

going to protect them on the battlefield. We are going to make sure they have the resources to do the job, and when they come back home, we want to be sure they have health care and they have jobs and they have job training.

I know the distinguished Presiding Officer has been a leader in making sure that when our troops come home, they have job training, and I thank him for that.

I am not new to this position on the war. I never wanted to go to war in the first place, not because I am a pacifist—and I respect those who are—but I read that national intelligence report; I am on the Intelligence Committee. I had very grave suspicions about the level of weapons of mass destruction Saddam had. But I also believed it was the U.N.'s job to go to Iraq and do the work that the U.N. was supposed to do.

I opposed giving the President unilateral authority to engage in a preemptive attack just because he said we were in imminent danger. I wish he had micromanaged that a bit. Maybe we wouldn't have had to go. I said the United States had to exhaust our diplomatic options, and I encouraged the administration at that time: Please, stick with the U.N. so the U.N. can meet its responsibility to deal with the Saddam threat. I said we shouldn't go on our own and we should work with the U.N. and the international community.

The day of the vote when I spoke, I said I didn't know what lies ahead. I didn't know if our troops would be greeted with flowers or with landmines. Go to Walter Reed and Bethesda Naval Hospital and talk to those coming home from Iraq. You know what we got. When we got there, there were no weapons of mass destruction, but destruction sure happened.

After 4 years of fighting, are we better off in Iraq? The United States went to war with Iraq, now we are at war within Iraq. Saddam is gone, we are still there, and now we are in a civil war. It is time for us to come home, and it is time for us to come home following the Iraq Study Group recommendations.

We need a new way forward in Iraq. The Iraq Study Group gave us 79 recommendations. Surely, we could agree on 50. If the administration wasn't being so isolated and so rigid, they would know it is time to engage in the international community, that it is always better to send in the diplomats before we send in the troops. Let's send in the diplomats so we can bring our troops back home.

The Iraq Study Group calls for enhanced diplomatic and political efforts in Iraq and outside Iraq. It provides a direction for the U.S. Government and the Iraqi Government to follow that would bring our forces home by the first quarter of 2008. That is what the Reid resolution calls for.

The Reid resolution sets a goal of bringing all U.S. combat forces home

by March 31, 2008, except for limited numbers of troops for force protection, training of the Iraqi troops, and targeted counterterrorism operations. It would begin a phased redeployment within 4 months after the passage of this legislation. But it also develops a comprehensive diplomatic, political, and economic strategy. Finally, this resolution requires the President to report to Congress within 60 days.

That is why we support this resolution. Are we micromanaging? No, but I wish the administration, as I said, had micromanaged the war. We wouldn't be in the debate we are in now.

I support the Reid resolution because I believe what the Iraq Study Group said, that the Iraq problems cannot now be solved with a military solution, no matter how brave, no matter how smart. It requires a political solution by the Iraqis and a diplomatic solution with Iraq's neighbors. It says the Congress and the American people will not just support the troops, but protect them.

I want this war to end, and I believe this Reid resolution will do that. Yet, in ending the war, it is my responsibility to ensure our troops are brought home not only swiftly but safely.

Mr. President, I have had sit-ins in my office four times during the last 3 weeks. Four times, people have come to my office to sit in. Some come to protest, some come to get arrested, but all have a right to speak out. They want me to vote against the spending for the war. Well, there is no way a responsible Senator can vote against spending. There is no one line item that says: War, yes or no. That is not the way the supplemental works. That is not the way the defense budget works. That is not the way our entire budget works. There is no vote that says: War, yes or no.

So I won't vote for defunding the war. I say to the protestors—I say to those well-intentioned liberal activists—know that we are on your side, but what are you asking us to vote against? Do you want us to vote against the pay for the soldiers and for their spouses and for their children? I won't vote against their benefits. What do you want us to vote against—the bullets and what they need to fight? I won't vote against that. Do you want us to vote against the body armor and the armored humvees they need for survival? I won't vote against that.

