleagues to allow themselves to wait and consider changing their minds as further facts unfold in Iraq. The nonbinding resolution before us is not about stopping a hypothetical plan. It is about disapproving a plan that is being carried out now by our fellow

Americans in uniform in the field. In that sense, as I have said, it is unprecedented in congressional history, in American history.

This resolution is about shouting into the wind. It is about ignoring the realities of what is happening on the ground in Baghdad. It proposes nothing. It contains no plan for victory or retreat. It is a strategy of "no," while our soldiers are saying "yes, sir," to their commanding officers as they go forward into battle. And that is why I will vote against the resolution by voting against cloture.

I understand the frustration, the anger, and the exhaustion that so many Americans, so many Members of this Congress feel about Iraq, the desire to throw up one's hands and simply say "enough." And I am painfully aware of the enormous toll of this war in human life and of the mistakes that have been made in the war's conduct. But let us now not make another mistake. In the midst of a fluid and uncertain situation in Iraq, we should not be so bound up in our own arguments and disagreements, so committed to the positions we have staked out that the political battle over here takes precedence over the real battle over there.

Whatever the passions of the moment, the point of reference for our decisionmaking should be military movements on the battlefields of Iraq, not political maneuverings in the Halls of Congress.

Even as our troops have begun to take Baghdad back step by step, there are many in this Congress who have, nevertheless, already reached a conclusion about the futility of America's cause there and declared their intention to put an end to this mission, not with one direct attempt to cut off funds but step by political step.

No matter what the rhetoric of this resolution, that is the reality of this moment. This nonbinding measure before us is a first step toward a constitutional crisis that we can and must avoid. Let me explain what I mean by "a constitutional crisis." Let us be clear about the likely consequences if we go down this path beyond this nonbinding resolution.

Congress has been given constitutional responsibilities, but the micro-management of wars is not one of them. The appropriation of funds for war is. I appreciate that each of us has our own ideas about the best way forward in Iraq. I respect those who take a different position than I. I understand many feel strongly that the President's strategy is the wrong one, but the Constitution, which has served us now for more than two great centuries of our history, creates not 535 Commanders in Chief but 1, the President of the United States, who is authorized to lead the day-to-day conduct of war.

Whatever our preponderance of this war or its conduct, it is in no one's interest to stumble into a debilitating confrontation between our two great

branches of Government over war powers. The potential for a constitutional crisis here and now is real, with congressional interventions, Presidential vetoes, and Supreme Court decisions.

If there was ever a moment for non-partisan cooperation to agree on a process that will respect both our personal opinions about this war and our Nation's interests over the long term, this is it.

We need to step back from the brink and reason together, as Scripture urges us to do, about how we will proceed to express our disagreements about this war. We must recognize that while the decisions we are making today and we are about to make seem irretrievably bound up in the immediacy of this moment, and the particular people now holding positions of power in our Government, these decisions will set constitutional precedents that will go far beyond the moment and these people.

President Bush has less than 2 years left in office, and a Democrat may well succeed him. If we do not act thoughtfully in the weeks and months ahead, we will establish precedents that future Congresses, future Presidents, and future generations of Americans will regret.

Right now, as the battle for Baghdad begins, this institution is obviously deeply divided. However, we should not allow our divisions to lead us to a constitutional crisis in which no one wins and our national security is greatly damaged.

We are engaged, as all my colleagues know, in a larger war against a totalitarian enemy, Islamist extremism, and terrorism that seeks to vanquish all the democratic values that is our national purpose to protect and defend.

Whatever our differences in this Chamber about this war, let us never forget those great values of freedom and democracy that unite us and for which our troops have given, and today give, the last full measure of their devotion.

Yes, we should vigorously debate and deliberate. That is not only our right, it is our responsibility. But at this difficult junction, at this moment when a real battle, a critical battle is being waged in Baghdad, as we face a brutal enemy who attacked us on 9/11 and wants to do it again, let us not shout at one another but let us reach out to one another to find that measure of unity that can look beyond today's disagreements and secure the Nation's future and the future of all who will follow us as Americans.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am so honored to be on the floor with Senator JOE LIEBERMAN today and to listen to his remarks, frankly, to stand in the shadow of his leadership on this issue because he has been that, a bipartisan leader, recognizing, as he so appropriately has spoken, the leadership role

that a Congress should take at this time in our Nation's history. And he has said it well. It is not one of micro-management. It is not one of 535 generals all thinking we can act and think strategically about the engagement currently underway in Baghdad.

It is our job, I would hope, to stand united in behalf of the men and women we send there in uniform to accomplish what we so hope and wish they will be able to accomplish, and that is the stability of Iraq, the allowing of the Iraqi people to once again lead their country and to take from it the kind of radical Islamic fascism that is well underway and dominating the region.

Let me make a few comments this afternoon that clearly coincide with what Senator LIEBERMAN has spoken to. This is not, nor should it ever become, a partisan issue. I think his presence on the floor this afternoon speaks volumes to that. This is not a partisan issue. This is a phenomenally important national and international issue for our country to be engaged in that, frankly, few countries can engage in the way we have and with the kind of energy and strength we have brought to it.

The majority leader has put us in a very precarious situation, one that is clearly divisive. Frankly, I can say things as a Republican that maybe my colleague cannot say.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: At the hour of 1:30, is there an order for another Senator to be recognized?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. And who is that Senator?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Can my colleague finish up in 1 minute? I want to try to accommodate my colleague.

Mr. CRAIG. I will be relatively brief. I was instructed to be here at 1:15, but I think we have had a runover of time; is that not correct?

Mr. WARNER. I was not here.

Mr. CRAIG. Can we inquire of the Chair?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority has 30 seconds remaining, and then time reverts to the majority. The majority has granted the Senator from Virginia the time.

Mr. CRAIG. His time is?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia has 30 minutes, until 2 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG. May I ask the Senator how much time he planned to consume?

Mr. WARNER. Well, I have to jump a plane, but how much time does my colleague wish?

Mr. CRAIG. I will take no more than 5 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. If my colleague can make it 3 minutes, then I think my