

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 90 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Republicans and the second 30 minutes under the control of the majority and the last 30 minutes equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

## IRAQ

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, we all know and understand that Americans are deeply concerned about the war in Iraq. We all represent the finest and bravest men and women across this great country who put themselves in harm's way to protect our very way of life. We all want our brave men and women who are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan to come home as soon as possible.

Members of Georgia's military community have given mightily to our efforts in the Middle East. In fact, members of the 3rd Infantry Division, headquartered at Fort Stewart, GA, are heading to Iraq for the third time as we speak, and I wish to underscore how much we appreciate them and their families. These resolutions which the Democrats continue to put forth undermine these men and women. Any attempt to set a timeline for withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq, as the latest resolution does, will embolden the enemy and tell them exactly how long they need to wait until they are free to take over and wreak havoc in Iraq.

I understand the desire to have the Iraqis take responsibility for their own country and step up to the plate in terms of taking the political, economic, and military actions necessary to secure Iraq, and I strongly support that goal. However, this resolution is the wrong way to accomplish it.

These resolutions—and I believe there have been about 17 put forth over the course of the last couple of months—simply send the wrong message to our troops, and they send the wrong message to the enemy.

Winston Churchill once said:

Nothing is more dangerous in wartime than to live in the temperamental atmosphere of a Gallup poll, always feeling one's pulse and taking one's temperature.

I think that sums up what is going on here today.

These resolutions only serve to micromanage the war by a political body which simply is unable to do it ef-

fectively. We have a Commander in Chief who is entrusted with managing and leading our military during wartime, and the Commander in Chief's new plan for Iraq deserves a chance to succeed. These resolutions are designed to ensure that the President's plan fails, not that it succeeds.

Also, these resolutions are completely contradictory to the Senate's support for GEN David Petraeus, our new commander of the multinational forces in Iraq. No Senator opposed General Petraeus's nomination. I have not heard anyone criticize him, and rightly so. We need to give General Petraeus and his counterinsurgency campaign in Iraq a chance to succeed. The people of Georgia, myself included, want General Petraeus to succeed. We understand the consequences of failure, and there is no question the latest resolution we are considering in this body will not help him succeed.

This resolution advocates transitioning U.S. forces in Iraq to protecting U.S. coalition personnel, training and equipping Iraqi forces, and conducting counterterrorism operations, and calls for a diplomatic, political, and economic strategy to stabilize Iraq. Many people say the situation in Iraq requires a political and not a military solution. I strongly agree with that position; however, it is not possible to have a political solution or to make political progress if citizens live in an unstable and unsafe society. Some level of order and stability must be in place before a political solution can take hold.

In America, we take order and stability for granted because we live in a country that is extremely safe, secure, and stable. However, Iraq is not the United States. Iraqis do not live in a secure and stable society, and order and stability must be in place before there can be any hope for a long-term political solution. The additional troops we are sending are meant to create that order and stability, particularly in Baghdad. We need to give this effort a chance to succeed, and we need to create stability and order before we can be hopeful about a long-term political solution.

The Reid resolution opposes the President's plan without offering any concrete alternative. It opposes the mission which the Senate has unanimously confirmed General Petraeus to carry out, and it will not serve to help our troops and our commander in Iraq succeed in the mission we have sent them on to accomplish. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to point out some of the bitter ironies of this debate.

Since roughly January, when the new majority took charge of this Congress, there have been numerous proposals

with regard to how we should conduct ourselves in Iraq. I have tried to keep track of the various resolutions that have been proposed and, as my colleagues can see, there have been, according to my count, at least 17 resolutions. They start with the Biden and Levin resolutions, the Reid-Pelosi resolution, the Murtha resolution, the Biden-Levin resolution, the Conrad funding cut resolution, a waiver plan, a timeline plan, the Feingold resolution, the Obama resolution, the Clinton resolution, the Dodd resolution, the Kennedy resolution, the Feinstein resolution, the Byrd resolution, the Kerry resolution, and then the latest, the Reid resolution we are on today.

