

Federal poverty guideline of \$16,600 for a family of three. We should be ashamed of our Nation that we have reached this point where we ignore what we are doing to people because of this minimum wage.

Let me add that I salute our Governor in Illinois who, through the State legislation, increased Illinois' minimum wage so that we pay more to workers. But clearly we need to do this across the Nation and not leave it to the leadership of Governors. We should show leadership in Congress.

Raising the minimum wage is going to help the economy, too. A lot of people argue otherwise. Whether it be raising the Federal or State minimum wage, history shows that it doesn't have a negative impact on the economy. That is the argument which has been used against the minimum wage since Roosevelt first created it; that if you raise the minimum wage to \$1 an hour—or whatever it happened to be in the earliest days of the history of this legislation—somehow jobs would be eliminated because people would say that rather than pay a dollar an hour, they will hire fewer employees. That is always the argument, and that argument fails every time when we look at the impact of an increase in the minimum wage.

In the 4 years after the last Federal minimum wage increase passed in Congress, the economy experienced its strongest growth in over 30 years. Nearly 12 million new jobs were added in the late 1990s—almost a quarter of a million a month. So as we raised the minimum wage, the number of jobs didn't shrink, it dramatically increased—exactly the opposite of what the critics of increasing the minimum wage have argued for 60 years or more.

The last raise in the minimum wage did not have a negative impact on my State's economy when the State of Illinois sought a minimum wage increase. The fact is, in the 4 years after Congress passed the last Federal increase, Illinois experienced great economic growth. Over 350,000 new jobs were added to the State's economy. Even the retail industry, which is often cited as the industry most sensitive to the minimum wage, saw over 44,000 new jobs created in Illinois 4 years after the increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Research shows that other States experienced similar impacts.

A study by the Fiscal Policy Institute of 10 States that raised the minimum wage above the Federal rate found that both total employment and employment in the retail sector grew more rapidly in higher minimum wage States.

And for small businesses with fewer than 50 employees, the number of businesses, employment, and the size of the total payroll grew faster in higher minimum wage States than in States where the lower minimum wage prevailed, exactly the opposite of what critics say if you raise the minimum wage: you are going to hurt the retail

sector; they are going to have to shut down their businesses. Exactly the opposite has happened time and again.

The minimum wage needs to be updated. In contrast to the first 4 years after the Federal minimum wage took effect and created jobs, in the last 4 years under the Bush administration the minimum wage has held steady while its real value has steadily declined, and only 4.7 million jobs have been created.

It is one thing for politicians to give lofty speeches about values and family values. It is another thing to look at the rollover on the minimum wage and ask those same Members who are pontificating about the guidance—the divine guidance—that brings them to this Chamber and then systematically voting against the poorest among us. That, to me, is a shame and something we should remedy by adopting the Kennedy amendment.

We force a lot of hard-working Americans and their families to work longer hours, work harder to pay for the necessities. That is time away from their children, time away from just a little relaxation so they can put their lives together and face another hard week of work.

In Illinois, a worker earning the minimum wage has to work 95 hours a week to afford a two-bedroom apartment. Mr. President, 11.9 percent of Illinois residents live in poverty, and an unacceptably low minimum wage is part of the problem.

Over 20 States, including Illinois, have taken upon themselves to raise the minimum wage and give an economic boost to their citizens. After the State of Illinois raised the minimum wage in January of 2005 to \$6.50, Illinois nonfarm employment increased by 79,800 jobs. It didn't go down in Illinois after the minimum wage went up. It increased.

Since the State raised the minimum wage, Illinois has ranked No. 1 among all Midwest States in the total number of new jobs.

Illinois employers have created 30,000 new jobs in the traditionally lower paying, higher proportion minimum wage industry sectors of leisure, hospitality, and trade.

The minimum wage amendment we are debating today would give a raise to 333,000 workers in Illinois.

It has been more than 9 years since the minimum wage workers last saw an increase in their wages. It is a delicate subject and one that Members of Congress do not want to discuss, but I think we have to be very honest about it. While we have consistently, year after year, denied an increase in the minimum wage to the poorest, hardest working Americans, we have every year without fail increased congressional pay. Our salaries have gone up while we have ignored the plight of the poorest among us.

