

Al-Qaida and its allies flourish and multiply in the chaos of failed States with no rule of law or respect for human rights. Instead of debating a cut-and-run strategy in Iraq that has already failed on the floor of this Senate four times, we should be focusing on how to provide the defenders of our freedom—our commanders and our troops—with the necessary tools to complete their mission.

Last week, I had the opportunity to meet with the new commanding general of the 101st Airborne at Fort Campbell, KY. Located on the southern border between Kentucky and Tennessee, the Fort Campbell community has felt the effects of deployments and casualties.

Right around 200 soldiers from Fort Campbell have given their lives for their country. Thousands of good men and women have spent tours of 15 months away from their families—some four, some three, others two, and some one: tours of 15 or 12 months from the 101st Airborne in Iraq.

Speaking with the commanding general only reinforced my belief that we have some of the finest patriots serving in our Nation's military. The brave men and women who answer the call to defend our Nation, and the families and communities who support them, are our most valuable national asset. I do not want to see their unbelievable efforts in Iraq fail. We as a nation have invested too much to hand a big victory to al-Qaida in Iraq.

This political show needs to end.

In April, General Petraeus will report back to Congress on the state of our mission in Iraq. As Senators who voted in support of his confirmation, we owe him this opportunity to present his report to us, instead of cutting him off at the knees right before his report. We should show him the respect of listening to his report. We owe an honorable man, who has spent—I want you to remember this—who has spent most of the last 5 years away from his family in Iraq to see that freedom in America is preserved.

I urge my colleagues to join me in giving General Petraeus this opportunity and opposing these bills.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

IRAQ WAR

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first of all, I welcome this opportunity to talk about the current status of the involvement of the United States in Iraq. I am glad we are having this discussion. I start by thanking the troops for their incredible service to our country and the incredible work they are doing, and I think this Congress, by words and deeds, has shown its support for our troops. The budget we provided last year provides the resources to take care of our veterans and the funds to take care of our active military. That is what we should be doing.

But we have now been in Iraq for many years. Several years ago I was in Iraq. I had a chance to visit our troops and take a look at what was happening on the ground. I saw then that we didn't have the right equipment there; that the administration had sent our troops without having the right support. I was proud of the action the Congress took in providing the military support and the type of equipment our troops needed.

But the discussion of what is best for our troops is whether we have the right mission in Iraq. This campaign is now entering its sixth year. We have been in Iraq longer than we were in World War II. We have now spent a half trillion dollars directly on our war in Iraq. Almost 4,000 Americans have been killed, almost 30,000 have been wounded, 67 Marylanders have given their lives, and over 800 have been injured. Many of these injuries are life changing.

I have had a chance to visit Andrews Air Force Base as our wounded soldiers come home, and I have been able to see firsthand the type of injuries they sustained. They will have to deal with them for the rest of their lives.

When we look at the strength of al-Qaida, our experts tell us they are stronger today than they have ever been. So we haven't accomplished our mission as far as dealing with the threat against the United States.

Let's talk about the facts. The inescapable conclusion is that President Bush was wrong in sending our troops to Iraq in the first place. I am proud I voted against that authorization when I was in the other body. Our troops are involved in trying to referee a civil war. That is their primary focus. Yes, we are fighting terrorists, and we need to continue to do that, but the primary need for American troops is to deal with the civil unrest that is currently taking place in Iraq.

The costs, as I explained before, in lives has been our deepest loss, but also the dollars—a half trillion dollars. Think about what we could have done with that money. I think about schools in Baltimore that should be replaced. We could have replaced every school with the money that has been spent so our children could get a proper education. We could have dealt with the energy crisis in this country and built the transit systems we need and become energy independent so we are not dependent on foreign oil in the Middle East. We could have done something about the health care system in this country.

A year ago, Diamante Driver died in Prince George's County, MD, because he couldn't get dental care. We are suffering an economic downturn right now because we have large debt, in part, and that debt is accumulating because we are not only spending a half trillion dollars, we are not paying for it. We are borrowing the money. It is making it even more dangerous for our economy.

