NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1585, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1585) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Nelson (NE) (for Levin) amendment No. 2011, in the nature of a substitute.

Warner (for Graham/Kyl) amendment No. 2064 (to amendment No. 2011), to strike section 1023, relating to the granting of civil rights to terror suspects.

Cornyn amendment No. 2934 (to amendment No. 2011), to express the sense of the Senate that General David H. Petraeus, Commanding General, Multi-National Force-Iraq, deserves the full support of the Senate and strongly condemn personal attacks on the honor and the integrity of General Petraeus and all the members of the United States Armed forces.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after Senator BOXER offers an amendment related to the subject matter of the pending Cornyn amendment, the Boxer and Cornyn amendments be debated concurrently for 20 minutes, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators BOXER and CORNYN or their designees; that no amendments be in order to either amendment; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Boxer amendment; that upon disposition of that amendment there be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the Cornyn amendment; that each amendment be subject to a 60-vote threshold, and if the amendment does not achieve 60 votes, the amendment then be withdrawn, with the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. I wonder if my friend would modify that to have the second vote for 10 minutes rather than 15 minutes?

Mr. LEVIN. I so modify the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I think the distinguished chairman and I have had a conversation that, following that, for the benefit of our colleagues, we would move to the Feingold amendment and with it we will seek a time agreement. Then with the cooperation of our colleagues, we will at least try as much as possible to dispose of Iraq amendments today, if we could.

I remind my colleagues we still have the basis of this bill, which has Wounded Warriors, pay raises, housing, training, and equipping of the men and women of the Armed Forces. We do have a number of pending amendments on the bill. I think, in fairness, we should try to dispose of the Iraq issue as soon as possible so we could move on to the rest of the bill and pass it so we can get to conference and get it signed. There are vital parts of this bill on which the chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee have worked literally months, and I hope we could get to that aspect of the legislation as well.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator will yield for a moment, on that point I agree totally with what he just said about the importance of this bill. We are circulating a request to our Members on this side that no amendments be in order to this bill—that no amendments be filed after a certain point this afternoon, which I believe we have tried to identify as 3 o'clock. I don't know, I didn't have a chance to talk with my friend from Arizona about that, but hopefully on your side something similar could be hot-lined so we could bring this to an end.

We have literally 250 amendments already. We have disposed of a lot. We disposed of 50. We can dispose of more today at some point, but we can't have more amendments coming in than we are able to work out.

I hope on both sides we can get a unanimous consent agreement that no amendments will be in order to this bill in the first degree if they are filed later than a fixed time this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the initial unanimous consent request, as modified, by the senior Senator from Michigan?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time? The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2947 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2011

(Purpose: To affirm strong support for all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and to strongly condemn attacks on the honor, integrity, and patriotism of any individual who is serving or has served honorably in the United States Armed Forces, by any person or organization)

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2947 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], for herself, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DURBIN, proposes an amendment numbered 2947:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. __ SENSE OF SENATE

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The men and women of the United States Armed Forces and our veterans deserve to be supported, honored, and defended when their patriotism is attacked;

(2) In 2002, a Senator from Georgia who is a Vietnam veteran, triple amputee, and the recipient of a Silver Star and Bronze Star, had his courage and patriotism attacked in an advertisement in which he was visually linked to Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein;

(3) This attack was aptly described by a Senator and Vietnam veteran as ''reprehensible'';

(4) In 2004, a Senator from Massachusetts who is a Vietnam veteran and the recipient of a Silver Star, Bronze Star with Combat V, and three Purple Hearts, was personally attacked and accused of dishonoring his country;

(5) This attack was aptly described by a Senator and Vietnam veteran as ''dishonest and dishonorable.''

