

arrived in Nashville later that evening and went directly to the hospital. His son was born the next morning.

It was at this point that Hal D. Hardin, the United States Attorney in Nashville, stepped up to the plate. Hardin, a "yellow dog" Democrat, had been appointed United States Attorney by President Jimmy Carter in July 1977. Prior to that appointment, he had been the widely respected presiding judge on the Circuit Court for Davidson County. In fact, Governor Blanton himself had placed Mr. Hardin on the bench in 1975. Despite Governor Blanton's protestations that the "clemency for cash" investigation was a partisan Republican conspiracy, Hardin had been involved with the investigation for more than a year.

Mr. Hardin had learned from a confidential source that Governor Blanton was preparing to issue clemencies for 18 to 20 more prisoners who were implicated in the ongoing "clemency for cash" investigation. Rather than waiting for events to unfold, Mr. Hardin, without the knowledge of the FBI or his staff, telephoned Lamar Alexander on the morning of January 17, 1979. He told Alexander that he was calling as a Tennessean and explained that he had received reliable information that Governor Blanton was preparing to issue additional clemencies, and he recommended that the Governor-elect consider taking office three days early in what Lamar Alexander later described as a "swift and secret coup."

Lamar Alexander had high regard for Hal Hardin. However, rather than acting on his own, he asked Hardin relay the information to Speaker McWherter, Lieutenant Governor Wilder, and General Leech. Hardin placed separate telephone calls to Speaker McWherter and Lieutenant Governor Wilder. He suggested a meeting among the three of them. Speaker McWherter and Lieutenant Governor Wilder decided against the meeting because they were concerned that a private meeting might violate the Sunshine Law. Instead, they asked him to meet with General Leech. Mr. Hardin telephoned General Leech, and a short time later, General Leech and two senior members of his staff met with Mr. Hardin in a hotel room across the street from the federal courthouse that Hardin had rented under an assumed name. Both Hardin and Leech understood that they had been given the responsibility to chart a course of action for the leaders of state government. The discussion was tense and sometime heated despite their close personal and professional relationship. For several hours, they reviewed Opinion No. 79-3 and eventually determined that the original opinion was correct. They also discussed how Governor Blanton might react and formulated contingency plans. When the meeting concluded, both General Leech and Mr. Hardin agreed to advise the state officials that the only way to prevent Governor Blanton from issuing more clemencies would be for Lamar Alexander to take the oath of office immediately.

Mr. Hardin returned to his office following the meeting in the hotel room. General Leech telephoned Lamar Alexander. He told the Governor-elect that despite his earlier misgivings about Opinion No. 79-3, he was now convinced that state law permitted the Governor-elect to assume office before the inauguration and that removing Governor Blanton from office was not only appropriate but necessary. Then General Leech met with Speaker McWherter and Lieutenant Governor Wilder and reiterated what he had told the Governor-elect. The legislative leaders were convinced that Governor Blanton should be removed from office, and Speaker McWherter telephoned Lamar Alexander and told him, "It's time for leadership . . . We will support you."

Numerous telephone conversations involving Lamar Alexander, Speaker McWherter, Lieutenant Governor Wilder, and General Leech followed.

They agreed that bipartisanship was essential and that Tennessee's citizens should understand that Tennessee's elected leaders were united in this decision. They decided that the legislative leaders, the constitutional officers, and the Attorney General—all Democrats—should be present at the ceremony, and they agreed on a statement that Alexander would read before he took the oath of office. They also decided that the ceremony should take place in the courtroom at the Supreme Court Building in Nashville and that Chief Justice Joseph Henry, also a Democrat, should be invited to administer the oath of office.

Shortly after 5:00 p.m., Speaker McWherter, Lieutenant Governor Wilder, the constitutional officers, and the members of the media walked from the Legislative Plaza to the Supreme Court. They were joined there by Lamar Alexander, his family, and several of Alexander's senior advisors. Chief Justice Henry administered the oath. The somber ceremony lasted six minutes. The press conference that followed lasted much longer. It was not lost on the media that the new governor was a Republican while most of the other officials involved in the ceremony were Democrats. One television reporter attempted to obtain a partisan comment from Speaker McWherter. However, Speaker McWherter, who would later serve as Governor with distinction, cut the reporter short saying, "Let me say to you. First, I'm a Tennessean, and I think this is in the interest of Tennessee regardless of the party."