What if they are injured? One of the things that save their lives on the battlefields is the tourniquet. I won't cut off the money for the tourniquets. I want them to have the tourniquets to cut off the hemorrhaging on the battlefields. When they come out of there, there is the jet fuel that gets them on the medevac from Baghdad to Germany to Walter Reed and Bethesda. We will clean up Walter Reed, and we will fix Bethesda Naval Hospital, but they have to get here. When they get here, they need medical care. Hats off to acute medical care.

Now we need outpatient care. Now we need long-term care for the 50 years or so these men and women will have the need for it. We have had 22,000 people receive Purple Hearts in Iraq, and more have been injured than we will ever know or we will know years from now. So I can't vote against funding.

I tell all who are listening that you can sit in every single day, you can follow me throughout my Senate career, you can follow me to my grave—I will not vote to in any way harm the U.S. men and women in the military, nor will I cut off the support for help to their families. If you want to picket, you want to protest, you want to disrupt my life, better my life is disrupted than the lives of these men and women in uniform.

I am going to support this Reid resolution because I believe it helps bring the war to an honorable end, but at the same time, we are going to support our troops. It is time to stop the finger-pointing, and it is time to pinpoint a new way forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, some years ago, the distinguished and late great Senator from the State of Minnesota, Hubert H. Humphrey, said the following when he was talking about how we should evaluate budgets in government. He said:

The moral test of a government is how it treats those in the dawn of life, those in the shadows of life, and those in the twilight of life.

I rise today to speak of those in the dawn of their lives—children across America and especially the children of working families, working families who have no health insurance.

Unfortunately, despite good intentions and despite a good program I will be speaking about this morning, there are 9 million American children with no health insurance at all—9 million children. That is a blot on the American conscience—or should be—that there are 9 million children who have no health insurance at all. Justice cannot abide 9 million children in America with no health insurance.

That is the bad news. The good news is that we have a way to bring some relief to those children, to their families, and to the American economy. It is called the State Children's Health Insurance Program, known by the acronym SCHIP. So when I refer to SCHIP by that acronym, I am speaking of that program, the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Here is what this program does, and it bears repeating because of the broad coverage that important program provides to children across America. It provides comprehensive health insurance coverage to up to 6 million American children. It is financed jointly by State governments and the Federal Government. Currently, that program

costs the Federal Government just over \$5 billion per year—a very small price to pay in a huge Federal budget with all the return you get from that investment for our children. Remember what this program is: It is a program that covers the children of working families, those families whose incomes are too high to be covered by Medicaid and whose incomes are too low to have the coverage that is provided in the private market. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about families who are squeezed in between and who cannot afford coverage in the private market but also don't qualify for Medicaid.

In Pennsylvania, my home State, I am honored and proud to say that my father, Governor Casey, when he was the Governor of Pennsylvania, signed into law one of the first children's health insurance programs in the Nation in 1992. Since that time, not only in Pennsylvania but especially in our State, we have had broad bipartisan support for this program from Republican Governors and Democratic Governors. Currently, Governor Rendell is trying to expand the Children's Health Insurance Program in Pennsylvania. That is a good thing because even though it covers as many as 150,000 Pennsylvania children, there are still over 130,000 children in the State of Pennsylvania who have no coverage. The Governor wants to attack that problem and reduce that number. Unfortunately, this Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor Rendell, as well as Governors across the country, in both parties, are unable to expand their programs if the budget proposal set forth by the President becomes the law.

Here is what the Bush budget does when it comes to the State Children's Health Insurance Program, and I am quoting from a report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: "The Bush budget provides less than half"—less than half—"of the funding needed for States to maintain existing case-loads." What we are talking about there is, going forward in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012, in those budget years, the President's budget provides less than half the money to maintain the coverage for those approximately 6 million children who have coverage. This doesn't even address the problem I started with this morning, the 9 million children who don't have any health care coverage at all.

We have to do two things. We have to make sure we maintain the coverage for the 6 million children who have it in America across the country in almost every State in the country. They are not divided by Democrat and Republican; they are children and their families, and they are part of the family of America. We have to make sure we maintain their coverage. At the same time, we have to expand coverage to begin to cover the 9 million who have no health insurance coverage at all.