(6) On September 10, 2007, an advertisement in the New York Times was an unwarranted personal attack on General Petraeus, who is honorably leading our Armed Forces in Iraq and carrying out the mission assigned to him by the President of the United States; and

(7) Such personal attacks on those with distinguished military service to our nation have become all too frequent.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate—

(1) to reaffirm its strong support for all of the men and women of the United States Armed Forces; and

(2) to strongly condemn all attacks on the honor, integrity, and patriotism of any individual who is serving or has served honorably in the United States Armed Forces, by any person or organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank the clerk for reading those words. I hope Members of the Senate heard them well because in this amendment, what we are doing is saying that there is essentially a terrible trend in America today: to launch attacks on honorable people who serve in the military. By the way, it isn't just folks who were mentioned or alluded to. I have an article I would like to have printed in the RECORD from the San Diego Union Tribune, April 16, 2004, and another from the Seattle Times of May 13, 2007.

I ask unanimous consent to have two articles printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the San Diego Union Tribune, Apr. 16, 2004]

RETIRED GENERAL ASSAILS U.S. POLICY ON IRAQ

(By Rick Rogers)

Retired Marine Gen. Anthony Zinni wondered aloud yesterday how Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld could be caught off guard by the chaos in Iraq that has killed nearly 100 Americans in recent weeks and led to his announcement that 20,000 U.S. troops would be staying there instead of returning home as planned.

''I'm surprised that he is surprised because there was a lot of us who were telling him that it was going to be thus,'' said Zinni, a Marine for 39 years and the former commander of the U.S. Central Command. ''Anyone could know the problems they were going to see. How could they not?''

At a Pentagon news briefing yesterday, Rumsfeld said he could not have estimated how many troops would be killed in the past week.

Zinni made his comments during an interview with The San Diego Union-Tribune before giving a speech last night at the University of San Diego's Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice as part of its distinguished lecturer series.

For years Zinni said he cautioned U.S. officials that an Iraq without Saddam Hussein would likely be more dangerous to U.S. interests than one with him because of the ethnic and religious clashes that would be unleashed.

''I think that some heads should roll over Iraq,'' Zinni said. ''I think the president got some bad advice.''

Known as the ''Warrior Diplomat,'' Zinni is not a peace activist by nature or training, having led troops in Vietnam, commanded rescue operations in Somalia and directed strikes against Iraq and al Qaeda.

He once commanded the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Pendleton.

Out of uniform, Zinni was a troubleshooter for the U.S. government in Africa, Asia and Europe and served as special envoy to the Middle East under the Bush administration for a time before his reservations over the Iraq war and its aftermath caused him to resign and oppose it.

Not even Zinni's resumé could shield him from the accusations that followed.

''I've been called a traitor and a turncoat for mentioning these things,'' said Zinni, 60. The problems in Iraq are being caused, he said, by poor planning and shortsightedness, such as disbanding the Iraqi army and being unable to provide security.

Zinni said the United States must now rely on the U.N. to pull its ''chestnuts out of the fire in Iraq.''

''We're betting on the U.N., who we blew off and ridiculed during the run-up to the war,'' Zinni said. ''Now we're back with hat in hand. It would be funny if not for the lives lost.''

Several things have to happen to get Iraq back on course, whether the U.N. decides to step in or not, Zinni said.

Improving security for American forces and the Iraqi people is at the top of the list followed closely by helping the working class with economic projects.

But it's not the lack of a comprehensive American plan for Iraq nor the surging violence that has cost allied troops their lives—including about 30 Camp Pendleton Marines—that most concerns Zinni.

''In the end, the Iraqis themselves have to want to rebuild their country more than we do,'' Zinni said. ''But I don't see that right now. I see us doing everything.

''I spent two years in Vietnam, and I've seen this movie before,'' he said. ''They have to be willing to do more or else it is never going to work.''

Last night at the Kroc institute during his speech ''From the Battlefield to the Negotiating Table: Preventing Deadly Conflict,'' Zinni detailed the approach he believes the United States should take in the Middle East.

He told an overflow crowd that the United States tries to grapple with individual issues in Middle East instead of seeing them as elements of a broader question.

''We need to step back and get a grand strategy,'' he said.

[From the Seattle Times, May 13, 2007]

RETIRED GEN. BATISTE LASHES OUT ON WAR

(By Thom Shanker)

ROCHESTER, NY.—John Batiste has traveled a long way in four years, from commanding the 1st Infantry Division in Iraq to quitting the Army after 31 years in uniform, and, now, from overseeing a steel factory in Rochester to openly challenging President Bush on his management of the war.

