

Senate lose its role under the Constitution to be the second House of the Congress. This is not a rubberstamp for the House. That is what we will be if we follow the intention of the majority leader now.

Mr. LOTT. What is the order, Mr. President?

---

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will conduct a period of morning business.

The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am going to speak on Iraq, but first—I see the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania on the floor—I will introduce a bill on behalf of myself, Senator SPECTER, Senator LOTT, and Senator REID, regarding the insurance industry.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LOTT and Mr. SPECTER pertaining to the introduction of S. 618 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

---

#### IRAQ

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier today there was a lot of discussion here about whether and how we should have a debate on the Iraq war. I cannot think of any issue more important to the Senate.

I have said many times that the 100 men and women who serve here are privileged to do so. Someday, someone from our State will replace us. That is the genius of the Founders of this country. However, there are only 100 Members. There are 300 million Americans. The 300 million Americans expect the 100 Senators to speak for them. They do not have that opportunity themselves.

I consider it a great privilege to be here. I used to sit up in the gallery when I was a law student and watch the Senate, and I thought then as I do today that the Senate should be and often is the conscience of the Nation.

I heard the debates during the time of the Vietnam war. I became the only Vermonter to actually vote on whether to continue that war. Today, we have a different war but many people in this country are as concerned. Those for the war in Iraq, those against the war in Iraq.

I go to my State of Vermont and everywhere I go, whether I am in buying groceries and people come talk to me or I am at the gas station or if I am shoveling snow—and yesterday we had 2½ feet of snow at my home in Vermont—people stop and want to talk

about the war in Iraq. My guess is it is no different in any other State.

These are very patriotic, very honest, very concerned people, and they have legitimate questions. They always ask: Why isn't the Senate debating the war in Iraq?

A week ago, Senator REID, the distinguished majority leader, tried every which way to provide the Senate with an opportunity to debate a bipartisan resolution on Iraq. That effort failed, and it failed again earlier today. It was blocked by some in the Republican Party who insisted on a separate vote that was nothing more than a political ploy. Instead of a debate on the President's policy, they wanted the debate to be about who supports the troops. We all support the troops, but we have some very different views about the President's policy that put brave American men and women in harm's way.

As so often is the case when anyone asked a question, expressed reservations or outright opposed the President's policy in Iraq, the President's defenders accuse his detractors of not being patriotic or of not supporting the troops. What blatant balderdash that is.

For years I have fought for veterans' benefits, for fair treatment for the National Guard, for armor for our troops who were sent by this administration into battle unprepared—and still, 5 years later don't have the armor their vehicles need to withstand the roadside bomb blasts. I have fought to replace the depleted stocks of equipment that our troops need and depend upon so their families do not have to send to them what the Government should be providing. The absurd accusation that it is unpatriotic to disagree with a policy that has resulted in the deaths of thousands of American soldiers and created a terrorists' haven in a country that, before our invasion, posed no threat to the United States, has worn thin.

It reminds me of my days as a prosecutor, when a defendant was caught red-handed. What would they do? They would usually attack the accuser. They could not say "You caught me breaking and entering." Rather, their defense was "I was set up." Or "He made me do it." That is what has been going on since President Bush, Vice President CHENEY, and former Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld ignored all advice to the contrary and led us into this costly fiasco.

These are the people who, when they had a chance to get Osama bin Laden—and we all want to see Osama bin Laden brought to justice for the attacks on September 11—when they had him cornered in Afghanistan, they decided instead to invade Iraq. Iraq did not pose a threat. Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction. The intelligence was as equivocal as it was distorted and manipulated. But the President was fixated on Iraq, and he has remained so ever since.

Remember how the Vice President confidently said we would be welcomed as liberators? Some welcome. Remember the President, dressed up in a flight suit on an aircraft carrier so he could make a rousing speech under the sign "Mission Accomplished." Thousands of Americans have been killed or injured in Iraq in the years since that phony photo op.

The flawed policies of this administration have thrust our troops into the maw of a bloody civil war. Our troops are not responsible for the mistaken policies they have been asked to implement. Policymakers in Washington are responsible for that and only we can change those policies.

My youngest son was a member of the Marine Corps. He was called up during the first Gulf War. He saluted and was ready to do his duty, as are all the loyal men and women in our armed services. That was a different war. Thank God it was over so quickly. Neither he nor many others called up were in harm's way.

But the policymakers made this policy and only they can change it, not the troops on the ground. The polls show, unmistakably, that a majority of the American people want the Congress to debate and vote on the Iraq war. They know it is the key issue of the day. They see it is a widening civil war. They want their sons and daughters to come home pursuant to as sensible a plan as we can muster.

It is that simple. We ought to be debating that. If there are Senators who feel the troops should be there longer, that more of them should be sent there, then come to the Senate and say so. But also, there are those who feel we have to do all we can to bring our men and women home. We should have the opportunity to debate and vote on it.

The costs of this misadventure have not just been onerous, they have been catastrophic. More than 3,000 Americans killed, more than 20,000 wounded. My wife and I have visited some of the wounded. These are devastating wounds, crippling wounds, blinding wounds, wounds that disable people for the rest of their lives. And tens of thousands of innocent Iraqis have lost their lives.

In material terms, we are fast approaching the \$1 trillion mark. We are throwing money out the door at a rate of more than \$2 billion per week to fund this war. We are told about the things we cannot afford in America because we have to fund the war in Iraq. We are cutting funds for law enforcement, for police on our streets so we can pay for police in Iraq. We can't upgrade our hospitals. And on and on.

And the international reputation of America, which has brought us great influence, has now been tarnished, especially among our allies, tarnished and diminished.

Where are we in Iraq? We are in the midst of a civil war among religious and ethnic factions, an insurgency that