democracy forward on the path to freedom. I believe they will succeed as long as we do not break faith with them.

It was a week ago the Iraqis formally asked the United Nations Security Council to maintain the U.S.-led coalition with these words:

> While great achievements have been gained by the people of Iraq in the realm of political development, the continuation of the mandate of the multinational force in Iraq remains necessary and essential for our security.

Far from the rhetoric that is being used by some today, the Iraqi people want us, and they need us to help them. If we don't, if we break our promise and cut and run, as some would have us do, the implications could be catastrophic. Not only would it be a dishonor to our Americans, a dishonor of historic proportions, the threat to America's national security would be potentially disastrous. If large parts of Iraq were to fall into the hands of terrorists, there would be no end to the threats we might face. Iraq could become a terrorist base for attacking us and undermining our allies. Many of Saddam Hussein's weapons scientists are still in Iraq, and the destruction of 9/11 would pale in comparison to the devastation terrorists could inflict with weapons of mass destruction produced in Iraq using their experience.

Leaving Iraq to the terrorists is simply not an option. Surrendering is not a solution. Zarqawi's elimination on June 7 was a profound victory. Coalition forces have captured or killed 161 of Zarqawi's leaders, key elements in the command and control of the terrorist network. Iraqi troops and the Iraqi people are working ever more diligently to defeat the terrorist enemy. In July of 2004, there were no operational Iraqi Army division or brigade headquarters. In just 2 years, 2 divisions, 14 brigades, and 57 battalions control their own area of responsibility. That is progress. Also, 28 authorized national police units are in the fight with 10 battalions in the lead. Over 254,000 trained and equipped Iraqi security forces are taking the battle to the enemy. These are just a few of the positive indicators. With our help, Iraq is making steady and impressive progress every day.

America has faced great challenges before. We rose up to defeat Naziism, one of the ugliest ideologies in modern history. It took terrible sacrifice and great pain, but we defeated the Nazi scourge. Through the Marshall plan, we rebuilt a continent of democratic and independent states. For the next four decades, we battled the Cold War against Communism, a long battle we ultimately won. In the great wars of the 20th century, our ideals carried us through even when victory seemed far from assured. Young American men and women who had never seen the world came to be its bravest defenders.

As we continue the war on terror, we cannot retreat, we cannot surrender, we cannot go wobbly. The price is far too high. The strength we show now is the security we earn for the future. As the President has explained, America's troops will stand down as the Iraqi troops stand up. They are gaining strength every day. By keeping a steady eye on the ultimate goal, by having flexibility and patience, I am confident we will succeed. No less than America's security depends on it.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAQI AMNESTY PLAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it goes without saying there are a number of issues upon which Senate Democrats and Senate Republicans will never agree. We have our differences about whether there is global warming, about the staggering deficits we have, lack of health care, economic policy generally. I understand and respect the differences we have on those issues. If there were ever an issue where we should be able to find common ground, it is supporting the troops we have around the world. I use the word ''should'' because of what is now happening in the Senate.

As I speak, there is an amendment pending before this body. It is an amendment that says the Iraqi Government should not proceed with their plan to grant amnesty to terrorists who kill American troops. It is a very simple amendment with a message the American people, I know, agree with. So why is it that Republicans who control this body have filibustered this amendment? It has been going on for days now. I really have trouble figuring that out. Their excuses don't make sense.

Their first excuse is that aides to the Prime Minister were misquoted, but we don't have any evidence of that. In fact, it is quite the contrary. The aide who first stated this stands by his story. They have asked him to step down, and he no longer has his position. But he was quoted, after having stepped down, as saying:

> The prime minister himself has said that he is ready to give amnesty to the so-called resistance, provided they have not been involved in killing Iraqis.

That was the end of the quote. Of course, what it doesn't say, according to everything that they have said, is that it is OK to kill Americans but not Iraqis. We now have news accounts—not confirmed by the Pentagon, at least to me—that Kristian Menchaca, 23 years old, member of the U.S. Army, and Thomas Tucker, age 25, U.S. Army, who were abducted, taken as prisoners of war, have been killed. Try telling their families that it is OK to give amnesty to the so-called resistance provided they have not been involved in killing Iraqis, only Americans. The families of Tucker and Menchaca would be very displeased.

Over the weekend we received even more evidence that the Iraqi Government favors amnesty for those who shed American blood. From Sunday's Los Angeles Times: The amnesty plan would apparently include insurgents alleged to have staged attacks against Americans.

They are saying amnesty. So it is clear that the situation regarding amnesty, the amendment pending before this body, is one where the Iraqis who serve in their Government are saying that it is OK if the insurgents kill Americans and not OK if they kill Iraqis. The only thing that is clear is the Senate needs to go on record and direct President Bush to tell the Iraqi Government that that plan is unacceptable. That is what the amendment does.

There are other excuses offered by the majority. Some have argued that if indeed this amnesty plan is real, we should just accept it as we did amnesty plans following World War II and Vietnam. Of course, we know that there were war trials in World War II. World War II went on for 3 years plus. This war has been going on for 3 years plus. World War II was fought all over the world, Southeast Asia, all over Europe, Africa, all of the islands between Hawaii and Japan. The war in Iraq has been fought in a relatively small area and has been going on almost as long as World War II. So I believe the argument that we should accept their amnesty plan doesn't set well with me or with the American people.

The majority of Americans killed in Iraq have not been killed in traditional acts of war. This war is different from others. They have been killed in acts of war, even though they have been so-called nontraditional acts of war. They were killed in acts of terror, which is part of this war. Anybody who believes in freedom and what our troops are dying for in Iraq should believe their killers should be brought to justice if possible. I believe the excuses on the majority side are designed by Republicans to hide the truth.

The filibuster of the anti-amnesty amendment is just another example of cutting and running. We hear this all the time. If there were ever an example of cutting and running, it is not to allow a vote on a simple amendment that says we should not condone the Iraqis granting amnesty to Iraqis who have killed Americans.

I believe this cutting and running, which is thrown around here so gratuitously by the majority, could apply to what happened last year on the Defense authorization bill. It took months. The bill was reported out of committee, I think sometime in late April. We didn't get to the bill for months after that. Why? We had it on the floor once, but it was pulled because of gun liability legislation, which some believed was more important than the bill directing