''Mr. President, you did not listen,'' Batiste says in new TV ads being broadcast in Republican congressional districts as part of a $500,000 campaign financed by *Vote Vets.org*. ''You continue to pursue a failed strategy that is breaking our great Army and Marine Corps. I left the Army in protest in order to speak out. Mr. President, you have placed our nation in peril.''

Those are inflammatory words from Batiste, a retired major general.

Many senior officers say privately that such talk makes them uncomfortable; they say that when your first name becomes ''General,'' it is for the rest of your life. But Batiste says he has received no communications from current or former officers challenging his stance, although he occasionally gets an anonymous e-mail with the heading ''Traitor.''

Having quit the Army in anger over what he calls mismanagement of the Iraq war, he says he chose a second career far from Washington and the Pentagon so he could speak freely on military issues.

''I am outraged, as are the majority of Americans,'' he said. ''I am a lifelong Republican. But it is past time for change.''

Officials of VoteVets.org, an Internet-based veterans advocacy organization, say the TV ads, which challenge the president's argument that he listens to his commanders and say his Iraq policies endanger U.S. security, will run in the home districts of more than a dozen members of Congress.

Two other retired generals, Paul Eaton and Wesley Clark, speak in the VoteVets.org campaign's other ads.

In response, White House spokeswoman Emily Lawrimore said: ''We respectfully disagree.'' She said Bush confers routinely with senior officers, citing a meeting Thursday with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a conversation last week with Gen. David Petraeus, the senior U.S. commander in Iraq.

Mrs. BOXER. This is one where General Zinni, who criticized the war in Iraq, said, ''I have been called a traitor and a turncoat for mentioning these things.'' Outrageous—because he spoke out against the war in Iraq.

Then you have retired General Batiste, who lashed out on the war and says he gets e-mails with the heading, ''Traitor.''

My friend from Texas is taking one example, attacking an organization that he doesn't agree with—I am sure of that—and we are going to be pretty busy in the Senate if we turn into the ad police. When Senator Cleland was attacked we didn't have a resolution on the floor of the Senate. When Senator KERRY was attacked we didn't do it. When General Batiste was attacked we didn't do it. For General Zinni we didn't do it. We did speak out, and we did speak out about the ad, all of us on both sides of the aisle, that attacked General Petraeus. But we didn't have a resolution all these times.

Suddenly, now, a political organization is attacked by name in a resolution in something that reminds me of the old, bad days in America when organizations were attacked by the Government. So what we have done is we have written this. I thank Senators LEVIN and REID and DURBIN and other Senators who believe what we see is a trend to attack heroes. We say it is wrong. We don't go after one organization. We say it is wrong.

Let me show you the Max Cleland ad. We have the picture of Max Cleland in the same ad with Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein.

This is what Senator MCCAIN had to say about that ad. Here is what he said:

I've never seen anything like that ad. . . .Putting pictures of Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden next to a man who lost three limbs on the battlefield, it's worse than disgraceful, it's reprehensible.

But we didn't come down and pass a resolution attacking the campaign that ran this ad. But now we have an attack on one organization. It is wrong. It should be defeated. This amendment I have offered is the one that ought to pass this Chamber.

I yield to Senator DURBIN my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to be notified when I have spoken for 2 minutes and leave the remaining time under the control of Senator BOXER.

This is a balanced amendment that Senator BOXER, Senator LEVIN, and I have offered to this bill. I am not sure this is a debate in which we ought to engage on a regular basis, but Senator CORNYN has the right to raise this issue, and he has raised it.

The point we want to make is this: The Cornyn amendment focuses on one organization and one attack on an honorable, patriotic leader of our military, General Petraeus. If this resolution that he offers would be fair, it would also take into consideration the situations that we have raised in our amendment with Senator BOXER.

I asked Senator CORNYN last night: Will you amend your resolution so other attacks—unwarranted, disgraceful attacks—on the military can be included? And I gave him two examples, and he said no because those were involved in a political campaign.