So I know there has been a lot of debate on this floor about whether the President's surge policy has worked. I must tell my colleagues, I think our soldiers are performing, as I said earlier, in a great manner. When you put American troops in a country, they are going to do their job and they are going to provide the type of help to that country and to its communities that American troops are trained to do. But the problem is the mission is wrong. The surge has not worked in accomplishing the U.S. mission that is in the best interests of this country.

I remember when the President said: We are going to have the surge because we are going to provide stability in the country so the Iraqi Government can take control and we can bring our troops home. That was the mission. That is what we are trying to accomplish, but we haven't accomplished that. Let's look at the facts. Look at the facts.

Violence in Iraq continues today. The majority leader mentioned the headlines in today's paper. Violence continues. It is a dangerous country. Suicide bombers operate at will. The troop levels were supposed to be reduced. In January of 2007 we had 130,000 American troops in Iraq. Today we have in excess of 140,000. There is now a pause in reducing our troop levels. We haven't been able to reduce the troop levels. On governance, on the Iraqi Government representing the people of Iraq, they set their own benchmarks. We didn't set them. Of 18 benchmarks, only 3 have been accomplished. So, no, we haven't accomplished the mission the President established for why we needed our troops in Iraq.

But let's take a look at our military and foreign policy experts. They tell us our military today is spread too thin, that we aren't looking after the best interests of America's military interests. Talk to our people who run our National Guard and Reserve units.

I had a chance to meet with members of the Maryland National Guard. They have, again, answered the call. People of the Maryland National Guard have been deployed regularly into Iraq and Afghanistan. But I am told today we don't have the equipment in our National Guard to continue the proper training missions because the equipment was left in Iraq. We haven't replaced that. Also, recruitment is going to be more difficult, and we need to deal with the reintegration of the National Guard people who are coming back to Maryland in our community, and that is going to take a real effort. Now they have to be prepared for redeployment.

We have lost our focus, according to our experts on the war against terror. We should have taken care of Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan. We haven't done that. Now Afghanistan looks as if it is moving in the wrong direction because we are not focusing on the threat, which is terrorism. Instead, we have our troops dealing with a civil

war in Iraq. There is no disagreement among the foreign policy experts that America has lost its leadership internationally and is galvanizing the international community to help us in the war against terror. We have lost that focus. So our mission is wrong.

The question, though, is where do we go from here. Well, if we want to follow President Bush's policy, we will have a permanent presence of American troops in Iraq. I think that is the wrong policy. I believe the people of Maryland and of this Nation believe it is the wrong policy. The President's policy is basically waiting out the burning out of the civil war. We know 4 million Iraqis are displaced, some in the country, some outside the country. That is not the right answer for the people of Iraq, and it is certainly not the right answer for U.S. policy.

So we have an alternative. Senator FEINGOLD has brought to us a bill which I believe warrants our support. It is the right mission for our troops and our Nation. Fighting terrorism, I am for that. That is what we should be doing. Protecting our troops, that is what we should be doing. Helping the Iraqis in the training of their own military, that is what we should be doing. It focuses our mission on what is in the best interests of the United States. We need a political solution, not a military solution, for the people of Iraq. The Feingold resolution acknowledges that.

We need to work with the international community. We work best when we work with the international community. The international community is wondering what we are doing in Iraq.

The Feingold bill does not place a time limit on the withdrawal of U.S. troops. It is an honorable and orderly process for us to complete a mission in Iraq. I believe it is in the best interests of the United States. I believe it is the right policy for our soldiers, and I believe it deserves the support of this body.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I thank Senator CARDIN for his excellent remarks and for his leadership on this issue. It has been very helpful during a very tough battle that we have to keep fighting.

We had an interesting debate yesterday on the two bills I have offered with the majority leader. I know some of my colleagues expressed concern that we were spending too much time on this issue. Well I, for one, am pleased we are able to discuss one of the most pressing problems facing this country. Maybe now that they have allowed us to have this debate, the Republicans will allow us to actually consider and vote on these bills.

While I appreciate the chance to have this debate, I would like to take this chance to respond to some of the statements that have been made on the

other side. I have actually been accused of "legislating defeat in Iraq" or other variations on that theme, and somehow trying to micromanage the job of the commanders. Actually, we have already accomplished our military mission in Iraq: Removing Saddam Hussein. I am interested in achieving victory in the global effort to combat al-Qaida. We have to make a choice. The Army Chief of Staff has been clear that "the numbers of forces we have committed in Iraq now increases our level of strategic risk."

