I believe it is also important to add that, as of last week, three of the four Iraqi battalions that recently entered Baghdad were at above 100 percent troop strength. Another vital element is our new commander in Iraq, General David Petraeus. I can think of no better choice for implementing our new strategy.

General Petraeus has long been a student of counterinsurgency warfare. In the 1980s, when he received his Ph.D. from Princeton, he closely studied counterinsurgency operations.

During the initial race to Baghdad, the General commanded the 101st Airborne Division, and he is largely credited with devising and implementing a strategy that secured the city of Mosul immediately after the initial combat phase.

Later, when he commanded our effort to train the Iraqi Army, General Petraeus implemented the Transition Team concept. A Transition Team is composed of a group of advisers, primarily officers and seasoned noncommissioned officers, who serve with Iraqi units from those units' inception, including basic and advanced training and eventually combat operations. This is an important strategy, since experienced U.S. soldiers learn firsthand the operational characteristics and requirements of Iraqi units and tailor a training program to fit the units' needs. It also provides a detailed analysis of the individual Iraqi units' combat capabilities. General Petraeus was also one of the authors of the updated Army/Marine Corps Field Manual on Counterinsurgency which was published in December of last year.

I do not know of any other officer with the intellect and experience necessary to carry out successfully this new strategy and win the war in Iraq. He has my confidence and apparently the confidence of most everyone in the Senate since 100 percent voted for him and he clearly articulated this new strategy. But what he needs is our support and time to carry out his new strategy.

One must also remember that all of the additional forces needed to fully implement this new strategy will not be in place until early June.

As the General stated in a recent news conference:

> We are, in any event, still in the early days of this endeavor, an endeavor that will take months, not days or weeks, to fully implement, and one that will have to be sustained to achieve its desired effect. . . . I have been on occasion bemused by people ''Hey, how's it going? Have you won yet?'' And the answer is we've just started. Just the second of five brigades [has arrived]. . . . Our soldiers are resolute. They want to see this succeed, as do their Iraqi counterparts, and that is exactly what we're endeavoring to do.

So what do we offer him and the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and coastguardsmen under his command? We offer guaranteed defeat in the form of a joint resolution.

But with great respect for General Petraeus, I believe we have already seen some preliminary success. For example, Richard Engel, an NBC News reporter who has lived in Iraq for the past few years covering the war, responded just last month about our change in tactics. He said:

> Night and day. There's a radically new war plan under way in Baghdad right now. For the past four years, U.S. troops have been on main bases, most of them outside the city center, some of them in Baghdad itself, and then have been effectively commuting to work. Now they live at work, they're living in small forward operating bases. . . . It is a very different strategy. We're seeing foot patrols again that we haven't seen in Baghdad for a long time, more hearts and minds campaign. . . . It's very much a new war. A lot of people say that this feels like '03, that the war is starting again and that this is a new battle plan. The battle plan to end the war in Iraq and finally establish some sort of stability.

I would also like to address a matter that, more than any other, has weighed on my heart over the past few years. That question is, Do we, not just as a nation but as a people, have the will to see our obligations through? This has always been an important question. But now, during an insurgent war, where the side with the greatest will, not technological advantage, will generally emerge victorious, it has become the essential question.

So now we must ask ourselves: Do we have the will to see right triumph? Do we as Americans believe in making sacrifices for the greater good? History provides an answer.

Almost 230 years ago, the Continental Army began a retreat, or more accurately a route, from Brooklyn Heights over the island of Manhattan into New Jersey and then across the Delaware River. General Washington had fewer than 1,000 troops and was confronted by the greatest Army of the day. The Continental's enlistments were up and many soldiers, lacking basic supplies and even food, were making plans to go home. For all intensive purposes, the American experiment in democracy, where all men were to be treated equal, was about to end.

Then something miraculous happened. A writer named Thomas Paine wrote a pamphlet entitled ''Crisis.'' But panic was not his essay's subject. He wrote about commitment and faith that freedom would one day be victorious. His words still echo today:

> These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman.

Shortly, after the Continental Army heard these words, the morale, which had been crushed by the cold winters of New Jersey, was restored enough for General Washington to launch the raids on Trenton and Princeton, thus saving the young Republic.

Commitment and faith had been restored—the faith that freedom is worth fighting for, that it is worth sacrificing for, and that is what we as a Nation must remember now more than ever.

I see the leaders are on the floor, and I will not take any more time, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Utah being his usual courteous self.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 9 be agreed to and that the Senate now begin debate en bloc on the following: S.J. Res. 9, S. Res. 107, and S. Con. Res. 20 by Senator GREGG; that there now be 4 hours for debate on the above items equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that no amendments or motions be in order to any of the above; that at the conclusion or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on each of the above in the above order; and that the preceding all occur without intervening action or debate; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, since a filibuster is any Member's prerogative, I renew my consent with 60 votes required to pass each measure; and that if any measure fails to get 60 votes, the vote on passage be vitiated and the item be returned to its previous status.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me also say, when we complete these votes, we are going to move to three judges, one circuit court judge and two district court judges. So Senators should be alerted that we could have six votes.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 214