Just before the ceremony began, General Leech telephoned Governor Blanton to inform him he was no longer Governor. Following the call, Governor Blanton complained that "there was no courtesy extended to me today." Agents of the FBI circulated through the Capitol serving grand jury subpoenas on Governor Blanton's staff. Hal Hardin decided not to attend the ceremony. Rather than remaining in his office, he went for a long drive to be alone with his thoughts and to reflect on the events of the day.

As soon as the ceremony ended, several senior members of now Governor Alexander's staff made their way to the Capitol to secure the Governor's office. They found Governor Blanton's lawyer in his office preparing clemency papers for 30 more prisoners. Lewis R. Donelson, a Memphis lawyer who had already been named as the new Commissioner of Finance and Administration, refused to permit the lawyer to leave the building with the papers. When Governor Blanton telephoned to question his authority, Mr. Donelson replied that he was acting "by the authority of the new governor." In response to Governor Blanton's assertion that he was still the governor, Mr. Donelson replied, "Not anymore."

A full discussion of the aftermath of the events of January 17, 1979 must await another day. Governor Alexander appointed Fred Thompson as special counsel to oversee his Administration's response to the clemency crisis. Governor Alexander's formal inauguration took place as planned on January 20, 1979. For the second time, Governor Alexander took the oath administered by Chief Justice Henry in the presence of Speaker McWherter, Lieutenant Governor Wilder and the constitutional officers. While litigation in the federal and state court would follow, the transition of governmental power proceeded with bipartisan dignity. Governor Alexander announced that "today ought to be a happy one because the people and their government are back together again."

Courage does not always draw attention to itself. Hal Hardin did not attend the inauguration. Bill Leech was present but did not play a prominent role in the ceremonies. While Lamar Alexander, Ned Ray McWherter, and John Wilder deserve credit for their personal courage and decisive demonstration of bipartisanship, the principal figures in this political drama agree that the events of January 17, 1979 would not have unfolded the way they did had it not been for Hal Hardin and Bill Leech. These lawyers placed the rule of law and governmental integrity ahead of political expediency and personal reputation. In the words of Speaker McWherter, they were Tennesseans first and their actions sprang from their desire to protect the interests of all Tennesseans, regardless of party.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Washington. I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to Morning Business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment to strike section 1315 of the supplemental appropriations bill now before the Senate. The motion to strike was proposed earlier today by the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN. I am honored to be a cosponsor of it. I wish to explain to my colleagues why I am cosponsoring it.

This is a bill that is quite necessary to the funding of our military effort in Iraq and more broadly. The bill has kind of grown like Topsy and has a lot of other stuff in it. Maybe I am reflecting on the fact that I am going to see my grandchildren soon. One of my favorite Dr. Seuss books is about Thidwick the moose. Thidwick is a glorious moose with large antlers. Various creatures in the forest begin to occupy, ultimately quite unjustifiably, Thidwick's antlers until they fall off. There are parts of this supplemental appropriations bill that in my opinion, respectfully, do not belong there. Most significant of those is section 1315, which our motion would strike.

Section 1315 would order a withdrawal of American troops in Iraq to begin 120 days after passage, regardless of conditions on the ground, regardless of the recommendations of General Petraeus, regardless of the opinions of our partners in Iraq and throughout

the region, regardless of whether security is improving or deteriorating, the most significant of all. The withdrawal would be ordered by this section of the bill regardless of whether security was improving or deteriorating on the ground. It is the wrong measure at the wrong time. Ultimately, it will be a lot of sound and fury that signifies nothing but, more importantly, that accomplishes nothing and may do harm.

Why do I say it will accomplish nothing? Because everyone in this Chamber knows that the President of the United States could not have been more clear: If section 1315 is in this bill and is sent to his desk, he will veto it. In my opinion, he should veto it. Everyone in this Chamber knows there are not the votes in either House of Congress to override that veto. So that all that would have been accomplished is a delay in getting essential support to our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, support they need and on which they are counting. That is unacceptable.

Obviously, Iraq and what has happened there, what is happening now is on our minds. We should discuss it. There are ways in which we can appropriately legislate with regard to Iraq. In fact, in this bill before us, there is a section on benchmarks which establishes for ourselves and for the Iraqi Government some benchmarks, some goals that we have in mind for what they primarily, on their own, should be achieving as they move to secure Baghdad and the rest of the country and to take control of their own destiny, an Iraqi Government governing the Iraqi people, which was the aim of our overthrow of Saddam Hussein.