During the 9 years that Congress has raised its own pay by \$31,600, we have not increased the minimum wage for

the poorest workers in America. It isn't fair.

How can we continue to turn a blind eye to these people who get up and work hard every day? Who are they? They are the people who took the dishes off your table at the restaurant this morning. They are the ones who made the bed at the hotel after you left. They are the ones who are watching your kids at the day-care center. They are the same ones who are watching your parents at the nursing home. They are the ones who are making sure your golf course is perfect when you go out to play golf. And they are the ones who get up every single day and do these hard jobs for very little pay.

Why in the world are we sitting here ignoring the obvious? If you value families and you value workers, you should value work. To hold the minimum wage at \$5.15 an hour for 9 years is shameful, and it should change.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment that is going to be offered by Senator KENNEDY. I am happy to be a cosponsor of that amendment.

Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the Democratic side in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEMINT). There is 1 minute remaining.

---

#### IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, later this week as part of the debate on the Defense authorization bill, we will talk about Iraq. That a timely issue. As of last week, there have been 2,500 soldiers' lives lost in Iraq since the beginning of this conflict. What was promised to the American people to be a rather uncomplicated effort by America to rid Iraq of a dictator has turned out to be a war that has gone on for 3 years with no end in sight.

This week the Senate will have a chance to say to the Iraqi people that as of the middle of next year, this becomes your responsibility. We will give you 12 months and more American lives and more American dollars and then, Iraq, you have to stand up and defend yourself. If you believe in the future of your Nation, it has to go beyond an election, go beyond political debate. It has to reach the point where Iraqi citizens are prepared to stand, defend, and die, if necessary, for their own country.

There are 130,000 American lives on the line today and every day. We have to serve notice on the Iraqis that their future has to be in their hands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 7 minutes in morning business.

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

---

#### IRAQ

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I heard the distinguished deputy minority

leader speak last Friday morning in about a 15-minute speech, and he just added another minute, about Iraq. So I come to the floor to address the specific points the distinguished Senator just raised and the potential amendments that will be offered on the floor.

I want to tell you about the flashback that went through my mind as I sat in that chair and listened to that speech. The flashback was to my generation's war in the 1960s and 1970s in Vietnam. The flashback was to what I remember started in 1970 and culminated in 1972.

I commend my staff, in particular Andrew Billing, for spending the weekend accumulating the speeches on the floor of the Senate from August of 1970 to May of 1972, speeches by Cranston and McGovern and KENNEDY and BYRD and Humphrey. They talked about it was time for us to start withdrawing, first not on a time certain, but by just a certain number of troops, until the crescendo built so loud over 18 months it became a date certain, August 31, 1972.

The debate on the Senate floor drove the policy of the United States of America against communism and in defense of freedom, and all of us remember what happened. The first steps were it wasn't a date certain, it was 120,000 troops, and we went from a half million to 380,000 and then to 240,000, and then when we got to 240,000, the resolution became: Withdraw by August 31, 1972.

Anyone who was alive on that date who remembers that scene remembers precisely what happened: the last of the Americans to leave Saigon on the roof of our Nation's embassy being shot at by the Vietcong as they were climbing a rope ladder into a Huey helicopter.

We lost over 50,000 American lives in Vietnam and a lot of them between the beginning of that debate to withdraw in August of 1970 until the end of it in August of 1972.

I know there is a proposed amendment, probably by the Senator from Michigan, that will begin the same way the amendments began over 30 years ago on this Senate floor: not a date certain, but a scaling down of our commitment. And to that I want to address the damage that will do to our effort.

First and foremost, it hands a victory to our enemy they cannot win on the battlefield. The terrorists have said it is to psychologically destroy the will of America that they want to win the battle. They know they can't win it on the battlefield. Why should we begin to question our resolve and, worst of all, why should we repeat the horrible mistake of the way in which we managed our conflict in the seventies?

It is time we recognized that we are winning a great victory for mankind, not just the Iraqi people; that America went to enforce a U.N. resolution when the U.N. would not; that we deposed a dictator that everybody said was bad. We won in Afghanistan over the

Taliban, and we are winning in Iraq today over the insurgency headed by al-Qaida.

