

cannot continue as we are now, in every meaningful way completely alone.

Third, Iraq's neighbors will be obliged to assume greater responsibility for averting the risk of a Sunni-Shiite conflict igniting in Iraq and spreading beyond Iraq's borders. Without us in Iraq as a police force for a civil war, neighboring nations will have an enlivened incentive to avert a wider war.

Finally, the Bush administration's preoccupation with Iraq leaves us weakened in our capability to address other obligations around the world, from the changing situation in North Korea, to the ongoing battle for Afghanistan, to the serious threat posed by Iran's nuclear program.

Mr. President, these are serious matters, and they deserve the serious and sustained attention of the Senate. I hope tomorrow's vote will allow us to bring this question that attention.

Mr. President, I will support that vote tomorrow. I ask other Senators, who hear our fellow Americans' genuine and sincere concern about our national interest, will do the same.

I will support not only the resolution disapproving of the President's escalation plan and supporting our troops, but also other, stronger measures that will follow, and that will continue to put pressure on this administration to finally bring our troops home.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, before I begin discussing the war in Iraq, I wish to say a few words about another issue that is perhaps even more important and that is the constitutional issues at the very heart of this entire debate.

Let me be very frank: I am not a great fan of the Bush administration. And of the many grave concerns I have about President Bush and his actions, at the top of that list is that the President seems not to understand what the Constitution of the United States is all about. Whether it is the consistent attack on our constitutional rights which his administration has pursued for a number of years or his "signing statements" which attempt to circumvent legislation passed by Congress, the President appears to believe he can do whatever he wants, whenever he wants to. That, in my view, is not what the United States of America is all about, and it is not what our Constitution provides for.

In that regard, I wish to inform my colleagues in the Senate that I have submitted a resolution, similar to one introduced by Congressman DEFAZIO in the House, that makes it very clear the President does not have the constitu-

tional authority to start a war against Iran without the express authority of the Congress. There are many people in my State of Vermont—and there are people all over this country—who are deeply worried that the President may take us into a war in Iran and that he is currently laying the groundwork for that war in exactly the same way he led us into the war in Iraq.

So let me be very clear: If President Bush were to start a war in Iran without receiving the authority to do so from Congress, he would not only be creating, in my view, an international disaster, he would also be creating a major constitutional crisis. I hope very much he does not do that.

President Bush fails to understand the power to declare war under the Constitution is given to the Congress, not the President. My resolution, S. Con. Res. 13, is very simple. It states clearly that it is "the sense of Congress that the President should not initiate military action against Iran without first obtaining authorization from Congress." I hope my colleagues will give strong support to this resolution.

Mr. President, in my State of Vermont and all across this Nation, the American people are increasingly concerned about the war in Iraq. As others have stated more eloquently than I, the American people want real debate in Washington, in the Senate, on this issue that is worrying people all across our Nation. More importantly, not only do they want debate, they want action, and they want action now.

Frankly, I have a hard time understanding why some of my colleagues would try, through parliamentary maneuvers, to prevent a vote on what is at best a very modest proposal. This issue is not complicated in terms of what will be taking place tomorrow on this floor. It seems to me that if you support President Bush's escalation of the war in Iraq—and there are many who do—then vote against the resolution. That is your right. On the other hand, if you don't believe that an escalation of this war is a sensible idea—and I certainly do not—then vote for the Reid resolution. But at the very least, there should be a vote. Let the American people know how we stand.

Let me be clear in giving you my perspective on this war: In my view, President Bush's war in Iraq has been a disaster. It is a war we were misled into and a war many of us believe we never should have gotten into in the first place, a war I voted against as a Member of the House. This is a war the administration was unprepared to fight. The administration has shown little understanding of the enemy or the historical context in which we found ourselves.

Who will ever forget President Bush declaring "mission accomplished" aboard the aircraft carrier Abraham Lincoln when, in fact, the mission had barely begun. Who will forget Vice President CHENEY telling us that the

insurgency was "in its last throes" just before some of the bloodiest months of the war. Who will forget those Bush advisors who predicted the war would be a cakewalk, nothing to worry about, and that we would be greeted in Iraq as liberators.