The benchmarks are in there, inspired by the good work done by Senator NELSON of Nebraska, Senator WARNER of Virginia. Senator MCCAIN and I, earlier in the debate on Iraq a couple of months ago, were prepared to introduce an amendment to have such benchmarks. So there was constructive work that could be done. The benchmarks in this bill are in the form of a sense of Congress. They are a message. But they are not tied to a deadline. The measure that passed the House last week actually has some benchmarks that are tied to triggers that would begin withdrawal from Iraq.

President Eisenhower, speaking as a general, once said, now famously because it has been quoted often in these debates about Iraq, and I paraphrase: Anyone who sets a deadline, who argues for a deadline to be set in war doesn't understand war.

I believe what General Eisenhower was saying is that war is a dynamic process, a terrible process, a deadly process, one we try, through the exercise of all our diplomatic strength, to avoid. But when you are in a war, you have to give some deference not just to the generals you authorized to be in command but to the reality on the ground. War is ever changing. I believe Eisenhower must have intended, when he said deadlines should not be set in

war, that there are two occasions which would justify a withdrawal. One is when the mission is accomplished. When the purpose for which a nation entered a war is accomplished, then one withdraws in victory. The second occasion when one would withdraw, based on what is happening on the ground, not some arbitrary deadline set far from the battlefield, would be if those in charge conclude that it is impossible to achieve the mission, to achieve the purpose for which the military action, the war, was commenced. Then a retreat occurs, a retreat which is a retreat in defeat.

As difficult as it has gone in Iraq and as many mistakes as have been made, as many setbacks as have occurred, as much as these mistakes and setbacks have stirred feelings of anger and frustration among the American people, which are totally understandable, justified, we have not reached the point in Iraq, in my considered judgment, where it is ready for a retreat because we have lost all hope of achieving our purposes there, which are to create a self-governing, self-sustaining Iraqi Government that will be our ally, particularly in the war against terrorism, as opposed to our enemy, and would create a model, a path, an alternative path to a better future in the Arab world, the Islamic world, than the death, hatred, and suicidal ambitions of al-Qaida and the other Islamic extremists, such as those who attacked us on September 11.

We are in a long and difficult war, and the price paid by our heroic soldiers and their families has been heavy. I understand the feelings of anger and frustration among the American people. But what is not understandable, with all respect, is for Congress now to let the passions of this moment, in Washington, obscure what is happening at this moment in Baghdad and in Anbar. Our actions should be driven by the real-war conditions in Iraq, not by the mindset here in Washington.

So I ask my colleagues to keep their minds open as we begin this very important and, critical debate. Our national security, in my opinion, is on the line in the outcome of this debate. The lives of our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan are on the line, quite literally, in the outcome of this debate.

I ask my colleagues to keep their minds open and to make a judgment as to whether this section—ordering a withdrawal from Iraq within 120 days, regardless of what happens on the ground; to be essentially completed by March of next year when most American troops would be withdrawn, regardless of what is happening on the ground in Iraq—to keep their minds open as to whether this is the right time for such a measure, whether it is the right measure, and whether it has any chance to do anything but to send a mixed message from this Congress, particularly to those who are fighting for us.

I ask my colleagues to look from here, for a moment, at what is actually

happening on the ground in Baghdad and in Anbar Province, to the west, under the new security strategy with the new troops GEN David Petraeus is implementing.

Here is what I hear people saying—this is preliminary, this is early, but it is encouraging—sectarian fighting between Sunni and Shia is down significantly in districts in Baghdad where American and Iraqi forces have entered. That means the number of people killed in sectarian conflict, violent acts, death squads in Baghdad is down significantly in those districts where Iraqi and American forces have entered and established a presence.

As security improves, many Iraqi families that fled from their homes are returning to Baghdad. Moqtada al-Sadr, the head of the Mahdi militia, who has been so anti-American, has disappeared and many of his top lieutenants have been arrested.

The Government of Prime Minister Maliki, the Government in Iraq, has shown the kind of strength and decisiveness that is an obvious and necessary precondition for progress there.