Have some of us forgotten 9/11/2001? Have we forgotten the USS *Cole*? Have we forgotten the fatwa issued in 1996 when war was declared by al-Qaida on the United States of America? Most Americans haven't.

I want to conclude by three little stories about the past month in my life.

I stood on the courthouse steps in Walton County, GA, this Saturday welcoming home eight members of the 48th Brigade from Iraq. I stood there with all the citizens of Monroe and Walton Counties cheering them on—all the citizens, including Robert Stokely, the father of SGT Mike Stokely who died in August of 2005 in Iraq. He came up and gave me Michael's dog tag, hugged me, grabbed my hand, and he welcomed home those eight soldiers, knowing that his son, Michael, the ninth, was not home with them, but he was proud of his effort.

Let's make sure Michael didn't die in vain. Let's not lose our resolve on the floor of the Senate.

The second incident I want to describe is what happened yesterday in the Atlanta airport. I was late. I was running for my flight. I went through the atrium. All of a sudden a huge round of applause erupted. I stopped. I didn't know what in the world was going on. I turned and looked, and there marched about 30 members of the United States Army in their desert fatigues on the way to an airplane, probably on their way to Iraq, and all those citizens in that airport from around the world flying through Atlanta stopped to give them a standing ovation.

I don't think those people would want us to set deadlines, timetables, and withdraw from the ultimate battle.

And my last analogy is in Margraten in the Netherlands 3 weeks ago when Senators CRAIG, SPECTER, BURR, and myself sat on a beautiful sun-lit day before 7,000 Dutch in the American Cemetery in the Netherlands as the Royal Dutch Air Force flew over in a missing-man formation and as the Royal Dutch Senior Man's Choir sang "God Bless America."

I stood there for the better part of an hour having my hand shook by citizens of Holland thanking me for what Americans did 62 years ago when they invaded Normandy, fought the Battle of the Bulge, and deposed Adolph Hitler.

There is nothing different about the hatred and intolerance for humanity, race, and religion of Adolph Hitler and the intolerance for race, religion, and faith of al-Qaida. The battle is just as great. The warriors may be different, the site may be different, the methodology may be different, but the result would be the same.

Had we not stayed the course in the 1940s, the world would have lost. If we do not stay the course today, if we turn our back, the world will lose again.

Once again, the sons and daughters of the United States of America are fight-

ing the right war in the right place at the right time for the right reason. For us to talk about timetables or suggest drawdowns or compromise our commitment is just plain wrong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I compliment our distinguished colleague from Georgia for his remarks. I hope throughout the day colleagues on both sides will address this critical issue with regard to our future policies in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, it is amazing to me that less than a week after the President returned from Iraq, having visited with the new Government leaders there, and having disclosed the death of the top al-Qaida leader Zarqawi, in Iraq, colleagues in the Senate would actually be proposing withdrawal from Iraq.

The strategy there needs to be to win, not to withdraw. Withdrawal follows victory. If we think about the wars we have gone into—think about World War II, for example—would it have made any sense for the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution saying to Franklin Roosevelt: You set a deadline for getting out of Germany and for getting out of Japan or we are not going to continue to support this effort? It would have been ludicrous at the time. More importantly, it sends a message to our troops, to our enemies, and to our allies, and to the people in Iraq that is devastating.

Let me read a letter that was written by one of our soldiers stationed in Fallujah recently to his hometown newspaper in Ridgefield, CT, which expresses what I suspect is the view of many of our soldiers. Here is what he said:

In Fallujah, the people watch Al-Jazeera. However, they also watch CNN. A lot of them fear the United States will soon cut and run. . . . Furthermore, they know that the insurgents will not end their efforts early . . . Therefore, if they help us, their lives and the lives of their loved ones will be in great jeopardy the minute we leave—if we don't finish the job. Much that they see on American television leads them to believe that we intend to abandon our efforts before the new Iraqi Government is capable of defending itself and its citizens.

The bottom line is that the people in Iraq watch what we do, our friends and our enemies, and much of our ability to win there depends upon figuring out which is going to be the winning side. They want to be on the winning side. They don't want to side with us only to have us cut and run, leaving them with these insurgents who will find out who they are and take care of business. Obviously, we have to send a message to them that we intend to prevail and therefore they can side with us.

