

administration must finally adopt a realistic, clear, and comprehensive strategy.

This Democratic amendment lays out many of the principles that should guide that strategy, including using all of our diplomatic, military, political and economic leverage to defeat the insurgency, getting greater international support for the reconstruction effort, strengthening the capacity of Iraq's governing ministries, and training Iraqi security forces. And it requires the administration to regularly report back to Congress and the American public on the status of implementing the measures necessary to complete the mission.

As we know from painful experience, no President can sustain a war without the support of the American people. In the case of Iraq, their patience is frayed nearly to the breaking point because Americans who care deeply about their country will not tolerate our troops giving their lives without a clear strategy, and will not tolerate vague platitudes when real answers are needed.

The Democratic amendment addresses that by calling on the administration to give Congress and the American public a target schedule for achieving the conditions that will allow for the phased redeployment of U.S. troops, the status of efforts meet that schedule, and the estimated dates for such redeployment.

Let's be very clear on this point: the Democratic amendment does not call for setting any arbitrary deadlines for withdrawal of U.S. troops. It envisions redeployment of U.S. forces as conditions allow. But it rejects the administration's hollow, vague declaration to just "stay as long as it takes" by calling on the administration to give target dates and regular updates on reaching those conditions.

For far too long, Congress and the American public have been left in the dark when it comes to Iraq. We have repeatedly been asked by the administration to take their word that they have a strategy for success, without being given any sense of what that is or when our troops will be home. It is past time for Congress and the American people to be fully informed about what our strategy is, the progress that is being made in implementing it, and when we might expect to see our troops redeployed. That is what the Levin amendment will do.

While the Democratic amendment and the Republican amendment offered by Senators WARNER and FRIST are a wakeup call to the Bush administration that there is an overwhelming bipartisan majority with deep concerns about the administration's aimless course in Iraq, I will not support the Warner-Frist amendment because it stripped out two of the key provisions of the Democratic amendment. The first is the sense of the Senate that America should let the Iraqi people know that we will not stay in Iraq in-

definitely, which will send an important message about our intentions while reducing the sense of U.S. occupation. The second is the requirement that the administration provide a report to Congress that includes estimated dates for the redeployment of U.S. troops as specific conditions are met, which is necessary to keep Congress and the American public informed about our progress towards the ultimate goal of finishing our mission and getting our troops home. These provisions are an essential part of a real strategy for success in Iraq. We owe our troops and the country nothing less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill, as amended.

Mr. WARNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 326 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Akaka	Domenici	McCain
Allard	Dorgan	McConnell
Allen	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Ensign	Murkowski
Bayh	Enzi	Murray
Bennett	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Frist	Obama
Bond	Graham	Pryor
Boxer	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Gregg	Reid
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burns	Harkin	Rockefeller
Burr	Hatch	Salazar
Byrd	Hutchison	Santorum
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Carper	Inouye	Schumer
Chafee	Isakson	Sessions
Chambliss	Jeffords	Shelby
Clinton	Johnson	Smith
Coburn	Kennedy	Snowe
Cochran	Kerry	Specter
Coleman	Kohl	Stabenow
Collins	Kyl	Stevens
Conrad	Landrieu	Sununu
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Talent
Craig	Leahy	Thomas
Crapo	Levin	Thune
Dayton	Lieberman	Vitter
DeMint	Lincoln	Voinovich
DeWine	Lott	Warner
Dodd	Lugar	Wyden
Dole	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—2

Alexander

Corzine

The bill (S. 1042), as amended, was passed.

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1042, as amended, be printed as passed.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I now ask further unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration en bloc of S. 1043 through S. 1045, Calendar Orders Nos. 103, 104, and 105; that all after the enacting clause of those bills be stricken, and the appropriate portions of S. 1042, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof according to the schedule which I am sending to the desk; that these bills be advanced to third reading and passed; that the motions to reconsider en bloc be laid upon the table; and that the above actions occur without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The bill (S. 1043) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as amended.

(The text of the bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The bill (S. 1044) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military construction, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as amended.

(The text of the bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

The bill (S. 1045) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as amended.

(The text of the bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, with respect to H.R. 1815, the House-passed version of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from any further consideration of the bill; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1042, as amended, be substituted in lieu thereof, and that the bill be advanced to third reading and passed; that the Senate insist on its amendment to the bill and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees; that the motion to reconsider the above-mentioned votes be laid upon the table; and that the foregoing occur without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1815), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent with respect to S. 1042, S. 1043, S. 1044, and S. 1045, as just passed by the Senate, that if the Senate receives a message with respect to any of these bills from the House of Representatives, the Senate disagree with the House on its amendment or amendments to the Senate-passed bill and agree to or request a conference as appropriate with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees, and that the foregoing occur without intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. WARNER. Now, Mr. President, the Chair was about to announce the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. WARNER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. BAYH, and Mrs. CLINTON as conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, time is short. We are about to go to our respective caucuses, but I say to my colleagues that I wish to express my profound appreciation first and foremost to my distinguished friend and colleague of 27 years; we have been together in this Chamber, working toward the passage of authorization bills in each and every one of those 27 years. I thank my friend.