I am sorry, but that isn't good enough. If the principle is sound, it is sound whether it is in the course of a political campaign or not. If we are going to stand up for the honor, integrity, and patriotism of those who serve our country in uniform, let's do it without partisan favor and certainly not arguing that a political campaign is somehow fair game to say anything about anybody. That is what is wrong with American politics, and that is what has to change.

The Boxer amendment, which I am honored to cosponsor, changes it. I think the examples we have cited in this amendment include not only the MoveOn ad, which has been dismissed and criticized by many on both sides of the aisle, but also goes to the so-called Swift Boat Veterans for Truth out of Texas, an organization that attacked our colleague, Senator JOHN KERRY, in what I think was one of the lowest moments in Presidential politics. It goes to the attacks on Senator Max Cleland, a man who used to sit in a wheelchair, having lost three limbs in Vietnam, a disabled veteran struggling to be a Senator from Georgia whose patriotism and courage were attacked in a political ad—something which I am sure is going to remain a shameful chapter in American politics.

Those who want to join in standing up for men and women in uniform, past and present, have a chance to do it with the Boxer amendment. I am honored to be a cosponsor.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in decrying the tone of modern politics where there are all too many personal attacks. But what they fail to recognize is those who volunteer to put ourselves up for public office, to run for public office, we know what we are going to be subjected to in the back and forth of a political campaign. What this amendment seeks to do, what the Boxer amendment seeks to do, is to change the subject. The subject is this ad. The subject of my amendment is this ad put in the New York Times on September 9, 2007, attacking a four-star general wearing the uniform of the U.S. Army, the Commander of the Multi-National Forces in Iraq—not only this individual, but everyone under his command, 170,000, approximately, members of the U.S. military.

What does it accuse him of? Cooking the books for the White House. The ad asks: Is it General Petraeus or General Betray Us? My friends on the other side of the aisle want to change the subject. They do not want to confront organizations such as MoveOn.org, which have the right to express their view thanks to the first amendment of the Constitution, thanks to people like General Petraeus and the brave men and women of the U.S. military who protect moveOn.Org's right to have its say. But we ought to have our say, too, and to condemn, in the strongest possible words and by our actions, this kind of irresponsible ad. It is clear, according to the New York Times Magazine of September 9, this was a part of an orchestrated effort, both on the Hill and off the Hill, to disparage this general before he even had a chance to make his report to the Congress.

The Boxer amendment, with all due respect, is an effort to change the subject, is a smokescreen to try to distract colleagues on the floor from holding MoveOn.org and those who would slander and by character assassination attack the reputation of leaders of the U.S. military who are doing nothing more than their duty and what the Commander in Chief and this Congress asks them to do. This is an attempt to excuse this kind of conduct by trying to change the subject. I would urge my colleagues to reject it.

Frankly, if colleagues are going to vote against my amendment, it will be tantamount to saying this kind of character assassination is okay. It is my hope that on a bipartisan basis we would rise up and we would say it is not okay, it is unacceptable.

If, in fact, there are colleagues who think the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from California is going to be a fig leaf, well, I tell you, it is not big enough, as most fig leaves are, to cover up the shame that will be on this body if we see colleagues vote against—basically vote for this kind of irresponsible ad.

There is a difference in kind, and I hope colleagues would, on calm reflection, recognize the differences between those of us who run for public office and hold public office, and while we may all decry the kinds of personal attacks that have become all too common in political campaigns, it is a difference in kind for MoveOn.org and those who support them to make personal attacks against a four star general in the U.S. military commanding 170,000 American military servicemembers in a war zone in Iraq.

It is my hope that colleagues would vote unanimously for the amendment which I have offered and reject the Boxer amendment as an attempt to change the subject and obscure the fact that this shameful ad is out there without the disapproval, so far, of this body.