What is the effect of this budget on these families? The Bush budget has a

funding shortfall over 5 years of \$7 billion. That is a big number, but let us talk about that in terms of children. That is the most important thing here. That \$7 billion shortfall equates, by 2012, to 1.4 million children losing their coverage. We are still on problem No. 1, those who have coverage who will lose it—1.4 million of them—if this budget goes through. That is what we are talking about when we talk about this budget and this important program. But we have to make sure we do more than just maintain coverage; we have to make sure we expand it for the millions of children who don't have health insurance.

I wish to conclude this morning with a couple of basic questions for the President, for the Senate, and for the House. This is what every elected official in Washington has to answer when they vote on this budget and when they vote on the question of the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Question No. 1 for the President and for the Congress: Does the administration and the Congress want 1.4 million children to lose their health insurance coverage? You can't have it both ways. If you vote for the President's proposal, you are voting to cut 1.4 million kids from the insurance rolls. That is question No. 1, and it is a "yes" or "no" answer. There is no dodging that question.

Question No. 2: Are tax breaks for millionaires and multimillionaires and billionaires more important than the State Children's Health Insurance Program? Do they have a higher priority? Do their needs come ahead of the children of working parents?

That is another question we have to answer because there will be people in this town who will talk about the cost of expanding health insurance coverage or even maintaining the coverage that is there. They will say: Oh, that is going to cost lots of money. Well, I have to ask them a basic question: Are the millionaires and billionaires who have benefited year after year to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars—is their tax cut more important than children? It is a "yes" or "no" answer, and that is what the Congress and the President have to answer.

Finally, No. 3, the basic question for today, tomorrow, but especially for many years from now: Do you want the gross domestic product to grow? Do you want the American economy to grow? Because if you answer that question "yes," you cannot oppose the expansion of the State Children's Health Insurance Program. You cannot. We know the benefits of providing health insurance to children. We know they will go to school ready to learn. We know they will be healthier in school, they will get higher test scores, and they will have the benefit of higher education, hopefully, for many of them, and they will go on to achieve their full potential in the job market and help grow the American economy. So if you care about the economy

today, tomorrow, and into the future, and you care about growing jobs, you must vote, in my judgment, to expand the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Finally, it is about coverage. It is about maintaining that coverage, and it is about making sure 9 million kids have health insurance in the future. It is also making sure we do everything possible to reach every child and make sure that child's family is utilizing the great services of the State Children's Health Insurance Program. If we meet this obligation to cover the kids who are covered now, to make sure their coverage is maintained, and to cover the 9 million children, we will have gone a long way toward meeting Hubert H. Humphrey's moral test of government: to make sure we are taking care and helping children in the dawn of their lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority controls 22 minutes in morning business.

Mr. PRYOR. I thank the Chair.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I have come here today to talk about the political firings of U.S. attorneys, which I believe raises serious concerns over the administration's encroachment on the Senate's constitutional responsibilities but now I also believe raises serious concerns over the Attorney General's ability to serve. That is why I come here today to call for Attorney General Alberto Gonzales's resignation.

There has been a lot of attention focused on U.S. attorneys over the last couple of weeks, but this is an issue I have been involved with for the last 9 months. I first realized a problem existed in July of 2006. On February 6, 2007, I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I won't repeat that testimony here, but I will focus on five facts today, and these are undisputed facts. First, based on the e-mails produced by the Department of Justice, this administration set out to fire or replace U.S. attorneys, some without cause and in some cases for suspicious reasons.

Second, this is different from anything done in previous administrations and includes putting a provision in the PATRIOT Act to carry out their scheme.

Third, it started with the White House.

Fourth, it was carried out by the Attorney General.

Fifth, the Attorney General crossed a line by putting politics above the pursuit of justice and has seriously damaged his stature and legacy in the process.

The first of these points is proven by e-mails from the Attorney General's Office and the White House. The fifth