I thank the distinguished members of our staff, and I do use the word "distinguished": Charlie Abell, who left the

Department of Defense at our request to come over to be our chief of staff, replacing a very fine person, Judy Ansley, who went on up to the National Security Council, and our Democratic staff director, Rick DeBobes, who has been with us many years. Together they have led a dedicated professional staff, all of whom deserve credit and recognition in helping Members reach agreements and to prepare all types of information needed by the Members, and I may say to give good, sound advice. I have always encouraged that of our staff. They are not just to be there to be "yessayers" or naysayers. They are to give us their best advice, and that they do.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the names of both the majority and minority staff be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES STAFF

Charles S. Abell, Staff Director; Richard D. DeBobes, Democratic Staff Director; June M. Borawski, Printing and Documents Clerk; Leah C. Brewer, Nominations and Hearings Clerk; William M. Caniano, Professional Staff Member; Jonathan D. Clark, Minority Counsel; Fletcher L. Cork, Receptionist; Christine E. Cowart, Administrative Assistant to the Minority; Daniel J. Cox, Jr., Professional Staff Member; Madelyn R. Creedon, Minority Counsel; Marie Fabrizio Dickinson, Chief Clerk; Regina A. Dubey, Professional Staff Member; Gabriella Eisen, Research Assistant; Evelyn N. Farkas, Professional Staff Member; Richard W. Fieldhouse, Professional Staff Member; Creighton Greene, Professional Staff Member; William C. Greenwalt, Professional Staff Member; Micah H. Harris, Staff Assistant; Bridget W. Higgins, Research Assistant; Ambrose R. Hock, Professional Staff Member; Gary J. Howard, Systems Administrator; Gregory T. Kiley, Professional Staff Member; Jessica L. Kingston, Staff Assistant; Michael J. Kuiken, Professional Staff Member.

Gerald J. Leeling, Minority Counsel; Peter K. Levine, Minority Counsel; Sandra E. Luff, Professional Staff Member; Thomas L. MacKenzie, Professional Staff Member; Derek J. Maurer, Professional Staff Member; Michael J. McCord, Professional Staff Member; Elaine A. McCusker, Professional Staff Member; William G. P. Monahan, Minority Counsel; David M. Morriss, Counsel; Lucian L. Niemeyer, Professional Staff Member; Stanley R. O'Connor, Jr., Professional Staff Member; Cindy Pearson, Assistant Chief Clerk and Security Manager; Paula J. Philbin, Professional Staff Member; Benjamin L. Rubin, Staff Assistant; Lynn F. Rusten, Professional Staff Member; Catherine E. Sendak, Special Assistant; Arun A. Seraphin, Professional Staff Member; Jill L. Simodejka, Staff Assistant; Robert M. Soofer, Professional Staff Member; Scott W. Stucky, General Counsel; Kristine L. Svinicki, Professional Staff Member; Diana G. Tabler, Professional Staff Member; Richard F. Walsh, Counsel; Pendred K. Wilson, Staff Assistant.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, as we stand in this great Chamber, I marvel at the work conducted by the Armed Services Committee since the beginning of the 109th Congress. The committee has conducted 46 hearings and received numerous policy and operational briefings on the President's

budget request for 2006 and related defense issues. Since the committee reported out this important legislation on May 12, the Senate has debated many important provisions contained in this legislation. Along the way, there have been many contentious issues to resolve, such as detainee policy, missile defense, BRAC, and many others.

After a total of 12 days of debate on the Senate floor, we have now resolved them. I am proud we have achieved our goal of passing this important bill. This marks the 46th year the Senate has passed a national defense authorization bill. I thank particularly my ranking member and my colleagues for their support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, we would not be at this point in our deliberations, we could not have arrived at this point on the road without our chairman, Senator John Warner, who is not only a person who is eminently fair—he is invariably that, fair—he is unflappable. Despite his passion for the men and women of the military, he is unflappable when it comes to getting things done in a very calm, deliberative, and bipartisan manner. I am proud to serve in this Senate for many reasons but not the least of them is being able to be a friend and colleague of John Warner of Virginia, truly a gentleman.

Our staff, as he has pointed out, has made it possible for us to be here as well. We function on a bipartisan basis. We obviously have disagreements at times. We are always able to work those out in an agreeable way or disagree in an agreeable way. We have been able to bring the bill to the floor again with the help of our bipartisan staff. We are glad Charlie Abell is back on our side of the Potomac again where he belongs. Dick DeBobes, as the chairman pointed out, leads our minority staff with distinction. I probably should not single out any other member of our staff, but I want to mention Peter Levine because of the unusual circumstance we found ourselves in where his particular expertise made it possible for us to resolve this issue relative to detainees. It is most needed and appreciated by all of us.

I think I can speak for both Senator WARNER and myself when I say that our staffs not only work together, as Senator WARNER has indicated, but make it possible for us to reach the point where we are.

I wanted to add my thanks, and now on to conference, which is always fun. We have had more bumps on the road this year than I can remember in any prior year for an authorization bill. We were on the floor, off the floor, on the floor, off the floor for various reasons which we don't need to recount. Hopefully, the road ahead of us will be smoother and we can come out of conference, I guess now would be early in the next year.