I ask my colleagues to consider the testimony given to the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, which I am privileged to chair, last Wednesday by Stuart Bowen, Jr., the Special Inspector General for Iraqi Reconstruction. Anybody who has followed Mr. Bowen's work knows this is a straight shooter. He is not in there to protect anybody. He is not in there to spin. He has told it as he sees it. He has been extremely critical of so much of what has happened in Iraq, particularly, obviously, within the jurisdiction the law gives him as Inspector General, which is to see how our money has been spent. He has documented waste in ways that are truly infuriating.

So when Stuart Bowen says something encouraging about what he sees in Iraq, that matters to me, and I believe it should matter to others. Last Wednesday, before the committee, Mr. Bowen said the week before he had returned from his 15th visit to Iraq. He said:

It's been about twenty months—

Almost 2 years—

since I have returned from Iraq with a sense of cautious optimism. I have that now.

That is significant. Why on Earth—with independent testimony from Iraq that there are preliminary, encouraging signs of the effect of the new troops, the new plan, the new leader—why on Earth would we at this time order a withdrawal of those troops to begin within 120 days regardless?

Why, in the face of these encouraging developments, would this Chamber demand that the essence of the plan that has brought about these encouraging developments should end? Why, just several weeks after confirming GEN David Petraeus to lead our effort in Iraq, would this Chamber block him from carrying out the strategy he

shaped, is now implementing, and appears to be working?

In my opinion, the deadline for withdrawal from Iraq that is in this bill now is a deadline for defeat, where victory and success are still possible. There are no guarantees, of course, in war. That is why we adjust our judgments according to what is happening on the ground. So there are no guarantees that the encouraging first results of the implementation of the Petraeus plan will continue and go to full success—no guarantees.

But I can tell you this: If we adopt an arbitrary order to begin to withdraw our troops, regardless of what is happening on the ground in Iraq in the war, it will guarantee failure. That failure will have profound consequences for Iraq, which I believe will break up into not just full-fledged civil war but the kind of ethnic slaughter that drew us a decade ago into Bosnia to stop. And we will have withdrawn and be expected to stand by and let it happen.

Of course, ultimately it will lead to what will be claimed as a victory for the forces of Islamic extremism, our enemies in this war we are fighting. It will, in my opinion, ultimately embolden them to strike us here at home again.

So I appeal to my colleagues, as this debate on this amendment to strike begins, let's have a good debate. That is our nature. That is the essence of our democracy and of this Senate in which we are privileged to serve. But I ask my colleagues, in the end, to step back and think carefully about what this section 1315 would bring about, and instead of undermining General Petraeus, or at best sending a mixed message to him and his troops, let's give him and his troops the unified support and time they need to succeed for us.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

I withdraw the suggestion of an absence of a quorum, seeing my friend and colleague from Oklahoma now on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, the Senate is going to take up, tomorrow, in rather full detail, an emergency supplemental spending bill. I think it is real important, first, for the American people to know what an emergency supplemental bill is supposed to be. It is supposed to be about funding unforeseen problems we could not have anticipated in the regular appropriations process. For a very small amount of this bill, that may be true.

This bill is \$121 billion of your grandchildren's and great-grandchildren's money. This bill does not have to stay within the budgetary limitations Congress sets on itself. This bill goes outside every rule we have in terms of controlling the budget, living within our means, and it says: Here is a credit card.

Now, by the way, on the way to funding the war in Iraq, the wisdom of the Senate has added—and it is \$21 billion in the House—about \$18.9 billion in a wish list. It is a Christmas tree. If each of us in our own personal lives ran our businesses or our households the way Congress is running the emergency supplemental process, we would do it for about 1 year. Then we would be going to bankruptcy court, and we would be losing the vast majority of our possessions because we would not have been deemed to be responsible with the assets we had.

There lies the problem. It is the culture of Congress that thinks we can put a hood over the American people's eyes so they will not know what we are about to do in the next 4 or 5 days in this Chamber. You are going to hear all the reasons in the world why somebody needs something, except it is never going to be held in contrast to the loss of the standard of living of our grandchildren. Yes, there are agricultural needs out there we should have funded a year ago.

The chairman of the Budget Committee said when he would get in power, when the Democrats would get in power, they were going to pay for it—except here we have an emergency agriculture supplemental bill, a good portion of which is needed but it is not paid for. There is no offset anywhere else in the hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of waste in the discretionary side of the budget alone, to reduce something else so we can take care of those who need us now.