What we will learn is that much of our ability to get al-Zarqawi and others depends upon the cooperation of the

Iraqis themselves. A lot of our intelligence comes from the fact that Iraqis believe we are there to stay until the job is done, and if they help us, they can hasten that day. But if they come to believe that they help us, we leave, and then the insurgents find out who they are, we are not going to get any more help. It is going to delay the time that we can leave rather than accelerate that time.

The people in the region, the countries that surround Iraq, would be in the very same position. They have decided that they are going to be on the side of the winner, and they believe right now the United States is the winner in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and certainly the leaders of Pakistan, of Saudi Arabia, of Lebanon, each of the countries surrounding has decided to throw in with us. As the President said, you are either for us or against us. If we cut and run from Iraq, those countries are not going to be able to stay with us, and what we will have done is to prove what Osama bin Laden said is true, and that is that instead of the strong horse, we are the weak horse. That is what the people in the region are waiting to see.

So these concepts—whether it is an immediate withdrawal or simply the beginning of a phased withdrawal this year, with the President being required to submit a plan for complete withdrawal by the end of next year—are all part and parcel of the same thing: a message to the enemy that we are leaving and here is our timetable for leaving. All you have to do is wait until we are gone and then it is yours for the taking. That is not just destructive for the Iraqi people; the whole point is that it is destructive for our whole policy in winning the war against the terrorists.

They have to believe we are on the offensive, we are going after them, and we won't quit until we win. But by pulling out of Iraq, we are sending the signal that by simply hanging on, by causing us trouble with roadside bombs and other mechanisms, all they have to do is wait us out; we will lose patience, we will lose nerve, we will leave, and that is how they win the war on terror.

So it is not just about the Iraqi people and their ability to govern themselves in freedom or the people of Afghanistan; it is about the message it sends to the people who are today with us in the war on terror. It is about our ability to continue to show that we are winning the war on terror, and that they better side with us rather than side with people who are going to lose. It is all about winning the war over there so that we don't have to worry as much about attacks in the United States.

This is a multifaceted war. There are enemies all over the globe. The best way to win that war is through good intelligence and then taking the fight to the enemy. Right now, the bulk of that fighting is in Iraq, and it is there that we have to confront the enemy and defeat the enemy. If we pull out

through these sort of sugar-coated notions of phased withdrawals—not a deadline—not cut and run—it is just a phased withdrawal, what kind of a signal does that send? It still creates a date, a timetable, and a message to the enemy that we are, in fact, going to be leaving, and all they have to do is wait us out.

So I say to my colleagues, these kinds of proposals should be soundly rejected as they were last week, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and we should be sending the signal to our troops, as well as to our enemies and to our allies: we are there to stay until victory, not until we achieve some artificial deadline.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contributions to this debate. I simply would add this one very important thought I have had all along. This has been a struggle of a nation to achieve its place in the world of governments of democracy. They have had—if there is one sign of courage amongst the Iraqi people, and today regrettably there is so much strife and killing, but these people have gone to the polls in record numbers three consecutive times. You need only look at history and the difficulty of forming a government to say that the newly elected government, a permanent government now, at long last, is a unified government, and it has been achieved in a matter of months. They were tough months, to wait them out. It is interesting that it took 8 years in a way for this great Nation of ours to achieve the final form of government that we have today.

So the Iraqi Government is in place, and we must recognize it is a sovereign nation, and they have to make decisions on their own. The Iraqi people cannot perceive that we are dictating how they will exercise their sovereignty. We are committed to stay there with our forces and the coalition forces to enable them to exercise their choice and the means by which to provide sovereignty for their people.

So I thank my distinguished colleague, and I think this will, in the hours and days to come, unfold into a very strong and vigorous debate on these issues. But in the end, always allow the beacon of sovereignty, which we have enabled through enormous sacrifice to allow them to achieve, to be the beacon that we must follow.

Mr. President, I understand that my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island is prepared to address the Senate for a period of 20 minutes or so is my understanding, and if that is in accordance with the wishes of my ranking member, he may so state.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would ask the Senator from Rhode Island, who is under a unanimous consent agreement to be recognized for 20 minutes, to yield to me for 2 minutes.