This war in Iraq has come at a very high price in so many ways. This is a war that has cost us terribly in American blood. As of today, we have lost over 3,100 brave American soldiers. In my own small State of Vermont, we have lost 25. Twenty-three thousand more Americans have been wounded, and tens of thousands will be coming home with posttraumatic stress disorder which will impact their lives forever. This is a war which, with the President's proposed increase in funding, will cost us some \$500 billion, with the price tag going up by \$8 billion every month. This cost is going to add to the huge national debt we are leaving to our children and our grandchildren and it is going to make it that much more difficult for us to fund health care, education, environmental protection, affordable housing, childcare, and the pressing needs of the middle class and working families of our country which have been so long neglected. Yes, for more military spending; no, for the needs of ordinary Americans who are struggling so hard to keep their heads above water.

This increased expense for the war will make it that much harder for us to fund the needs of our veterans whose numbers are increasing as a result of this war. This is a war which has caused unimaginable horror for the people of Iraq. People who suffered so long under the brutality of the Saddam Hussein dictatorship are suffering even more today. There are estimates that hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have been killed or wounded and almost 2 million have been forced to flee their own country, some 8 percent of their entire population. While civil war tears neighborhoods apart, children are without schools, people are without electricity, health care, and other basic necessities of life. The doctors and nurses, teachers and administrators who have provided the professional infrastructure for the people of Iraq are now long gone.

This is a war which has lowered our standing in the international community to an all-time low in our lifetimes, with leaders in democratic countries hesitant to work with us because of the lack of respect their citizens have for our President. Long-time friends and allies are simply wondering: What is going on in the United States of America, that great country? This is a war which has stretched both our Active-Duty military to the breaking point as well as our National Guard and Reserve forces.

Morale in the military is low, and this war will have a lasting impact on the future recruitment, retention, and readiness of our Nation's Armed Forces.

This is a war which has, in many respects, lowered our capability to effectively fight the very serious threats of international terrorism and Islamic extremism. Five years after the horrific attacks of 9/11, Osama bin Laden remains free. Using the presence of U.S. troops in Iraq as their rallying cry, al-Qaida's strength around the world continues to grow. And currently the situation in Afghanistan is becoming more and more difficult.

Tragically, this administration has refused to listen to the American people who, in this last election, made it very clear they want a new direction in Iraq and they want this war wound down. This administration has refused to listen to the thoughtful suggestions of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, which included two former Secretaries of State, including President Bush's own father's Secretary of State, as well as a former Presidential Chief of Staff and a former Secretary of Defense, that it was time for a change of direction. The President didn't listen to them. This administration has refused to listen to the advice of our military leaders in Iraq who told us increasing troops from the United States would make it easier for the Iraqi Government and military to avoid their political and military responsibilities. The more troops that come in, the easier it is for the Iraqi Government to avoid making the political compromises and the tough choices they have to make.

This administration has refused to listen to the Iraqi people, who, according to a number of polls, tell us very strongly that they believe in the midst of all of the chaos and horror taking place in Iraq today, the Iraqi people say they would be safer and more secure if our troops left their country. In fact, this administration has tragically refused to listen to anybody, except that same shrinking inner circle, led by Vice President CHENEY, who has been consistently wrong from day one. Those are the people the President continues to listen to.

As most everybody understands, and as the recent National Intelligence Estimate has recently confirmed, the situation in Iraq today is extremely dire. The sad truth is that now there are no good options before us; there are simply less bad options. In Iraq today, according to Secretary of Defense Bob Gates, there are now at least four separate wars being fought—four separate wars that our soldiers, who have fought with incredible bravery and skill, now find themselves in the middle of.

Let me quote Secretary Gates, who has recently stated:

I believe there are essentially four wars going on in Iraq: One is Shia on Shia, principally in the south; second is sectarian conflict, principally in Baghdad, but not solely; third is the insurgency; and fourth is al-Qaida.

The reality today, as described by the Secretary of Defense, has nothing to do with why President Bush got us into this war in the first place. In

March of 2002, he told us Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and that they were poised to use them against us. That was not true and certainly has no relevance to the war today. In 2002, he told us Iraq was somehow linked to al-Qaida and had some responsibility for the 9/11 attack against our country. That also turned out not to be true and certainly has no relevance today to the situation in which we find ourselves.