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 19, at 2 p.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, S. 214, a bill to preserve the independence of U.S. attorneys; that when the Senate considers the bill, it be considered under the following limitations: that there be 6 hours of general debate on the bill, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators LEAHY and SPECTER or their designees; that once the bill is reported, the Committee-reported amendment be agreed

to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the only other amendments in order be the following: the Kyl amendment regarding the nomination and confirmation of U.S. attorneys; the Sessions amendment regarding appropriate qualifications for interim U.S. attorneys; that debate on each amendment be limited to 3 hours equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that the amendments have to be offered and debated during Monday's session, except as noted below; that on Tuesday, the Senate resume consideration of the bill immediately after the opening proceedings and there be 90 minutes of additional debate time on the bill and the amendments are to run concurrently with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, but not later than 11:30 a.m., without further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Kyl amendment, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Sessions amendment; that upon disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill, as amended; that the text of these amendments be printed in the RECORD once this consent is granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 459 and 460) are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 459

(Purpose: To ensure that United States attorneys are promptly nominated by the President, and are appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate)

On page 2, strike line 1 and all that follows and insert the following:

SEC. 2. PROMPT NOMINATION AND CONFIRMATION OF UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Section 541 of title 28, United States Code is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b)(1) Not later than 120 days after the date on which a vacancy occurs in the office of United States attorney for a judicial district, the President shall submit an appointment for that office to the Senate.

''(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), not later than 120 days after the date of the submission of an appointment under paragraph (1), the Senate shall vote on that appointment.

''(3) If the President fails to comply with paragraph (1) with regard to the submission of any appointment for the office of United States attorney, paragraph (2) of this subsection shall have no force or effect with regard to any appointment to the office of United States attorney during the remainder of the term of office of that President.''.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF INTERIM APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.

Section 546 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

AMENDMENT NO. 460

(Purpose: To require appropriate qualifications for interim United States attorneys)

On page 2, line 23, strike the quotation marks and the second period and insert the following:

''(e)(1) A district court appointing a United States attorney under subsection (d) shall not appoint a candidate—

''(A) unless that candidate is an employee of the Department of Justice or is a Federal law enforcement officer (as that term is defined in section 115 of title 18); or

''(B) if the court learns that candidate is under investigation or has been sanctioned by the Department of Justice or another Federal agency.

''(2) Not less than 7 days before making an appointment under subsection (d), a district court shall confidentially inform the Attorney General of identity of the candidate for that appointment.''.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in view of the agreement just entered, I now ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion be withdrawn.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, let me say these few minutes Senator MCCONNELL and I have spent on the floor have been just a brief interlude, but getting to this point has taken hours and hours of people's time. I think we are at a point now where we have had a good debate over the last several days and we will have one today. We are moving into another contentious issue, which will be resolved Tuesday morning. So I think we have made great progress. I think it speaks well of the Senate, in spite of the closeness of the margin between Democrats and Republicans, that we are able to get things done. Sometimes it is a slow process in getting things done, but I am confident this is good for the body and the country.

Mr. President, also it is important that everyone be notified—we were scheduled to have a vote Monday at 5:00 or 5:30—that it is not necessary. We have a lot of work going on. We have the debate on the budget that will take some time. We are going to complete this U.S. attorneys issue and we are going to complete three judges today. So in short, there is no need to have a judge's vote, though we have two remaining on the calendar, and I think we will accomplish what we need to do. So there will be no votes on Monday night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me echo the remarks of the majority leader with regard to the painstaking process he and I have been through over the last day and a half trying to reach an agreement on the Iraq debate. I think it is an agreement that is satisfactory to both sides. It gives Senators an opportunity to express themselves on what is clearly, arguably, the most important issue on the minds of the American people at this particular juncture in our history, and we look forward to the debate starting shortly. Senator INHOFE will be here to control the time on our side, so let the debate begin.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the final 20 minutes of the debate relating to matters regarding the Iraq resolutions, the first 10 minutes of the 20 minutes be for Senator MCCONNELL, the second 10 minutes right before the vote be under my control.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNITES STATES POLICY IN IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2007—S. J. RES. 9

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT NO ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN TO UNDERMINE THE SAFETY OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OR IMPACT THEIR ABILITY TO COMPLETE THEIR ASSIGNED OR FUTURE MISSIONS.—S. RES. 107

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT NO FUNDS SHOULD BE CUT OFF OR REDUCED FOR AMERICAN TROOPS IN THE FIELD WHICH WOULD RESULT IN UNDERMINING THEIR SAFETY OR THEIR ABILITY TO COMPLETE THEIR ASSIGNED MISSIONS.—S. CON. RES. 20

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 4 hours of debate equally divided between the parties.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my understanding the debate will start with our side. I encourage all Members who wish to be heard on our side on any of these resolutions to come to the floor and be heard.

Let me share some thoughts. This is a rather awkward situation we find ourselves in because we are debating three resolutions concurrently. Frankly, one of the three I have not even seen yet, so it is very difficult to debate something you have never seen. But I do know from the past discussions the type of concerns people have, the differences between, quite frankly, the Republican side and the Democratic side. I know it is not right down party lines, but let me share some concerns I have and some thoughts I have.

We heard from several Senators who expressed their concern over our micromanaging the war from this body and from the body of the other side. Five hundred and thirty-five people cannot be Commanders in Chief. It seems as if that is what is happening. Also, I observe, and I am only speaking for myself, that this thing has become highly politicized. When the war first started,