So what does that mean? It means we must choose between letting the Iraqi people resolve their sectarian disputes on their own or, on the other hand, exhausting our troops in Iraq and losing ground in the global fight against al-Qaida.

Senator INHOFE said my bill demanding a strategy to defeat al-Qaida wasn't needed because we already have a plan to defeat al-Qaida. He failed to explain why, though. If we already have a strategy to defeat al-Qaida, why is it that al-Qaida has regenerated and reconstituted itself and is planning more attacks on our homeland? Admiral Mullen has been quite clear that under our current strategy, Afghanistan is a second priority where we only "do what we can"—do what we can. In other words, we are so bogged down in Iraq, we don't have the forces to respond to the situation on the ground in Afghanistan. If this is a strategy, it sure isn't working, which is why the majority leader and I want to require the administration to develop a plan that prioritizes the fight against al-Qaida and protecting ourselves at home over an endless war in Iraq.

Senators INHOFE and LIEBERMAN have claimed that we do already have political reconciliation in Iraq and that we have seen benchmark legislation in the Iraqi Parliament. Yes, a deBaathification law has passed, an amnesty law has passed, and the provincial powers election power law passed. Yes, we have seen movement in the Iraqi Parliament after waiting for more than 4 years. It is my great hope that the laws recently passed will bring the Sunnis fully into the political process. But as we well know, passing a law is one thing, but actually seeing it successfully implemented is another, particularly given the country's weak national government.

I think national reconciliation still looks far off. The passage of what the administration is calling "benchmark" laws does not ensure society-wide sectarian reconciliation. There are still significant concerns about how the local efforts we have supported to bring about declining violence will actually be integrated into the national framework. To illustrate this, the Sunni Awakening has taken tens of thousands of former insurgent Sunni militia fighters and provided them with U.S. funding in exchange for helping combat al-Qaida and Iraq. But to what extent we can rely on the long-term

loyalties of these fighters is a very open question. We do know, however, that this policy actually risks increasing distrust between the local Sunnis and the national government, which of course is led primarily by Shiites.

I would just like to ask, if Iraqis have agreed to political reconciliation, as Senator INHOFE suggested, well then doesn't that mean we have achieved the objectives of the surge and we can start bringing the troops home? When does the other side think we can bring the troops home? They never talk about that. Five years? Ten years? Twenty years? One hundred years? What kind of success is that?

After more than 4 years of waiting for the Iraqi Government to make progress, we have lost nearly 4,000 Americans, with no end in sight and no clear path for a reconciliation that incorporates all aspects and elements of Iraqi society.

Now, another argument we have heard is it has been suggested that Iraq would collapse or that genocide would occur if U.S. troops leave. Of course, that assumes our military presence there is actually helping the situation rather than simply postponing an inevitable day of reckoning. If we bring our troops out of this quagmire, Iraqis and their neighbors would have to confront the crisis head on. Now, I am not calling for the United States to abandon Iraq, but there is simply no way we can fix the mess we have made without a legitimate political settlement.

A U.S. redeployment would actually put new pressure on Iraqis and on countries in the region to engage productively and to make the decision as to whether a full-fledged civil war is really in the interests of Iraq or its neighboring countries. I suspect—I really do feel strongly about this, having looked at this issue for many years in both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Intelligence Committee—that if these countries were faced with that decision, they would actually try harder to reconcile their differences peacefully rather than further ignite tensions.

Some Members of this body seem to believe the war in Iraq is between U.S. troops on the one side and al-Qaida on the other. That is not what is going on. In fact, that is dangerous, wishful thinking. The recent patterns of violence in Iraq actually confirm what the intelligence community has said all along: that the war in Iraq is sectarian and intrasectarian and far from the oversimplified "us versus them" that proponents of an endless military engagement in Iraq continue to describe. Moreover, in mixed areas such as Mosul, violence is actually increasing. And in the south, the increased violence is among Shiites, and reduction in areas such as Anbar, which is almost entirely Sunni or in Baghdad, where sectarian cleansing has already occurred, do not represent a diminishment of the underlying tensions that could explode at any time.