In the 2006 elections, the American people, in a loud and unmistakable voice, told us they no longer had confidence in the Bush administration's handling of the war in Iraq. In my view, they told us they wanted Congress to begin asserting its constitutional authority over this war and that they wanted us to rein in this administration. Most importantly, they told us they wanted us to begin the process of bringing our troops home as soon as possible. And as a Vermont Senator, that is exactly the effort I intend to make.

In my view, the Reid resolution before us is but a small first step at moving us forward. If it is passed—and I hope it will be—it must be followed with much stronger legislation that has real teeth in it. That is what the American people want. I have cosponsored legislation, introduced by Senator KENNEDY, that would prohibit the use of funds for an escalation of U.S. military forces without a specific, new authorization from the Congress—a prohibition also included in the legislation introduced by Senator OBAMA, whose bill I also support.

Instead of just voicing our disapproval of President Bush's escalation of the war in a nonbinding manner, we should now be considering legislation that provides for the safe and orderly redeployment of virtually all of our troops out of Iraq within the next year, even as we continue to give support to the Iraq Government and their military for the purpose of helping them accept their political and military responsibilities. That is the legislation we should be passing.

Senator FEINGOLD has introduced legislation requiring that our troops be redeployed from Iraq within 6 months of passage of the bill. Senator OBAMA has introduced similar legislation requiring that our troops be redeployed starting this May.

In my view, while I will vote for the Reid resolution tomorrow, and while I think it is terribly important that we bring together a bipartisan effort to tell the President this escalation is wrong, the bottom line is we must go forward well beyond that, and we must do that in the near future. We must exercise the constitutional responsibility we have over the power of the purse.

We are mired in a war that has now gone on longer than any American involvement—longer than American involvement in either the First World War or the Second World War. We will spend more money on this war in real dollars than we spent on either the Ko-

rean war or the Vietnam war. Our standing in the international community has declined and our ability to combat international terrorism has been seriously compromised.

It is time to say no to this ill-conceived escalation. It is time to deploy our troops out of harm's way. It is time to end this war and to bring our troops home as soon as we possibly can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. I have listened carefully to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS. I know of his passion and his knowledge on the subject. That was demonstrated by his words this evening. He speaks from the heart on many issues. I know he spoke from his heart this evening about this war in Iraq. Before him, Senator WHITEHOUSE, a new colleague from Rhode Island, read letters he received from constituents asking the same questions we are hearing across Illinois and across the country—questions about why we are in this war and how we will start to bring our troops home.

Today, in the House of Representatives, in a historic vote, by a margin of 246 to 182, the House of Representatives made it clear they do not approve of President Bush's new policy to escalate this war in Iraq.

I think you have to step back for a moment and reflect on what happened today. Four years into a war—which Senator SANDERS has reminded us has lasted longer than World War I or II—we are now engaged in the first meaningful debate about the course of that war since the invasion; and 3,132 American soldiers have died, thousands have been injured, billions have been spent, and for years the Congress, in the thrall of another party, didn't have a hearing, didn't have a debate, and didn't question the policy of this war.

It is no surprise that the American people reached the limit of their tolerance and, in the last election, made it clear they want a change—not just a change in Congress but a change in the policy when it came to this war in Iraq. I was heartened after the election, particularly when President Bush asked for the resignation of Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld. I thought that finally we were going to see a breakaway from this so-called neocon theory that dragged us into this terrible conflict. Unfortunately, what I hoped for wasn't realized. Even though I think Robert Gates, the successor of Rumsfeld, is a good man and will be a good Secretary of Defense, when it came time for the President to talk about the policies of the war and what we would do, he dug the hole deeper.

I am not a military strategist and don't profess to be. There are people in our caucus with military experience who can speak to a wise strategy and an unwise strategy. I am not necessarily one of those, nor do I profess to be. But I have been to Iraq twice—first, in the early stage, when we visited the Green Zone in Baghdad and it

was so dangerous that we could not even stay overnight. In October, we were allowed to stay the night and visit with troops in the field and talk to some of the people who were working in Iraq. I will share some of those recollections in a moment.