Mr. REED. I will yield.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I noticed Senator KYL again uses rhetoric which

they apparently have decided will be used no matter what the facts of any particular proposal are. I would just point out in this morning's Washington Post that Mr. al-Rubaie, who is the National Security Adviser for Iraq, has argued that by year's end, we envision the U.S. troop presence to be under 100,000. That would be at least a 30,000 reduction. I wonder whether people, or Senators, who are going to mischaracterize the Levin-Reed et al amendment are going to also then suggest that the Security Adviser to the new Prime Minister of Iraq supports cut and run when he says that they envision a reduction of American troops to be below 100,000 by the end of this year, and he sets forth in this morning's Washington Post all of the reasons it is so important that foreign troops be redeployed, including to legitimize Iraq's Government in the eyes of its people.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article written by the Security Adviser to the new Prime Minister, Mr. al-Rubaie, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post]

THE WAY OUT OF IRAQ: A ROAD MAP

(By Mowaffak al-Rubaie)

There has been much talk about a withdrawal of U.S. and coalition troops from Iraq, but no defined timeline has yet been set. There is, however, an unofficial "road map" to foreign troop reductions that will eventually lead to total withdrawal of U.S. troops. This road map is based not just on a series of dates but, more important, on the achievement of set objectives for restoring security in Iraq.

Iraq has a total of 18 governorates, which are at differing stages in terms of security. Each will eventually take control of its own security situation, barring a major crisis. But before this happens, each governorate will have to meet stringent minimum requirements as a condition of being granted control. For example, the threat assessment of terrorist activities must be low or on a downward trend. Local police and the Iraqi army must be deemed capable of dealing with criminal gangs, armed groups and militias, and border control. There must be a clear and functioning command-and-control center overseen by the governor, with direct communication to the prime minister's situation room.

Despite the seemingly endless spiral of violence in Iraq today, such a plan is already in place. All the governors have been notified and briefed on the end objective. The current prime minister, Nouri al-Maliki, has approved the plan, as have the coalition forces, and assessments of each province have already been done. Nobody believes this is going to be an easy task, but there is Iraqi and coalition resolve to start taking the final steps to have a fully responsible Iraqi government accountable to its people for their governance and security. Thus far four of the 18 provinces are ready for the transfer of power—two in the north (Irbil and Sulaymaniyah) and two in the South (Maysan and Muthanna). Nine more provinces are nearly ready.

With the governors of each province meeting these strict objectives, Iraq's ambition is to have full control of the country by the end of 2008. In practice this will mean significant foreign troop reduction. We envisage

the U.S. troop presence by year's end to the under 100,000, with most of the remaining troops to return home by the end of 2007.

The eventual removal of coalition troops from Iraq streets will help the Iraqis, who now see foreign troops as occupiers rather than the liberators they were meant to be. It will remove psychological barriers and the reason that many Iraqis joined the so-called resistance in the first place. The removal of troops will also allow the Iraqi government to engage with some of our neighbors that have to date been at the very least sympathetic to the resistance because of what they call the "coalition of occupation." If the sectarian issue continues to cause conflict with Iraq's neighbors, this matter needs to be addressed urgently and openly—not in the guise of aversion to the presence of foreign troops.

Moreover, the removal of foreign troops will legitimize Iraq's government in the eyes of its people. It has taken what some feel is an eternity to form a government of national unity. This has not been an easy or enviable task, but it represents a significant achievement, considering that many new ministers are working in partisan situations, often with people with whom they share a history of enmity and distrust. By its nature, the government of national unity, because it is working through consensus, could be perceived to be weak. But, again, the drawdown of foreign troops will strengthen our fledgling government to last the full four years it is supposed to.