Under this current iteration before the Senate, it says: The President shall commence the phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, with the goal of redeploying by March 31, 2008, all U.S. combat forces from Iraq, except for a limited number that are essential for the following purposes: protecting U.S. and coalition personnel and infrastructures, training and equipping Iraqi forces, and conducting targeted counterterrorism operations.

The reason I find this list of resolutions—and now with the culmination on March 15—somewhat ironic is we are beginning to see some of the signs of success of the new plan, the Baghdad security plan proposed by Prime Minister Maliki, with the support of the United States.

For example, in the Associated Press yesterday, Robert Reid wrote that bomb deaths have gone down 30 percent in Baghdad since the security crackdown that began a month ago and that execution-style slayings have been cut nearly in half.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

I want to add a few key quotes to highlight what this article says.

... there are encouraging signs. Gone are the "illegal checkpoints," where Shiite and Sunni gunmen stopped cars and hauled away members of the rival sect—often to a gruesome torture and death.

He goes on to say:

The rattle of the automatic weapons fire or the rumble of distant roadside bombs comes less frequently. Traffic is beginning to return to the city's once vacant streets.

Consider this:

In the months before the security operation began, February 14, police were finding dozens of bodies each day in the capital—victims of Sunni and Shiite death squads. Last December, more than 200 bodies were found each week—with the figure spiking above 300 in some weeks, according to police reports compiled by the Associated Press. Since the crackdown began, weekly totals have dropped to about 80—hardly an acceptable figure but clearly a sign that death squads are no longer as active as they were in the final months of last year.

Mr. President, I think it is important to recognize that it has only been since February 14 that this new security plan has been operating and that Iraqi brigades and American surge forces are coming over the period of months and will not finally be deployed there for some time yet. Yet we are seeing some preliminary indications—nobody is claiming success or victory, but there are some preliminary indications that the plan is actually working. The article quotes MG William Caldwell, and I share in the sentiments he expresses when he says:

I would caution everybody about patience, about diligence. This is going to take many months, not weeks, but the indicators are all very positive right now.

We should also be cautious and patient and diligent, but we should also recognize that progress is being made with this new plan proposed by General Petraeus, embraced by the President and his new Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, and we should give it the chance to work.

That is precisely the reason I think this resolution is so misguided. The idea that we have simply lost and we have to give up, with no constructive alternative plan being suggested to deal with what will occur. In all probability there will be massive ethnic cleansing and a vast humanitarian crisis when the various sects continue to escalate their conflict against one another, which likely will draw in other, for example, Sunni majority nations such as Saudi Arabia to try to protect the Sunni minority in Iraq, and Iran, a Shiite majority nation, seeks to take advantage of the chaos there. Without the stabilizing influence of the U.S. and our Iraqi allies and this new Iraq security plan, it is probable that this troubled area of the world will descend into a vast regional conflagration.

What I don't understand about this resolution is that there is virtually not even a nod of the head or a tip of the hat to the fact that, as Senator LEVIN pointed out, there are about 5,000 to 6,000 al-Qaida foreign fighters in Al Anbar Province. This so-called phased redeployment, which is just Washington-speak for getting out of town as fast as you can, leaves a void, a power vacuum in this area where al-Qaida can basically run wild and continue as they did in Afghanistan before 9/11—to plan, recruit, train, and finance terrorist attacks and launch them against the United States.

I am sure I wasn't the only one who was chilled at the testimony released today in the newspapers of Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, who confessed to beheading Daniel Pearl, the Wall Street Journal reporter, in Iraq and some 30 other terrorist attacks, including the attacks of 9/11. But how anybody in good conscience can advocate simply quitting in Iraq with the threat of 5,000 to 6,000 al-Qaida foreign fighters there, with the risk of a regional conflict, along with the tremendous body blow that would cause to the

American economy, I don't know. I just don't understand it.