First, let me tell you that my highest priority was to sit across the table from our soldiers, to break bread with them and talk about home and try to take their minds away from the danger of their daily lives. These men and women are the best. These are the best and bravest among us. They are volunteers to a person. They have enlisted in the services and they risk their lives every single day.

Unfortunately, many want to drag this debate into a referendum about whether we respect, admire, and honor these troops. Any honest person would tell you that you should concede the obvious: We all respect, admire, and honor these troops. Many of us believe the best way to honor them is to start bringing them safely home. When I think about what they have faced, and continue to face, and I think about these young men and women getting into these humvees or walking the streets of Baghdad and other cities, risking their lives every day, I want this to end and end soon.

What those on the other side argue is the opposite. They argue that the President is right, that sending more troops into harm's way is the best way to end the war. I could not disagree more. But the point of that disagreement is the reason the debate is necessary. It happened in the House. It should happen in the Senate.

Tomorrow, we will have a chance, at 1:45 p.m. eastern time, to vote as to whether we will have a real debate on this war in Iraq. I am not hopeful. We need the cooperation of Republican Senators to even debate the issue. Many have already announced they are opposed to this debate; they don't want it to occur. I think they are wrong. I think they are walking away from our basic responsibility as Members of the Senate.

I think those who want an escalation of the war need to answer some fundamental questions. I think they should answer the question: How many troops will be involved here? Will it be 21,000, as the President says or, as the CBO tells us, a number much larger than 21,000, which represents combat troops; they may need an equal or larger number to support those combat troops, endangering the lives of 40,000 more soldiers, not 20,000.

Outgoing Army Chief of Staff Peter Schoomaker said yesterday that an increase of 17,500 Army combat troops in Iraq represents, in his words, "only the tip of the iceberg." It worries me that this is the beginning of a spiraling escalation, endangering even more troops.

Army officials have also stated that virtually all of the U.S.-based Army combat brigades are not prepared to be

deployed. The Army is scrambling to find the gear and personnel for units that are being sent to Iraq and Afghanistan, pulling both people and equipment out of other units, scavenging for pieces of equipment that are necessary, to get them ready in some fashion for battle. General Schoomaker testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that—pay special attention to this—"I am not satisfied with the readiness of our nondeployed forces."

We ask a lot of our men and women in uniform. We ask for their commitment to our country. We ask them to be trained and to be brave. But we should never ask them to go into battle without the equipment they need in order to come home safely.

What this general says, the outgoing Army Chief of Staff, is that that is exactly what is going to happen with this escalation. Men and women will be sent into dangerous situations without the protection they need.

On January 25, the Department of Defense inspector general released a summary report that stated that American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan experienced "shortages of force-protection equipment, such as uparmored vehicles, electronic countermeasure devices, crew-served weapons, and communications equipment." January 25, just a few days ago.

The report went on to say:

As a result, servicemembers were not always equipped to effectively complete their missions.

We have a special responsibility—those who make the policy in this town and those who vote for it—to keep our promise to these soldiers and their families that we will give them the training and equipment they need so they can perform their missions effectively.

The same report I referred to stated that when servicemembers were asked to perform tasks outside their usual duties, they often did not receive the equipment necessary to perform their wartime mission.

These were tasks such as training Iraqi forces, one of our most important missions, or disposing of explosives, a highly dangerous undertaking.

Today's Washington Post states that approximately 40 percent of Army and Marine Corps equipment is now in Iraq or Afghanistan or undergoing repair or maintenance.

It is inexcusable that 4 years and almost \$400 billion into this war, we should be sending our troops into action without the equipment they need. Those who support the escalation and say they are supporting the troops need to be asked, and answer, the basic question: How can you support a soldier if you don't give them the equipment they need to be safe, perform their mission, and come home?

Army Deputy Chief of Staff of Force Development, LTG Stephen Speakes, recently said the Army would need 1,500 up-armored trucks for the new forces that were being sent to Iraq. But he went on to say:

We don't have the [armor] kits, and we don't have the trucks.

He said it will take the Army months, probably until the summer, to supply and outfit additional trucks. In the meantime, units are sharing vehicles, many of which are not properly protected so that these soldiers will be safe.