Contrary to what we heard yesterday, Iraq simply is not the central

front on the war on terrorism. To the extent to which there is such a front in this very global conflict, it is clearly Pakistan and Afghanistan. No rational reading of press reports, independent studies or our own intelligence could possibly conclude otherwise. While the administration has focused on Iraq, al-Qaida has reconstituted itself along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. That sounds like a big mistake. That sounds like a real strategic error in an international battle against terrorism. Yet far too many people in the administration and my colleagues somehow believe Iraq is what it is all about. What a terrible strategic mistake.

Early this month, the DNI testified before Congress that the central leadership based in the border area of Pakistan is al-Qaida's most dangerous component. And a few months ago, the DNI again repeated the intelligence community's assessment that over the last 2 years "Al Qaeda's central leadership has been able to regenerate the core operational capabilities needed to conduct attacks in the Homeland"—in the homeland, our homeland, our country, the United States of America.

The DNI also testified that al-Qaida "is improving the last key aspect of its ability to attack the U.S.: The identification, training, and positioning of operatives for an attack in the Homeland"—in this country.

Meanwhile, the Federally Administered Tribal Areas—or FATA region—in Pakistan is serving as a staging ground for al-Qaida in support of the Taliban and providing it with a base similar to the one it used to have across the border in Afghanistan.

Over the past year, as we all know, we have seen an unprecedented rise of suicide bombings in Pakistan. The Taliban is gaining ground in Afghanistan, and while we may be sending an additional 3,200 marines to Afghanistan in the near future, we have been fighting for far too long there with too few soldiers and too few reconstruction funds. The price of that neglect is a dramatic resurgence of militants that must be urgently addressed.

Yesterday, a Washington Post article noted that:

More foreign soldiers and Afghan civilians died in Taliban-related fighting last year than in any year since U.S. and coalition forces ousted the extremist Islamic militia, which ruled most of the country, in 2001. Military officials expect the coming year to be just as deadly, if not more so, as the Taliban becomes more adept militarily and more formidable in its deployment of suicide bombers and roadside explosives.

With the Joint Chiefs saying: "In Iraq we do what we must and in Afghanistan we do what we can," it is no wonder Afghanistan is teetering on the edge. It has been neglected, shoved to the back burner so the President can pursue an open-ended war in Iraq.

I remind my colleagues it was from Afghanistan, not Iraq, that the 9/11 attacks were planned, and it was under the Taliban regime, which is once again gaining ground, that al-Qaida

was able to flourish so freely. This is the actual position, this is the actual situation in terms of this global fight against those who attacked us on 9/11. It is not all about Iraq.

Al-Qaida affiliates from Africa to Southeast Asia pose a significant terrorist threat. While we have been so myopically fixated on Iraq, the threat from an al-Qaida affiliate in North Africa has grown and now, according again to the testimony of the Director of National Intelligence, "represents a significant threat to the United States and European interests in the region."

Since its merger with al-Qaida in September 2006, it has expanded its targets to include the United States, United Nations, and other interests, and it likely got a further boost when al-Qaida leadership announced last November that the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group united with al-Qaida under AQIM's leadership. Its possible reach covers Tunisia, Morocco, Nigeria, Mauritania, Libya, and other countries. Meanwhile, it is using deadly tactics that suggest it is acquiring knowledge and help from the war in Iraq, basically a training ground for those who get exported to attack us.

Al-Qaida has affiliates around the world—in Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Lebanon, where al-Qaida poses a "growing threat," the Horn of Africa, and Southeast Asia. And a few weeks ago, there were more arrests in Europe. None, not one of these developments has been prevented by the war in Iraq.

We cannot ignore the rest of the world to focus solely on Iraq. Al-Qaida is and will continue to be a global terrorist organization with dangerous affiliates around the world. The administration claims al-Qaida in Iraq may be on the run, but al-Qaida has not abandoned its efforts to fight us globally. In fact, we are watching al-Qaida strengthen and develop its affiliates around the world, while we remain bogged down in Iraq. How foolish can we be to allow them to reconstitute all over the world as they watch us unable to extricate ourselves from a mistake which was, of course, going into Iraq the way we did.