There is another aspect to this funding bill; that is, the politics that plays into it over the debate on the Iraq war. What we are seeing play out is a double-edged sword of how do we hurt the troops in the field by adding things to a supplemental bill to take care of them, when there has already been a threatened veto over the bill because it adds \$18.9 billion more than what the President asked for to fund the war.

So as you listen, in the next 4 or 5 days, to the Senate debate this bill, there are a couple things you ought to pay attention to, and you ought to ask yourself the question: Where is the money coming from to pay for this bill? Where is the sacrifice from the generations today to do what the Members of this body want to do?

There is no sacrifice. We are not calling on anybody to sacrifice. What we are saying is: Those unborn, those young, those who are about to be born, and the children of those who are young, unborn or about to be born are the ones who are going to pay for it.

It portends a great moral question of our society today: How is it we can totally turn upside down the heritage of this country, the heritage of a country that has been built on the following premise: "I am going to work hard. I am going to sacrifice. And I am going to serve so that my children and grandchildren get ahead"? Have we become such a selfish country that we do not care about the next two generations?

I think the Senate has spoken, at least the appropriators have spoken. They have said "yes," it is OK to do things such as pay for the conventions, in August, of the Democratic and Republican Parties for the additional funds that will be needed for police enforcement with an emergency bill. Our grandchildren are not going to benefit from that. The political process today is. But we put it in this bill because it means if we put it in this bill, it will not be charged against the regular budget process. It is another way to spend more money. So let's move more things into the emergency category, so we do not have to be responsible when the rest of the appropriations bills come through the Senate.

Think about this: You have a grandchild sitting on your knee and you say: Yes, back in 2007, they had a party in Minneapolis and in Denver, and they charged it to you. You may get to go to college, you may not, but I just want you to know we had a good time at our conventions. How about \$100 million for businesses that have under \$15 million in revenue a year that have suffered some loss from a drought over the last 2 or 3 years. We already have several organizations within the Federal Government: Farm Service Agency, loan capabilities from the Department of Agriculture, the Small Business Administration. All are qualified to loan money to businesses that work in the agricultural area but, no, we set aside. We expanded the farm program with this bill to give \$100 million to small businesses that have been hurt. If you are not connected to agriculture and you have been hurt, where is the bill to help you? Where does the precedent stop in terms of your small business?

What about the fact that gas prices rose and some auto dealers went out of business? Where is the \$100 million for them? What about the fact that energy prices have gone up and small business profits all across the country have been severely damaged because if they are energy dependent, their costs have risen significantly? Where is the \$100 million? Where does it stop? Where does it stop that we steal—when do we stop stealing from our grandchildren?

There is also in this emergency provision \$3.5 million for tours of the Capitol. An emergency, that we have to have the money now, otherwise we won't have tours in the Capitol? That isn't right, but that is what is in the bill: \$3.5 million. Why? So we can have \$3.5 million more to play with when we get inside the budget now that we are outside the budget.

Oh, and I forgot to mention the fact the administration isn't innocent in this either, because the war in Iraq is hardly an emergency. As a matter of fact, it is in its fourth year. The administration should know what they need. Rather than send a supplemental up here, it should be in the Defense appropriations bill. It should have been in the bill we passed this last year. But instead, even the administration is complicit.

Who is going to stand and speak for the future against the processes the Congress uses today to fund and grow the Government, not worrying about how we pay for it in the future? Will you? Will you challenge this process? Will you say enough is enough? Will you do your part as a citizen of this country to make a difference, to hold people accountable here, rather than let the continued culture—and I call it a culture which actually the majority party ran on. It is a culture of corruption. When you do for you and steal from those who are weak and have no access or ability to pay it, that is corruption. It is morally corrupt. It is a process by which we undermine the very foundation upon which our country has become strong. If we continue it, what we will see is a weakened nation.

We now have \$70 trillion of unfunded liabilities for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Think about that for a minute. Go figure out how many zeroes are associated with \$1 trillion. If you had everyone who was worth more than \$1 billion in the world sell all of their assets tomorrow and give every bit of that to the U.S. Government, it wouldn't even pay the interest for 1 year. How is it we can be going down this road? How is it we can be turning our backs on the principles that made us great as a nation—the idea of personal responsibility even applied to Senators, and accountability, and transparency. We are going to hear a lot of stories about what is and isn't happening with this bill over the next 3 or 4 days, but the question I hope the American people will ask themselves is where is the money coming from? Where is the money coming from? If it is not in a pot somewhere and if it is not saved, somebody is going to have to pay for it.