I was also surprised to see in today's New York Times some comments by Senator CLINTON, who, of course, is running for the Democratic nomination for President. Notwithstanding this resolution and her stated support for the resolution, she is quoted as saying she foresees a "remaining military as well as political mission" in Iraq. If elected President, she would keep a reduced military force there to fight al-Qaida—I am glad to hear that—deter Iranian aggression, protect the Kurds, and possibly support the Iraqi military.

It is a little troubling. While she says that would be her goal, it appears to be inconsistent with this resolution that she also says she will vote for. This is another quote in the article of March 15 in the New York Times. She said:

So it will be up to me to try to figure out how to protect those national security interests and continue to take our troops out of this urban warfare, which I think is a loser.

This article says:

Asked if her plan was consistent with the resolution, Mrs. CLINTON and her advisers said it was, noting that the resolution also called for "a limited number" of troops to stay in Iraq to protect the American Embassy and other personnel, train and equip Iraqi forces, and conduct "targeted counterterrorism operations."

I don't know how that is consistent with this resolution. I don't know how it is consistent with her other statement that she made on the campaign trail when she said:

If we in Congress don't end this war by January 2009, as President, I will.

It is speculated in this article that what she is proposing is a mirror image of a plan advocated by Dov S. Zakheim, a Pentagon comptroller under Donald Rumsfeld. He estimated that no more than 75,000 troops would be required for the kind of plan she describes, as opposed to the 160,000 troops the United States will have in Iraq once the surge is complete. But I wonder whether it is wise to embrace a plan proposed by the Pentagon's comptroller—in other words, the Pentagon's numbers cruncher, the budget man, as opposed to the plan proposed by GEN David Petraeus, who is an acknowledged expert in counterinsurgency matters, the very kind of plan that is being executed now with the Baghdad security planning—clearing, holding, and building. I cannot understand how you would embrace a plan essentially proposed by the Pentagon's bookkeeper as opposed to the Pentagon's best generals.

I see the distinguished whip on the Senate floor. I will yield the rest of our time to him.

I cannot understand why our friends on the majority side cannot make up their minds. We have 17 resolutions and counting. It seems as if each day brings a different plan but none to address the most urgent needs for our national security in the Middle East.

## EXHIBIT 1

## SOME PROGRESS MAY MEAN HOPE FOR BAGHDAD

(By Robert H. Reid)

BAGHDAD.—Bomb deaths have gone down 30 percent in Baghdad since the U.S.-led security crack down began a month ago. Execution-style slayings are down by nearly half.

The once frequent sound of weapons has been reduced to episodic, and downtown shoppers have returned to outdoor markets—favored targets of car bombers.

There are signs of progress in the campaign to restore order in Iraq, starting with its capital city.

But while many Iraqis are encouraged, they remain skeptical how long the relative calm will last. Each bombing renews fears that the horror is returning. Shiite militias and Sunni insurgents are still around, perhaps just laying low or hiding outside the city until the operation is over.

U.S. military officials, burned before by overly optimistic forecasts, have been cautious about declaring the operation a success. Another reason it seems premature: only two of the five U.S. brigades earmarked for the mission are in the streets, and the full compliment of American reinforcements is not due until late May.

U.S. officials say that key to the operation's long-term success is the willingness of Iraq's sectarian and ethnic political parties to strike a power- and money-sharing deal. That remains elusive—a proposal for governing the country's main source of income—oil—is bogged down in parliamentary squabbling.

Nevertheless, there are encouraging signs.

Gone are the "illegal checkpoints," where Shiite and Sunni gunmen stopped cars and hauled away members of the rival sect—often to a gruesome torture and death.

The rattle of automatic weapons fire or the rumble of distant roadside bombs comes less frequently. Traffic is beginning to return to the city's once vacant streets.

"People are very optimistic because they sense a development. The level of sectarian violence in streets and areas has decreased," said a 50-year-old Shiite, who gave his name only as Abu Abbas. "The activities of the militias have also decreased. The car bombs and the suicide attacks are the only things left, while other kinds of violence have decreased."