We need a robust military presence and effective reconstruction program in Afghanistan. We need to build strong partnerships where al-Qaida and its affiliates are operating—across North Africa, in Southeast Asia, and along the borders of Pakistan and Afghanistan, and we need to address the root causes of the terrorist threat, not just rely on military power to get the job done.

I would like to turn now briefly to the impact of the Iraq war on our military and National Guard. There is nobody in the Senate who cares more about this than the Presiding Officer. I will start by repeating what GEN George Casey, the Chief of Staff of the Army, said yesterday in congressional testimony:

The cumulative effects of the last six-plus years at war have left our Army out of bal-

ance, consumed by the current fight and unable to do the things we know we need to do to properly sustain our all-volunteer force and restore our flexibility for an uncertain future.

Many U.S. troops currently in Iraq, as we all know, are now in their third or fourth tours of duty. Approximately 95 percent of the Army National Guard's combat battalions and special operations units have been mobilized since 9/11.

Mr. President, 1.4 million Americans have served in Iraq and over 420,000 have served multiple tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. As I said before, nearly 4,000 of our men and women have been killed in Iraq, and over 27,000 have been wounded.

The Army cannot maintain its current pace of operations in Iraq without seriously damaging the military. Young officers are leaving the service at an alarming rate.

Readiness levels for the Army are at lows not seen since the Vietnam war. Every active Army brigade currently not deployed is unprepared to perform its wartime mission.

More than two-thirds of Active Duty Army brigades are unready for missions because of manpower and equipment shortages, most of which, of course, can be attributed to Iraq.

There are insufficient Reserves to respond to additional conflicts or crises around the world.

This failure to prioritize correctly has left vital missions unattended. Natural disaster response, U.S. border security, and international efforts to combat al-Qaida are all suffering due to the strain on military forces caused by poor strategy and failed leadership in Iraq.

In addition, thousands of our troops have, as we well know, returned home with invisible wounds, such as PTSD and TBI, traumatic brain injury, which will have a long-term impact on veterans and their families. These invisible wounds are not counted in the casualty numbers, but we will be struggling with them for generations.

I haven't even touched on the massive debt we are running up to pay for this war. We are spending approximately \$10 billion a month in Iraq. Congress has appropriated over \$525 billion for this war, and the debt keeps mounting.

We heard eloquent floor statements yesterday on this side about how these costs are affecting our ability to address other priorities. I will not repeat all of what was said, but I do want to note that the war in Iraq keeps us from adequately addressing critical gaps in our homeland security and law enforcement. While we had 92,000 more troops to the Army and Marine Corps, the city of New York has 5,000 fewer police officers on the beat than it did on September 11, 2001.

This year, we will spend a fifth of our \$740 billion "national security budget" on Iraq, twice what the Federal Government spends defending our Nation.

Meanwhile, the administration wants to cut grants for first responders, and the Coast Guard is struggling with an inadequate force size.

It doesn't make sense. It simply doesn't make sense. The American people know that, which is why they voted the way they did last November. More than 60 percent of Americans are in favor of a phased withdrawal. They don't want to pass this problem off to the next President and another Congress, and they sure don't want another American servicemember to die or lose a limb while elected representatives put their own political comfort over the wishes of their constituents.

Polls continue to show voters strongly oppose the war in Iraq, and that is one of the top issues on which they will be voting. A recent Washington Post/ABC poll found that 65 percent of Americans disapprove of the situation in Iraq and 56 percent disapprove strongly. The same poll also found this is the second most important issue to voters in November, behind the economy and jobs. And a recent Gallup poll showed a majority of Americans, 56 percent, do not believe the surge is working and want a timetable to get out of Iraq. Those Americans need to be heard, and that is what we are trying to do with this important debate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROVIDING FOR THE SAFE REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS FROM IRAQ—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 2633, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to consider S. 2633, a bill to provide for the safe redeployment of United States troops from Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today we are here to address the issue of the Iraq war, and many are saying: Well, why should we address the Iraq war again? Because, obviously, it is still going on; there is still no direction in terms of political progress; the Shiites, the Sunnis, and the Kurds still have their age-old enmities; the goals of the

Iraqi Government set by this Government for them have not been met; but most of all, I think we are here to debate this issue, at least in my judgment, because we are at a turning point in terms of the debate in Iraq. That turning point—the case against this war—has been building for a long time. As we debate this bill on Iraq, we are at a turning point in the argument against the war. We have always been aware of the cost in life, both American and Iraqi, and we have known how severe that cost is. Despite the good works of our troops, we are continually troubled by the tragic loss of life. The American people are baffled by the lack of political progress and, most of all, the American people are beginning to comprehend the eye-popping figures of what this war is costing our budget and our economy. It is becoming clear to all Americans—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—that by continuing to spend huge amounts on Iraq, we are prevented from spending on desired goals and needs here at home.

