

As this debate unfolds, it is my hope we will have the opportunity to bring the Gregg amendment to the floor and vote to send a clear message to our men and women in harm's way that we support them, the funding will be there, and we will stay with them as they pursue the cause on behalf of peace, liberty, freedom, and democracy in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I recently came to the Senate floor to express my views relative to the deliberations this body was undertaking approving and disapproving of the President's way forward in Iraq. I am strongly in favor of this body debating the U.S. policy relative to Iraq and believe all my colleagues are as well.

However, as I stated in my earlier speech, it is not appropriate to allow the majority party to completely dictate the terms of that debate, as they have tried to do over the last several weeks. That is why I voted against cloture on the motion to proceed to the Reid resolution on February 17, along with a vast majority of my Republican colleagues.

Mr. President, since that time, a new strategy relative to this debate has come forward. The strategy is essentially an attempt to deauthorize or restrict U.S. military action in Iraq by revoking or altering the Iraq war resolution, which passed this body by a vote of 77 to 23 on October 11, 2002. I don't agree with this tactic.

On January 26, the Senate unanimously approved GEN David Petraeus for his fourth star and to be commander of the multinational forces, Iraq. No Senator opposed his nomination. General Petraeus supports President Bush's plan and new strategy in Iraq and has embarked on the mission for which President Bush chose him and for which this body unanimously confirmed him. Once again, now we are being asked to disapprove and deauthorize the very mission we have unanimously confirmed him to execute. Hopefully, my colleagues can see the irony, as well as the inconsistency, in the choice they are presenting before this body.

As I have said before, we need to give the new strategy in Iraq a chance to work. If General Petraeus comes and says it is not working, then I am prepared to change course. President Bush's current strategy is not guaranteed to work. However, no approach I have seen or heard discussed in the past several months has any greater

chance of success than the course we are now taking. Therefore, this strategy deserves a chance.

In talking with some of my colleagues, on the Republican side as well as the Democratic side, who recently returned from Iraq, I am very hopeful that based on the comments they have made, per their visual inspection of what is going on in Iraq today, based upon their conversations with General Petraeus, we are seeing some successes, even though they are minimal at this point. But there is now hope and encouragement that this strategy is going to work.

If Members of Congress truly don't support our efforts in Iraq and believe we should withdraw troops, they should vote to cut off funds for the war, which is the primary authority Congress has in this area. However, having refused to allow the Senate to vote on protecting funding for our troops serving in harm's way, the Democrats are now proposing another symbolic resolution.

This is the fourth resolution that the Senate Democratic leadership has backed to address the troop increase, and the Democrats still insist on avoiding the fundamental issue of whether they will cut off funds for troops serving in Iraq.

As the Wall Street Journal wrote in an editorial:

Democrats don't want to leave their fingerprints on defeat in Iraq by actually voting to bring the troops home. So instead, they're hoping to put restrictions on troop deployments that will make it impossible for the Iraq commander, General David Petraeus, to fulfill his mission.

This is essentially an attempt to ensure the policy does not succeed. Logically, the Senate should be giving General Petraeus everything he needs to succeed, both in terms of financial as well as political support. But that is not what the majority party is trying to do.

Democrats in the House of Representatives have undertaken a plan that would tie war funding in a supplemental spending bill to strict new standards for resetting, equipping, and training troops. This strategy to choke off resources and the Senate plan to revise the use of force authorization are attempts to make the war in Iraq unwinnable while avoiding political responsibility.

As Charles Krauthammer has said:

Slowly bleeding our forces by defunding what our commanders think they need to win or rewording the authorization of the use of force so that lawyers decide what operations are to be launched is no way to fight a war. It is no way to end a war. It is a way to complicate the war and make it inherently unwinnable—and to shirk the political responsibility for doing so.

There is nothing easy or pretty about war, and this war is no exception. Not a day passes that I don't consider the human cost of our attempt to defeat the terrorists and eradicate extremism in Iraq and replace it with a self-reliant and representative government.

The debate, as we move forward, should focus on how we can most

quickly and effectively achieve the victory that all of us desire. It is not about political posturing. It is about what Congress can do to support our young men and women in Iraq and help them accomplish this critical mission.

Losing the global war on terrorism is not an option. Failure in Iraq would be devastating to our national security, entangling the Middle East in a web of chaos that breeds terror and extremism. The Iraq Study Group and countless expert witnesses have testified that simply leaving Iraq, without stabilizing the country, would be disastrous.

As the senior Senator from my State, my support of our mission and our troops includes a responsibility to examine the tactics and question the steps that we take to reach our goal. I will continue to do that in a very deliberate way, but I intend to be constructive in my approach and criticism in order to do everything we can to ensure that our troops and our mission succeed, rather than doing whatever I can to make sure they fail.

When this motion to deauthorize or micromanage the war in Iraq comes to the floor of the Senate, I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. 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.

IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 4, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4) to make the United States more secure by implementing unfinished recommendations of the 9/11 Commission to fight the war on terror more effectively, to improve homeland security, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 4

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,