While Iraq is trying to gain its independence from the United States and the coalition, in terms of taking greater responsibility for its actions, particularly in terms of security, there are still some influential foreign figures trying to spoon-feed our government and take a very proactive role in many key decisions. Through this many provide some benefits in the short term, in the long run it will only serve to make the Iraqi government a weaker one and eventually lead to a culture of dependency. Iraq has to grow out of the shadow of the United States and the coalition, take responsibility for its own decisions, learn from its own mistakes, and find Iraqi solutions to Iraqi problems, with the knowledge that our friends and allies are standing by with support and help should we need it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after Senator REED is recognized—the chairman and I have talked about this—at that point, the Dorgan amendment be the matter before the Senate. I believe that the Senator from Virginia and I have agreed that Senator DORGAN would be recognized for 10 minutes, to be followed then by the chairman for 5 minutes, and the intention then would be to proceed to a rollcall vote.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are fully in concurrence as managers, but I would like to have the benefit of our leaders and the respective staff working up a unanimous consent agreement precisely outlining that. Then, as I further discussed with my colleague from Michigan, we had hopes that the matter raised by the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, in which he had an amendment relating to the issue of amnesty, be addressed together with the side-by-side amendment by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL. So I hope that while hearing from our colleague from Rhode Island addressing the Senate, we can have a formalized UC agreement.

I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2766, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2766), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 4241, to name the Act after John Warner, a Senator from Virginia.

Nelson of Florida/Menendez amendment No. 4265, to express the sense of Congress that the Government of Iraq should not grant amnesty to persons known to have attacked, killed, or wounded members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

McConnell amendment No. 4272, to commend the Iraqi Government for affirming its positions of no amnesty for terrorists who have attacked U.S. forces.

Dorgan amendment No. 4292, to establish a special committee of the Senate to investigate the awarding and carrying out of contracts to conduct activities in Afghanistan and Iraq and to fight the war on terrorism.

Kennedy amendment No. 4322, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Frist amendment No. 4323 (to Amendment No. 4322), to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, shall be recognized to speak for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise this morning to discuss the fiscal year 2007 Defense authorization bill. I am glad it is on the floor. It is very important legislation, and it is arriving in a timely manner where we can dispose of it along with the other body and hopefully conclude in the next few weeks with a finalized Defense authorization bill.

I would also note that this is Senator WARNER's last bill as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I personally want to commend him and thank him for his leadership, not only as the chairman of this committee, but as a young sailor, a young marine, and a more mature Secretary of the Navy, and now a mature Member of the United States Senate. So thank you, Senator, for your leadership and friendship.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island. I appreciate his remarks, a Senator with a

very distinguished military record of his own, and quite modest about it. But at some point I would love to have a colloquy with the Senator on why Rhode Island—we are talking about sovereignty and the formation of governments—about why did they hold out those many years before ratifying the Constitution? At some point, could the two of us have a colloquy about that?

Mr. REED. I would be happy to do that, in the future.

I would like to highlight some of the aspects of the bill which I think are very important. I have had the privilege of working with Senator CORNYN as the ranking member of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee. It has been a real pleasure. He has conducted the committee with great efficiency and great cooperation. The staff has been particularly helpful on a bipartisan basis.

I am pleased to note that in the context of our deliberations, several important measures were included in this legislation. First, we have authorized an additional \$400 million for science and technology programs. The original request sent by the Department of Defense was woefully inadequate. Science and technology is the key to our future on the battlefield as we match the skill and valor of our soldiers with the very best technology. We have to continue this investment. I am pleased that our legislation increases that item by \$400 million.

Also, the bill includes language to require a report to Congress on the testing policies and practices that should be pursued with respect to rapid acquisition programs, spiral development programs, quick reaction fielding programs, and the testing for safety and survivability of deployed equipment. One of the weaknesses, I believe, with the present approach of the Department of Defense is a failure to adequately test and evaluate, and I think that failure has to be corrected and this report will, I hope, put attention on this issue and lead to positive results.

The legislation also urges the Department of Defense to identify and nominate an individual to serve as the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. This position has been vacant since January 2005. It is a critical position. This individual is the key independent personality in the Department of Defense to look at the testing and evaluation of new equipment. Without this position, the testing emphasis is woefully inadequate in the Department of Defense.

As we put new systems into the military, we have to ensure that these systems are adequately tested. Without an individual with that responsibility and that position and posture within the Department of Defense, we are not providing the appropriate personality and mechanism to do the job.

The bill also establishes the Joint Technology Office to coordinate all DOD hypersonics research programs in