In the months before the security operation began Feb. 14, police were finding dozens of bodies each day in the capital—victims of Sunni and Shiite death squads. Last December, more than 200 bodies were found each week—with the figure spiking above 300 in some weeks, according to police reports compiled by The Associated Press.

Since the crackdown began, weekly totals have dropped to about 80—hardly an acceptable figure but clearly a sign that death squads are no longer as active as they were in the final months of last year.

Bombings too have decreased in the city, presumably due to U.S. and Iraqi success in finding weapons caches and to more government checkpoints in the streets that make it tougher to deliver the bombs.

In the 27 days leading up to the operation, 528 people were killed in bombings around the capital, according to AP figures. In the first 27 days of the operation, the bombing death toll stood at 370—a drop of about 30 percent.

Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, a Shiite, made a show of confidence Tuesday by traveling out of Baghdad for meetings with Sunni tribal leaders and government officials in Ramadi, a stronghold for Sunni insurgents.

"I would caution everybody about patience, about diligence," U.S. spokesman

Maj. Gen. William C. Caldwell said Wednesday. "This is going to take many months, not weeks, but the indicators are all very positive right now."

Figures alone won't tell the story. In Vietnam, generals kept pointing to enemy body counts to promote a picture of success even when many U.S. soldiers and civilian officials realized the effort was doomed.

True success will be when Iraqis themselves begin to feel safe and gain confidence in their government and security forces. Only then can the economy, long on its heels and with unemployment estimated between 25 and 40 percent, rebound and start providing jobs and a future for Baghdad's people.

A long-term solution also must deal with the militias that sprang up after the ouster of Saddam Hussein.

Much of the relative calm may be due to a decision by Shiite cleric Muqtada al-Sadr to remove his armed militiamen, known as the Mahdi Army, from the streets. Al-Maliki warned the young cleric that he could not protect them from the Americans during the offensive.

U.S. troops rolled into the Mahdi stronghold of Sadr City on March 4 without firing a shot—a radical change from street battles there in 2004.

Some Mahdi Army fighters may have left the city. But Iraqis who live in Shiite neighborhoods say many others are still around, collecting protection money from shopkeepers and keeping tabs on people—albeit without their guns.

When American patrols pass by, Mahdi members step into shops or disappear into crowds until the U.S. troops are gone. Sunni militants remain in some areas of the city too, although last year's sectarian bloodletting drove many Sunnis from their traditional neighborhoods, depriving extremists of a support network.

Sunni militants, meanwhile, are believed to have withdrawn to surrounding areas such as Diyala province where they have safe haven. The U.S. command sent an extra 700 soldiers Tuesday to protect the highways leading into the capital from there.

If militants from both sects are indeed lying low, that suggests they may have adopted a strategy of waiting until the security operation is over, then reemerging to fight each other for control of the capital.

Conscious of that possibility, new U.S. commander Gen. David Petraeus and other senior generals avoid setting a date for when the operation would end. They insist the extra troops will stay as long as they are needed.

And they say the military will continue to track down key militia and insurgent figures, in hopes of crippling the leadership of insurgent groups before they attempt to reemerge.

"You generally think that if you're going to achieve (the desired results), that it would need to be sustained certainly for some time well beyond summer," Petraeus told reporters last week.

The No. 2 commander in Iraq, Lt. Gen. Ray Odierno, has recommended that the buildup stretch longer, into the early months of 2008—if Congress will provide the money.

But positive trends in Iraq have proven hard to sustain. Hopes for reconciliation are quickly shattered. There have been a series of failed security initiatives. With so many uncertainties, public opinion appears mixed.

"We gain nothing from this government. No change," said Abu Zeinab, a Shiite father of two in Baghdad's Hurriyah district. "Today is like yesterday. What is the difference?"

In eastern Baghdad, one homeowner whose house was seized by the family of a Shiite

militiaman gained enough confidence to tell them to leave or he would turn them in to the Americans—unthinkable only a few weeks ago.