The Washington Post interviewed commanders in Iraq about the equipment situation. These commanders doubted that the new units would receive the full complement of humvees that they need.

One senior Army official was quoted as saying shortfalls would be inevitable "unless five brigades of uparmored humvees fall out of the sky." This official predicted some units would have to rely more heavily on Bradley fighting vehicles and tanks.

The good news is that these vehicles are very highly armored, but they may not be the best vehicles for the mission.

Our troops are the best. Shouldn't their equipment be the best? If you believe that an escalation of this war and more soldiers thrown into the crossfire of the civil war is in the best interest of America, shouldn't those same Senators step forward and demand that these soldiers be given the equipment they need?

These equipment shortfalls are more acute on the battlefield, of course, but they are echoed throughout our military, including the Guard and Reserve. I recently met with Lieutenant General Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau at the Pentagon. He reports that National Guard equipment readiness levels are at 34 percent. Guard units have about one-third of the equipment they need to be ready for battle. That is 34 percent of the equipment they need for missions at home and abroad. That is another direct cost of the war in Iraq.

I asked the general what the Pentagon's plans were to address this situation. He said there was a 5-year budget plan to bring the Guard up to a readiness level of 60 percent, which incidentally is below the level of readiness when this war began.

In the world we live in, 60 percent is not good enough if it is your son, your daughter, your brother, your sister, your husband, or your wife. It will cost another \$40 billion to bring the Guard up to the readiness level that we really need. I think that is an investment we ought to make.

That is one of the real costs of this war—to make sure our troops, our Guard, have the equipment they need. These issues demand our attention, our debate, and our vote.

Tomorrow, if the Republicans refuse to cross the aisle to cooperate, to start this debate, these questions will not be addressed as part of this debate over the escalation of this war. That is not fair to these soldiers. That is not fair to their families. It certainly is not fair to the States and the people we represent.

We should have an up-or-down vote, a basic exercise of Congress's responsibility. We have offered to the Republicans an opportunity to vote not only on the measure that passed the House today but on an alternative offered by Senator MCCAIN, who is asking we increase the troops who will be involved.

I have read many things about this war. Some of them I think are extremely insightful; some of them are troubling. Yesterday in the Washington Post, there was an article which laid out what was expected to happen in Iraq and never occurred.

When GEN Tommy Franks and his top officers got together in August 2002 to review the invasion plan for Iraq, they reflected on what would likely occur. By their estimate today, we would have 5,000 American soldiers left in that theater. Instead, we have over 130,000 and a President wanting to increase that number by 20,000 or 40,000 more. It shows that the planning and vision of the people who scheduled this invasion was seriously flawed.

I joined 22 others on the floor of the Senate voting against the authorization for this war. I felt at the time that the American people had been deceived—deceived about weapons of mass destruction that did not exist, deceived about connections with al-Qaida terrorists and 9/11, which did not exist, deceived about nuclear weapons and mushroom clouds when there was no threat.

That deception that occurred in the fear and panic that still followed 9/11 led many of my colleagues to vote for this war. I was not one of them. But then came the time when I was challenged, and others, as to whether we would vote for the money to wage the war. I stopped and reflected and said if my son or my daughter was in uniform, I would want them to have everything they need to come home safely, even if I think this policy is wrong.

These soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen didn't write this policy. It was written in the Pentagon and the White House. They were sent into battle with the battle plans that were handed to them, not battle plans that they wrote. They deserve a lot better. They deserve to come home. If they are going to war, they deserve the equipment they need. They deserve leadership in the White House and in Congress that is sensitive to their bravery and responds with real caring for their future.

DARFUR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to come to the floor, as I have done many times before, to speak on the crisis in Darfur, Sudan. I keep coming because at the very least, I want to do that, to keep speaking out. But this Senator, this Congress, this country, and the world must all do more. None of us have done enough.

Last fall, U.S. Special Envoy to Darfur Andrew Natsios declared that on January 1, 2007, the United States

would launch a forceful "plan B," as he called it, if Sudan did not accept the joint United Nations-African Union peacekeeping mission that is desperately needed in Darfur. As described in the Washington Post, plan B was to include aggressive economic measures against Sudan.