I think we all recognize that political campaigns are different. We do not necessarily like them, but we are all volunteers, and we volunteer to subject ourselves, unfortunately, to the tone of modern political campaigns today. I wish we could change it, and if there was a way to do so, I would support that effort. But I do not support the Boxer amendment because it fails to recognize the key distinction between those who are public figures by choice and those who are public figures by duty, people such as General Petraeus. It is a shame that we have not been able to get a vote yet on this amendment, but I am glad we will here in the next few minutes. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment on this character assassination against this good man and to vote against the Boxer amendment for the reasons I mentioned.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I might say that my friend and colleague—maybe he didn't read the Boxer amendment because we specifically pointed to the Petraeus ad, and we say, in fact, that it was an unwarranted personal attack. I will just tell you right now, if my colleague wants to vote no on all such attacks, whether it is against General Batiste or Zinni, then vote no on the Boxer amendment. If you want to vote no on the amendment that says two things here—we reaffirm our strong support for all the men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces, and we strongly condemn all attacks on the honor, integrity, and patriotism of any individual who is serving as or has honorably served in the U.S. Armed Forces by any person or organization—if my friend wants to vote against this, then so be it because just to attack one organization and not look at the larger problem of what is happening out there in our country seems to me a political vendetta and nothing more.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to Senator LEVIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I wish to join with Senator BOXER in saying that there is no way I know of that one can justify or rationalize the attacks on Senator Cleland or on Senator KERRY. You can't, I believe, do that by saying: Oh, no, they are in a political campaign; therefore, we can impugn their service because they run for office. To say it is different to impugn the honor of veterans such as Senator Cleland and Senator KERRY, it seems to me, is totally unacceptable. It is an effort to justify, differentiate, rationalize attacks which I consider to be abhorrent, just as I do the attack on General Petraeus, and I have said so very publicly. And this amendment, the Boxer amendment, makes it very clear that attacks on men and women who have worn the uniform honorably, attacking their service, their patriotism—this was not an attack on Senator Cleland's politics; this was an attack on his patriotism. Aligning him with Osama bin Laden in an ad is an attack on his patriotism. You can't just single out one attack which you dislike—and we all do, I hope; I hope we all condemn the ad in the New York Times. I have personally, and I feel very personal about it. I thought it was a disgraceful ad. But you can't just then say: But we are not going to talk about other attacks on men and women who have put their lives on the line, given up parts of their body, because they decide to run for public office.

No, I am afraid the Cornyn amendment is the effort to justify and rationalize something which cannot be justified or rationalized just because a veteran who has served honorably, put his life on the line, decides to run for public office. They are all disgraceful ads, and we ought to treat them the same way. They impugn the honor, integrity, and patriotism of real heroes.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four and a half minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I offered this resolution on the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill about 10 days ago, and it was objected to at that time, so that is the reason I am back again today and yesterday. It took until today for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come up with some reason not to support this amendment which condemns this ad against this four star general who wears the uniform of the U.S. Army and commands 170,000 soldiers currently serving in harm's way in Iraq.

There is too much venom and too much poison in the political arena today. I do not like it any more than my colleagues on the other side. But we have a tradition in this country of, after the campaigns are over, trying to work together in the best interests of the American people. That is what we all try to do despite our differences, despite our party affiliation. But I would think we ought to rise up unanimously and condemn this character assassination of General Petraeus. And the fact

that political campaigns in 2002 and 2004 involved ads that I think we all would find over the line as far as the political discourse in a contested election should not detract from or dilute our condemnation of this particular ad.

You know, there is an unfortunate trend in our society today by people refusing to take personal responsibility for their conduct by saying: Well, we ought to condemn everybody, as if we should not condemn those individuals and those organizations which have clearly crossed the line in this case by saying: Well, we have to condemn everybody.

Well, I think this is the place to start, by condemning this ad, this irresponsible ad run in the New York Times at a discount by that organization, by that business entity, in favor of MoveOn.org, for the kind of ad I would hope we would unanimously condemn. Rather than relitigating political campaigns in the past, my hope is we would vote for this amendment and vote against the Boxer amendment.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

I ask the Senator from Texas, I was down here yesterday spending quite a bit of time on this particular issue. I was not aware the Senator from California was going to come in with her amendment. I assume the first vote we have is going to be on the Boxer amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. INHOFE. Well, let me just suggest to you, I think if the defining moment—if you really agreed with what MoveOn.org did and what they said and how they demeaned one of the finest officers in the history of this country—the guy has a Ph.D. from Princeton; he is not just a normal person. The guy was unanimously agreed to and supported by the group here to go and do this work and take over the war in Iraq. This is the right guy for the right time. Huge successes are taking place.

