

another area where the rules issued by MSHA in recent years have contradicted the intent and spirit of the 1977 Mine Act.

We must continue to probe whether enough has been done. Two deaths last month in southern West Virginia serve as a macabre reminder that the crisis in the coal fields is not yet over—will probably never be over—but we have got to work at it. It is not yet over. We must be innovative. It is time for us to stop simply addressing mine disasters as they happen. We must seek opportunities to get ahead of the dangers. We must use foresight as well as hindsight.

Last month, I met with the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mine Safety and Health, Richard Stickler. Mr. Stickler is in his current position because of a recess appointment in October 2006. He has not been confirmed by the Senate, and so his appointment will expire at the end of this year. I am hopeful that he will prove himself a friend of the coal miner. He has a dedicated team at MSHA, which includes many former coal miners who would like to see MSHA do better. I am convinced that more can be done. The question is whether the Department of Labor and the White House will let MSHA do what needs to be done. The Congress will get some insight into that question as it reviews the President's budget request for mine safety, which was delivered today.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and as a Senator who will have some say about the Federal budget for mine safety, hear me when I say that the days of cheating the safety and well-being of our Nation's coal miners are over. The Senate Appropriations Committee will examine the various mine safety accounts, and the Senate Appropriations Committee will make its recommendations to the Senate about where improvements can be made. That process has already begun with the inclusion of \$13 million above—above, on top of, over—the President's request in the continuing resolution for the fiscal year 2007 for MSHA to hire and train additional coal safety inspectors. I and other Senators have encouraged the President of the United States—hear me—to include additional funds to retain those inspectors in his mine safety budget request for the fiscal year 2008, and I am glad that the President appears to have done so.

This is an issue that is close to my heart, and I pledge to do all that I can to increase congressional oversight in the coal field. As a son of the coal fields, the Appalachian coal fields, as the son of a coal miner, I am determined, yes, determined to be the "captain of a mighty host demanding the rights to which free men"—free men—coal miners—"free men are entitled." And women. Free men and women are entitled.

Mr. President, that concludes my prepared speech.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say this to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I have been privileged to be here but a small fraction of the time that he has, 29 years here and well over 40 for my colleague from West Virginia, but in that period we have worked many times on behalf of coal miners.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. As the Presiding Officer recognized, my fellow colleague from Virginia, our States are joined.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Those mines have a great deal of comparability, those in Virginia and those in West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Joined at the hip.

Mr. WARNER. They are joined. The plight of the miners and their families has been a subject that no Senator in the modern history of this Senate has fought harder for than the senior senator from West Virginia, and very often you have involved me and my colleagues, whoever they might be. I have served with three now, the distinguished HARRY BYRD, Jr., whom you will recall, Senator Robb, and Senator Allen. All of us have worked on this subject.

I hope to join you on this, and I hope the Presiding Officer, likewise, will work on this subject of coal mine safety. So I thank my friend.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished, the very distinguished senior senator from the great State of Virginia. I thank him.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, and we will work together.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IRAQ

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the cloture vote was very fully discussed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, with leadership and our ranking members, so I am confident that somehow this matter can be worked out. I want you to know, however, that I stand steadfast behind the content of a resolution I put together, along with Senator BEN NELSON, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, and some eight other cosponsors.

The question is how does the Senate bring it into focus under the complexity of our rules. I won't take the time to deal with that now, but I would say to those following this debate that we stand, the Senators I mentioned, the two principal cosponsors and myself, firmly behind this resolution, the content of which has been amended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amended copy of the resolution be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, allowing ready reference for those persons examining the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. WARNER. That resolution has been distorted and misunderstood in the debate thus far. That is one of the reasons I am so anxious to proceed with this debate. I want to make clear, because it was mentioned that perhaps these resolutions were brought along for political cover, that on that issue each Senator has to speak for themselves, but I assure my colleagues that this Senator from Virginia has moved forward with my thoughts and my ideas in the best interest of the country and the best interest of the men and women of the United States military, and not for any political cover. Nor will I, in any way, impugn the motives of Senators whose opinions differ from mine.

This being my 29th year in the Senate, I have never, to my knowledge, ever intentionally, and I don't think indirectly, impugned the motive of any Senator for the position he or she has taken on a matter. We are all patriots. We are equal patriots. We all support the men and women of the Armed Forces. Let that be understood.

I firmly believe, as we are approaching this debate, that it is imperative that the Senate work its will, and work its will in the open, on this issue which is so critical at this point in time in our many years of involvement in the Iraq situation.

I solidly support the President in his view that we cannot accept failure in getting a government, whether it is this one or an ensuing government, in Iraq up and running and functioning such that it can seize the full range of sovereignty in this nation, and not let this nation implode, causing absolute disaster throughout the region. Indeed, certainly as it relates to energy and other issues, it could impact severely on the rest of the world, not only in energy but in a signal that the terrorists have won. We cannot let that happen. So let's let the Senate work its will, and I think our colleagues here, the distinguished leaders, will work out a procedure by which we will do that. The comment was made, and understandably, that this is a nonbinding resolution. Nonbinding. Well, we have them in the history of the Senate. At this time, this Senator is not voting for any cutoff of funds. That is our one constitutional lever we can pull. As a matter of fact, in our resolution—I refer to our resolution as the one that I, together with Senator BEN NELSON and Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine have put together—we specifically have included an iteration of the concept advanced by our distinguished colleague Senator GREGG, which may come before the Senate. We solidly support that concept of no cutoff of funds.