This money is coming from the big Visa card of the Federal Government. We are going to “cha-ching” and we are going to say: Grandchildren, you have to pay for this war in Iraq, plus another \$19 billion, because we don't have the courage to hold this Government accountable. We don't even have the courage to hold ourselves accountable. We don't have the courage to eliminate the duplication, the fraud, and the waste that accounts for over \$200 billion every year in this \$3 trillion budget. There is no courage here to face that. We can do oversight hearings, and we have done so. Senator CARPER and myself did 46, more than any other committee of Congress, over the last 2 years. What we found was almost \$200 billion of either duplicative programs, wasteful programs, or outright fraud. Yet where is the Congress offsetting those with this bill? No. It is too hard work. You might offend somebody. The next election is more important than the next generation. Being here is more important than doing what is the best thing for our Nation.

So I hope as we approach this bill, the American public will ask that ques-

tion about where the sacrifice comes from to do this. Where does the sacrifice come from? Unfortunately, it is going to come from the next 2 generations. It is hard to identify what that means, but with \$9 trillion of actual outstanding debt we have now and the \$70 trillion of unfunded liability, it doesn't take a great imagination to understand how that might impact our children and grandchildren, with high interest rates, lack of ability to afford a college education, inability to own a home, buy a new car. All of those things are coming as we continue to steal the future from our children and our grandchildren. The big government credit card. It is only available because there is a lack of backbone and spine in the Congress to do what is necessary to give the American people true value from their Government. It is hard. A lot of people get upset. But I would much rather stand here and try to change it now than try to explain to my grandchildren why we didn't change it, why we didn't do that.

I have some hope the American people are starting to wake up to the budgetary gimmicks and processes the Congress uses. When they really awaken, what they are going to do is change who runs this place. It is going to be real citizen legislators. It is going to be people who care about the future more than they care about today. It is going to be people who care about a heritage that continues to be and create and hold forth the greatest experiment in freedom that has ever been. Without that change, as Will Durant said:

Great societies are never conquered from without until they rot from within.

This is part of the rotting process we are going to see over the next 5 days in the Senate. If people summon courage, summon long-term viewpoint, summon sacrifice of giving up of themselves, whether it be position or power so we can create something better, the country will be all the better for that. If we don't, there won't be a headline that says: “Grandchildren hurt by supplemental bill,” but it doesn't mean they won't be. The fact is they will.

It is interesting the accounting that Washington uses. Last year the official number on the deficit was \$175 billion, but the real number, the amount the debt went up, was \$360 billion. If you are at home and you have a checkbook and you spend \$175 more than you had in the checkbook, but at the end of the year you charged another \$200 on top of it, you really spent it all, and you went into debt for that whole amount. But we don't do what national accounting standards say. We play a game. We take the Social Security money and we lessen the effect of what we are doing through Social Security and 30 some other trust funds such as the inland waterway trust fund and several others, and the retirement of the employees of the Federal Government that is not funded, and we add all that back and we make it look better than it is.

The idea behind a half lie is a whole truth, but it is not. A half truth is a whole lie.

So my hope is when we have this debate on this bill, this \$121 billion bill, America will say: Wait a minute. Why aren't you paying for it? Why aren't you trimming some of the fat? Why aren't you trimming some of the problems? Why aren't you doing that? Because it is hard. That is not a good enough reason to undermine the future of this country.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to come and speak this evening and the staff staying here.

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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that morning business be closed.

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

U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendments, and that no points of order be considered waived by virtue of this agreement; further, that the pending Cochran amendment remain in order, notwithstanding this agreement.

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

The amendment (No. 641) was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close the debate on Calendar No. 84, H.R. 1591, the emergency supplemental 2007 appropriations bill.

Harry Reid, Robert C. Byrd, Jack Reed, Patrick Leahy, B.A. Mikulski, Byron L. Dorgan, Christopher J. Dodd, Dianne Feinstein, Richard J. Durbin, Chuck Schumer, Debbie Stabenow, Barbara Boxer, Herb Kohl, Jay Rockefeller, Joe Biden, E. Benjamin Nelson, Daniel K. Akaka, Ted Kennedy.