

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes in morning business.

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

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, today I am going to offer an amendment to the Defense authorization bill that will do two things. The first is it will extend the mandate or, shall I say, direct the President to negotiate the extension of the mandate we now operate under inside Iraq under the rubric of the United Nations. The second would be to place a restriction on the implementation of the strategic framework agreement that is now being negotiated inside Iraq to bring it inside the Constitution of the United States and require that the Congress of the United States approve this strategic framework agreement before it is actually put into motion.

The reality right now is, our justification for operating inside Iraq under international law will expire at the end of this year. For almost a year, this administration has been negotiating two separate agreements with the Government of Iraq. One is a strategic framework agreement; the other is a status of forces agreement that would take place under the umbrella of the strategic framework agreement.

This period of negotiation has been done largely without the involvement of the Congress. It will, if implemented, shape and direct the policy of the United States in Iraq for a good period of time—our security framework, all these sorts of things that traditionally have taken place only inside a treaty. Under the Constitution, a treaty is required to be approved by a two-thirds vote in the Senate.

So we have two realities that have come together, that by the end of this year we need to address in some form or another. The first is we have to be operating under some proper international legal structure in order to maintain our forces in Iraq after December 31. The other is we need to be negotiating the right kind of bilateral future relationship between our country and the country of Iraq.

This amendment intends to resolve both of these situations in a way that is not disruptive, that is within the constraints of the Constitution, and it will allow us some time to get the right kind of strategic framework in place rather than our having to rush it, as we are seeing right now, to get something in place by the end of the year that is arguably not within the Constitution.

The first portion of this amendment basically says the President will direct the U.S. Special Representative to the United Nations to seek an extension of the multinational agreement that already is in place under the rubric of the Security Council of the United Na-

tions. It also states it is the sense of Congress that this extension should expire within a year or earlier. It should expire at the end of next year, unless we have a strategic framework agreement in place, at which time it will expire earlier.

The second goes to the notion that this agreement must be approved with the consent of the Congress. I have not gone so far in this amendment as to say we should treat this agreement as we would treat a longer, more formal treaty, with the recognition that treaties sometimes get tied up for years, but that we should have a law by the Congress, a vote by a majority of the Congress, approving this major step forward in our relationship with the country of Iraq.

As it stands right now, I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I am also a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We have not been shown one word of the actual document that is being negotiated. There are members of the Iraqi Parliament that have been shown portions of this document, if not all of it.

I think it is very important for us to give this agreement the time we can give it if we extend the mandate of the United Nations for a year but also to get the proper involvement of the Congress in this most important step into the future of our relationship with Iraq.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment. I hope we can have bipartisan support on it. This is an amendment that goes to the propriety of the constitutional process and also is intended to take the time constraints out of the negotiation of this agreement with Iraq.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:28 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

COLOMBIA

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the remarkable success story in the fight against terrorism and narcotrafficking that I believe very strongly needs to be told. It is a story that has largely gone unnoticed because it has not taken place in the Eastern Hemisphere or east of here, where most of the world's attention is focused today. It comes, rather, from the Southern Hemisphere in a country where protagonists have surged ahead of narcoterrorists militarily, while simultaneously improving the overall security and safety of the civilian population. What is most important is they

have done so while ensuring that protection of human rights and adherence to international humanitarian law are fully integrated into the daily life of every member of the security forces.

I am speaking about Colombia, of course. I visited there just a couple of weeks ago. I visited Bogota. I also visited Ecuador to find out what was going on in Latin America. I was greatly encouraged by the tangible evidence I saw in Colombia of a country in complete transformation. Most of us probably realize that just about 6 years ago, in 2002, as much as 40 percent of the area of Colombia was controlled by terrorist groups and ruthless narcotics trafficking. Many of my colleagues visited Colombia at the time and brought back grim reports, as they should have, of a country apparently descending into chaos, with a dim future, as Colombia was on the verge of becoming a failed state. The security situation was bleak, the economic outlook was decidedly negative, and drug trafficking threatened the very culture of Colombia and its people.

The situation had been slowly deteriorating in Colombia for decades. Even before the United States experienced the dramatic acts of terrorism of 2001 that would change our national perceptions forever, Colombians were dealing with an increasingly dangerous, deadly, and brutal form of terrorism that threatened to tear the country apart. Drug cartels were controlling larger and larger swaths of territory and had turned Colombia into the world's leading exporter of cocaine. Much of the cocaine was finding its way into the United States. Insurgent groups we have come to know as the FARC or the ELN were turning Colombia into a war zone, negatively affecting the economy and threatening the very stability of the nation.

That was the situation in 1998 when former Colombian President Pastrana conceived Plan Colombia, a 6-year plan to end long-armed conflict, to eliminate drug trafficking, and promote economic and social development. As you may recall, the United States agreed to take a gamble and invest in Colombia. President Clinton, a Democrat, led the way, and he was followed by President Bush. Both were strong supporters. The good news is that since 1998, the United States has continued to be the principal contributor to the plan, mostly through the Andean Counterdrug Initiative but also through foreign military financing and the central counter-narcotics account of the Department of Defense.

Today, our mutual objectives in support of Plan Colombia have evolved from a strict counternarcotics focus to encompass counterterrorism activities as well. Our investment appears to have paid off with dividends. I am happy to report that with U.S. aid to Colombian security forces and assistance in trade preferences under the Andean Trade Preferences Agreement, or the ATPA, the Colombian people have