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

#### THE IRAQ RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have not had a whole lot to say in the Senate about the process, the various proposals, and even the substance of the Iraq resolutions. But it obviously is a very troublesome issue for me.

One of my concerns is the process. How bad could we possibly look as an institution? We can't come to an agreement on how to have a full debate and votes. Everybody says we will agree to this but not that, and it goes back and forth. For the life of me, I cannot understand why we cannot have some clear identification of some different approaches to this issue and have debate and vote on them.

The majority leader has to understand he cannot dictate what amendments the Republicans are going to offer and the substance of those amendments or resolutions, if you will, any more than we can dictate that to the Democrats. It has to be a fair process. I think that can be worked out. I know our leaders are talking—and I wish them the best—so that we can have debate and a vote on different approaches and move on to other issues.

My second problem is, how many iterations is this going to go through? I remind my colleagues that the election is over. It was last year. All we have been doing in the Senate is political partisan positioning, all sound and fury, achieving nothing. What is the score in the Senate? 0 to 0. Democrats haven't gotten anything done. Not one bill of any substance that we have passed has been signed into law, except a continuing resolution, which we acknowledged had to be done to keep the Government operating and, frankly, because we didn't do our work like we should have on that issue last year. That is all. It is all about positioning.

There is one other score that is the worst of all: Democrats, 0; Republicans, 0; American people, 0. We have to figure out a way to quit finding what we can disagree about and find some things we can work together on for the good of the people.

Regarding this Iraq issue, on the one hand, we say we want to succeed. On the other hand, you have the out-of-Iraq caucus saying get out of there, set deadlines, and withdraw the troops. We say we are giving General Petraeus our total confidence with a unanimous approval in confirmation. He is there trying to get the violence calmed down and to do a better job and get an opportunity for their Government to do what it needs to do, have economic development. So while we are saying: Congratulations, we all vote for you and wish you will succeed, we are over

here doing things that could potentially undermine his ability to get them done.

You might say: Oh, well, that is not really what is at stake with the Iraq resolutions. Remember, to show you what positioning is going on, today, let's say we come to the conclusion that we are going to have two or three different votes and we will finish at some point this afternoon on the latest iteration of the Reid positions and we will move on to the budget. Well, the problem with that is we have already been told this will be back on the supplemental appropriations—the emergency appropriations to fund the needs of our men and women in uniform. We are being told: By the way, we are going to put this restrictive language on the funding resolution. So we are going to revisit this issue the week after next.

I think what we are doing is the worst of all worlds. We have had non-binding resolutions to express the sense of the Senate, which is a misnomer in itself. Then, now we finally come to what would be statutory language in a joint resolution by Senator REID, which has deadlines and begins a process of Congress micromanaging a war.

We have tried it before and it didn't work, or it led to what some people consider a disaster. For us to state some opinions is one thing, but it has gone beyond that now. This is going to have an effect. I don't think there is a lot of language or a lot we can do that can positively affect what is going on in Iraq right now, but there is a lot we can do that will negatively affect it.

So I think to start setting deadlines and having the Congress trying to micromanage what is going on in Baghdad—we cannot even manage the process. How are we going to manage a war? Even the New York Times—and I don't usually quote them because most of the time I disagree with everything they have to say—is raising questions about the different resolutions and what would be the effect of what we are trying to do in the Congress about Iraq.

The Economist, I think the world's most respected magazine, said there is actually progress being made. General Petraeus is doing some things that have made a difference. Maliki and the Government there are beginning to make some decisions. We say meet your benchmarks, but as progress is being made, we say: If you don't do it like we have outlined, we are going to begin to just withdraw.

Mr. President, I wish my colleagues—all of us on both sides of the aisle—would think seriously about what we are doing in Iraq.

Then also, of course, we are going to go to the budget resolution next week. I have been through a lot of budget battles. Again, we are going to fuss and we are going to fight and we are going to have lots of amendments and we will have a vote-arama, which is the worst exhibition imaginable. We will vote on