Today is February 16. There are only a handful of U.N. peacekeepers in Darfur. Still no sign of plan B, other than four U.S. Army colonels who have been stationed along the Chad-Sudan border.

Last week, according to a student publication at Georgetown University and other news sources, Ambassador Andrew Natsios told a student audience that genocide was no longer taking place in Darfur. He was quoted as saying:

The term genocide is counter to the facts of what is really occurring in Darfur.

I understand it is possible to get entangled in words and semantics in the definition of "genocide," but I was truly surprised to read this statement from Ambassador Natsios.

On December 10, not that long ago, the White House released a statement headlined in part, "President Bush Appalled by Genocide in Darfur."

The President's statement continued:

Our Nation is appalled by the genocide in Darfur, which has led to the spread of fighting and hostility in the Republic of Chad and the Central African Republic.

Nothing that I have seen or been told convinces me that conditions in Darfur are significantly better today than they were on December 10 when President Bush reconfirmed the ongoing horror of genocide. I can only assume the President was troubled by the Special Envoy's statement as well.

The State Department has since sought to clarify these remarks and stated that it remains the administration's position that the situation in Darfur is genocide. The State Department explained that the Special Envoy was referring to the fact that death rates are lower now, but the conditions could escalate.

I would argue that they are already escalating. People continue to be murdered and villages have been attacked by air. Humanitarian aid workers have come under special assault recently. These brave men and women, unarmed, working for the poorest people on Earth, have been subjected to beatings, rape, and arrests.

These concentrated attacks threaten the people of Darfur who depend on thin relief lines for survival. If the relief workers are forced to withdraw and these lines are severed, hundreds of thousands of lives will be in jeopardy.

Recently, along with Senator COBURN, I held the first hearing of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law. The focus of the hearing was genocide and the rule of law. Before this hearing, we noted that the United States was a late signatory to the treaty on genocide. One of our predecessors in the Senate, Senator

William Proxmire of Wisconsin, literally came to the floor of the Senate every day it was in session for years to convince the Senate to ratify this treaty. Finally, it happened. We focused on that treaty and the rule of law.

Given the ongoing crisis in Darfur and our own ineffectual attempts to halt the killing, I felt that should be the first topic of this new subcommittee.

The witnesses who came before us included the Canadian general, former U.N. general, and now Senator in Canada, Romeo Dallaire.

In 1994, General Dallaire commanded a small U.N. force in Rwanda. When the first wave of murders began, General Dallaire called for 5,000 troops—5,000 troops—to halt the killing.

My predecessor, my mentor, Senator Paul Simon of Illinois, along with Senator Jim Jeffords from Vermont, of the opposite party, both came together and called on President Clinton to help. Sadly, the Clinton administration did not. In fairness, they have acknowledged it was the most serious foreign policy mistake of their years in Washington.

General Dallaire did not receive the reinforcements. Instead, this tiny force of 2,500 was reduced. His country started withdrawing their soldiers from the U.N. force until there were only 450 left on the ground. They couldn't deal with the slaughter that followed. It is estimated that over 800,000 people were murdered in a very short period of time.

In Darfur, the African Union has tried to stop the killing, but after 4 years, U.N. peacekeeping forces have not even reached the level of 450. In his statement for the subcommittee hearing on genocide, General Dallaire said this of Darfur:

I have on occasion considered bringing a flak jacket I wore during the Rwandan genocide—a jacket that was blood-soaked from carrying a 12-year-old girl who had been mutilated and repeatedly raped—into the [Canadian] Senate chamber and throwing it in the middle of the room. Maybe this would finally capture the attention of the political elite in a way words fail to do. Maybe it would finally bring home the point that human rights are not only for those who have the money to buy and sustain [them]; they are the privilege and the right of every human being.

Mr. President, we must do more in Darfur. The United States must work through the United Nations and with other countries of influence to compel the Khartoum Government to accept a peacekeeping mission, and we must help provide the resources to make that possible.

Here at home we can do more as well. I am a strong supporter of divestment. I served in the House of Representatives during apartheid in South Africa when we tried everything in our power to stop the racist government. We suggested divestment. Many said it would be worthless; it wouldn't have an impact. But I think it was a positive