I listened with some interest this morning to the House Foreign Relations subcommittee proceedings yesterday, and the very people who were complaining that General Petraeus consulted with the White House to come up with his information are now saying he should have consulted with White House and did not do it. You can't have it both ways.

I would just say this: The vote we are about to take is not a vote on an amendment by Senator BOXER; it is a vote as to whether you agree with MoveOn.org coming in and saying the things they have articulated about one of our top military leaders. That is what the vote is all about.

I urge everyone to oppose the Boxer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, when General Petraeus was confirmed, the majority leader called him a great man. My colleague from California referred to him as an amazing man, saying: Of course I listen to General Petraeus.

The Senator from Delaware said: I do not know anyone better than Petraeus. This is the thanks he gets after 9 months of service in Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 343 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Johnson	Obama
Bingaman	Kennedy	Pryor
Boxer	Kerry	Reed
Brown	Klobuchar	Reid
Byrd	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cardin	Landrieu	Salazar
Carper	Lautenberg	Sanders
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Clinton	Levin	Specter
Conrad	Lieberman	Stabenow
Dodd	Lincoln	Tester
Dorgan	McCaskill	Webb
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagel	Murray	

NAYS—47

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Barrasso	Dole	McCain
Bennett	Domenici	McConnell
Bond	Ensign	Murkowski
Brownback	Enzi	Roberts
Bunning	Feingold	Sessions
Burr	Graham	Shelby
Chambliss	Grassley	Smith
Coburn	Gregg	Snowe
Cochran	Hatch	Stevens
Coleman	Hutchison	Sununu
Collins	Inhofe	Thune
Corker	Isakson	Vitter
Cornyn	Kyl	Voinovich
Craig	Lott	Warner
Crapo	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—3

Allard	Biden	Cantwell

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 47. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is withdrawn.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on rollcall No. 343, I voted ''yea.'' I intended to vote ''nay.'' Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote. This will not affect the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

AMENDMENT NO. 2934

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior a vote in relation the amendment No. 2934, offered by the Senator from Texas.

The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to proceed for a few minutes on my leader time.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been more than a week since the junior Senator from Texas offered an amendment condemning an ad by MoveOn.org that appeared last Monday in the New York Times.

The ad was, by any standard—by any standard—abhorrent. It accused a four-star general, who has the trust and respect of 160,000 men and women in Iraq, of betraying that mission and those troops, of lying to them and to us.

Who would have ever expected anybody would go after a general in the field at a time of war, launch a smear campaign against a man we have entrusted with our mission in Iraq?

Any group that does this sort of thing ought to be condemned.

Let's take sides: General Petraeus or MoveOn.org. Which one are we going to believe? Which one are we going to condemn? That is the choice.

MoveOn says he is a traitor. If we believe that, we should condemn him. If we do not believe that, then we ought to be condemning them, not him.

Now, here is what we know about this group. I will bet you a lot of our Democratic colleagues do not know everything MoveOn is for. I think you probably know they try to come to your aid from time to time, but I bet you do not know everything they advocate.

In the days after the terrorist attacks of September 11, it urged—MoveOn.org urged—a pacifist response to al-Qaida.

They rejected the idea that governments should be held responsible for terrorists such as al-Qaida who operate within their borders.

This is the group that called defeating the PATRIOT Act ''a success story,'' the group that ran an ad on its Web site equating the President to Adolf Hitler, the group that thinks organizations such as the U.N. will rid the world of al-Qaida.

That is MoveOn.org. This is what we are dealing with. I cannot believe those are the views of a vast majority of my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Now, what do we know about General Petraeus? Commander of the Multi-National Force-Iraq; been in Iraq for about 4 years; literally wrote the U.S. counterinsurgency manual; commanded the 101st Airborne Division