What do we do short of that? Well, we have a debate. Somehow you have to have some focal point, something written down, some document in writing as to the ability of this institution, the Senate, to reach a consensus, and a bipartisan consensus, on how best we go

forward with a new strategy in Iraq. That has been my motivation from the very beginning, to put this institution on record on a bipartisan basis. I am not talking about one or two Senators on that side joining all the Senators on this side or vice versa, no, a truly on its face bipartisan consensus, albeit a resolution without any legal force and effect.

It is important that the people of this country give their support to the men and women in uniform and to a strategy which they hope will succeed in our goal of not letting Iraq implode and fall into greater disaster than it is experiencing today. So how do they go about it? The President, in his speech on January 10, explicitly said those who have other ideas, generally speaking, or concepts, bring them forward. That is what we have done. We have exercised what the President has given us, the option to come forward.

To quote the President: "If Members," referring to Congress, "have improvements that can be made, we will make them," he said. "If circumstances change, we will adjust, showing flexibility," said the President.

Using that as our chart, we then proceeded as a group to figure out how best to comment on the President's strategy. We did say, and I repeat it, that the Senate disagrees with the plan to augment our forces by 21,500 and urge the President, instead, to consider all options and alternatives for achieving the strategic goals set forth below. Each Senator has to interpret that phrase, that sentence, as he or she so desires. I repeat that. Each Senator has the right to look at that and decide, one, do you disagree in any way with what the President is doing and the force of 21,500.

I believe we can accomplish the goals this country has set out to accomplish in Iraq, goals that were enumerated by the Baker-Hamilton commission, in a manner that we do not need a full force of 21,500. Indeed, that force, we now learn, could be somewhat higher than that number if you are going to have the essential support troops joined. Unfortunately, there was no reference to that made in the President's speech, and right now it is a matter of debate and contention.

I don't know what the additional figure is, but in my judgment, I say most respectfully that we do not in this resolution in any way challenge or contravene the constitutional provision that you are Commander in Chief and that you can deploy troops which, in your best judgment, are for the security of this Nation and the welfare of the troops. We don't challenge that. We simply accept your offer, we have expressed it, so we support it.

I support, for example, additional troops if they are necessary over and above the current level for operations in Al Anbar. On my last trip to that region, it was clear that the marines had enough troops to do certain portions of

their mission, but it was also clear that additional forces were needed. Perhaps they could come from within the current force structure currently in Iraq. But perhaps you need—to use the word "surge"—some modest surge to meet the requirements for Al-Anbar to be brought under a higher level of security.

Nothing in this resolution prohibits the President from having some portion of that surge force of 21,500 utilized to do those things which are essential—further training of the Iraqi forces, further embedding, enlarging the number of troops to be embedded with the Iraqi forces. Those are the sorts of things this Senator supports. Within the framework of this resolution, I can take those stands.

But I turn now to the principal thing we have in this resolution, and that is one of the main things that I believe has to have greater emphasis. It is as follows. We state it very clearly in a provision in our resolution:

The United States military operations should, as much as possible, be confined to these goals, which were enumerated by the Baker-Hamilton Commission.

I go back and I read the goals here, all set forth on page 6 of the resolution. The military part of this strategy should: focus on maintaining the territorial integrity of Iraq, denying international terrorists a safe haven, conducting counterterrorism operations, promoting regional stability, supporting Iraqi efforts to bring greater security to Baghdad, and training and equipping Iraqi forces to take full responsibility for their own security.

Therein is the principal motivation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WARNER. I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent that I could proceed until such time as Senators desiring to come forth and address the standing order, namely—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have an order to lay down the motion to proceed. Will the Senator allow that to go forward at this time?

Mr. WARNER. Fine, if the Presiding Officer desires to do that.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IRAQ—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 470, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 470) to express the sense of Congress on Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I wonder if I can ask unanimous consent at this time to proceed for another 5 minutes. Seeing my distinguished colleague on the Senate floor—

Mr. BROWN. If the Senator will yield?

Mr. WARNER. If I might finish the unanimous consent request? Then I will be happy to listen to the Senator.

In other words, at this point in time I ask unanimous consent that we proceed as in morning business such that I could complete in 5 minutes. And my distinguished colleague. We have been waiting for about 2 hours this afternoon. I do not know—perhaps I am mistaken—if there are Senators in the Chamber who wish to address the subject matter of the order just given by the Chair. I wouldn't want to interfere with them going forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, there is an hour-and-a-half debate scheduled on this motion.

The Senator is recognized.

Mr. REED. Parliamentary inquiry: Is the Chair establishing an order for speaking?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No order has been established.

Mr. WARNER. If I might say to my distinguished colleague, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, I think the Chair has granted me 5 minutes, to be followed by a period of about 5 minutes to my colleague from Nebraska, Senator BEN NELSON. From that point on, there may be those who wish to address the underlying order, or the Chair could recognize other Senators who wish to speak on the subject.

Mr. REED. If the Chair is ready, I ask that at the conclusion of the 5 minutes of Senator NELSON, I be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous consent agreement stipulate that following Senator REED's comments, I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request as modified by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer and the preceding Presiding Officer, my distinguished colleague.

I was speaking about the need to have greater involvement of the Iraqi forces. I ask unanimous consent to have this chart printed in today's RECORD.

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

TRANSITION IRAQ TO SECURITY SELF-RELIANCE—IRAQI SECURITY FORCES Ministry of Interior Forces*

<i>Component</i>	<i>Trained and Equipped</i>
Police	***-135,000
National police	-24,400