So the turning point is this: The lack of progress, particularly on the political front, continues; the tragic loss of life continues; but the cost of the war and the inability to use those funds to help us here at home, the cost of the war and the inability to use those funds to properly go after the most dangerous nexus of terror, which is a thousand miles to the east—Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iran—is now becoming a clinching argument that we must quickly and soon change the course, the direction, of this war in Iraq.

I went to Iraq over New Year's. I spent time with our soldiers. They are wonderful. They are awe-inspiring. The troops are awe-inspiring, from the private I met from Queens, just out of high school, who had enlisted 8 months previously and was in Iraq 3 weeks, to the majors and captains who had served 10 years in the Army or the Marines and had made the military their life's work—they see a greater good than just themselves, and it is wonderful—all the way to the generals. I spent time with General Petraeus at a New Year's Eve dinner. I spent time with General Odierno. They are fine, intelligent, good people.

When I went to Iraq, I assured our soldiers, from the private to the generals, that one good thing that would come out of this war is the esteem that we hold for both the military and our soldiers would be greater when the war finished than when it started—a far different cry than the Vietnam War, which is one of the most disgraceful times in America, when our soldiers were too often vilified for simply serving our country.

But after I left Iraq, I came to this conclusion, Mr. President, and that is that even if we were to follow General Petraeus's game plan—which, of course, involves not just military success in security but winning over the hearts and minds of the people—it

would take a minimum of 5 years and have about a 50 percent chance of success of bringing stability—not democracy but at least stability—to large portions of Iraq. That is not the military's fault, and that is not America's fault. That is because of the age-old enmities within Iraq—the Sunnis, the Shiites, and the Kurds, and then within the groups themselves. It would be very hard to create permanent stability without a permanent and large structure of troops.

Now, I ask you, stability in Iraq—a worthy goal, but is it on your top-five list for America? Is it on any American's top-five list? A few, maybe, not the vast majority. We have many other higher goals that cost the same dollars and need the same attention and energy that is now diverted to Iraq. Our education system is declining, our health care system doesn't cover people, and we are paying \$3.30 for gas because we don't have an energy policy. And even if your goals are just foreign policy, shouldn't we be taking the time and effort that is all now focused on Iraq, as well as the dollars, and spending more focus on the dangerous triangle composed of Pakistan, Iran, and Afghanistan? Of course. We must ask ourselves: Is it worth spending trillions of dollars needed elsewhere on such an uncertain and unpredictable outcome?

So the debate is changing. The costs of Iraq, the simple costs alone, are weighing too heavily on the American people, the American Government, and on our national purpose. While admirable as a goal, it is hardly the most important goal we have in this changing and dangerous and exciting world in which we live. The cost of the war has become the \$800 billion gorilla in the room. The backbreaking cost of this war to the American families, the Federal budget, and the entire economy is becoming one of the first things, after loss of life, people think about.

A report issued by the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, estimated that the total costs of the war will double what the administration has spent directly on the war alone—\$1.3 trillion through 2008. And that is a conservative estimate. According to budget figures on Iraq spending for 2000, the Bush administration wants to spend \$430 million a day on Iraq. For 1 day of the war in Iraq, we could enroll an additional 58,000 children in Head Start per year, we could put an additional 88,900 police officers on our streets per year, we could hire another 10,000 Border Patrol agents per year, we could make college more affordable for 163,000 students per year, and we could help nearly 260,000 American families keep their homes per year. In the fiscal year of 2008, we put \$159 billion into Iraq. That doubles our entire domestic transportation spending to fix roads and bridges, and it dwarfs all the funds we provide to the National Institutes of Health to discover cures for diseases such as cancer and diabetes. Iraq