

© 2007 CBS Broadcasting Inc.  
All Rights Reserved

*PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS CBS  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "CBS NEWS' FACE THE NATION. "*

*CBS News*

# ***FACE THE NATION***

*Sunday, February 18, 2007*

**GUESTS:** Senator JOSEPH BIDEN (D-DE)  
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee;  
2008 Presidential Candidate

Senator RICHARD LUGAR (R-IN)  
Foreign Relations Committee  
DOYLE McMANUS  
Washington Bureau Chief,  
The Los Angeles Times

JOSEPHINE HEARN  
The Politico

**MODERATOR:** BOB SCHIEFFER - CBS News

*This is a rush transcript provided  
for the information and convenience of  
the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed.  
In case of doubt, please check with*

**FACE THE NATION - CBS NEWS  
202-457-4481**

BOB SCHIEFFER, host:

Today on FACE THE NATION, the Senate fails again to take a stand on the war. Yesterday in a rare Saturday session, Republicans spared the president a rebuke by blocking a vote on his war policy. So what's next? Will Democrats try to cut funding for sending more troops to the war zone? And what about Iran and that proposed new deal with North Korea on nuclear weapons? We'll talk with the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Democratic presidential candidate Joe Biden of Delaware, and the ranking Republican on the committee, Dick Lugar of Indiana. Then we'll talk about the politics of all of this with Doyle McManus of The Los Angeles Times, and Josephine Hearn of Politico.com. I'll have a final word on how we can really support our troops in Iraq.

But first, debating the war on FACE THE NATION.

Announcer: FACE THE NATION, with CBS News chief Washington correspondent Bob Schieffer. And now, from CBS News in Washington, Bob Schieffer.

SCHIEFFER: And good morning again. Senator Lugar is with us here in the studio this morning. Out in Cedar Falls, Iowa, Senator Joe Biden.

Well, gentlemen, there is really nothing new in Iraq this morning. It's the same old story. After a little calm there, two car bombs have exploded in an outdoor market, at least 56 people have been killed, and at this point they say 127 people have been injured. This in spite of the clearing operation that's already under way.

Senator Lugar, let me ask you this question: When Republicans blocked this vote yesterday on Iraq policy, they clearly saved the president an embarrassing rebuke. Do you believe this was a victory for Republicans?

Senator RICHARD LUGAR (Republican, Indiana; Foreign Relations Committee): I think the debate yesterday was an aftermath of the election last November. I say it in this context, that Democrats won both houses of Congress. They've attempted to enact an agenda in the House of Representatives by blocking amendments of Republicans, they felt that was the aftermath of the election. And in the same way, to really extend in the Senate, Democrats have done this. And at the heart of this, Iraq was a very large issue in the campaign. For many of the new members who won, Iraq was the big issue, the reason why they got there. Now, they want to make a statement about that.

At the same time, and Nancy Pelosi characterized this very well, they don't want to go overboard about this. That is, to get into debates about supporting the troops, not want a Vietnam situation again, or funding for the troops. In other words, this only works for Democrats if you keep it to the single issue of the surge and try to focus it on the president, who Democrats perceive is unpopular currently with approvals in the 30 percentile range. And they also note that the surge is opposed by 63 percent of Americans. However, funding for the troops, Americans are in favor by the same 63 the

other way. So if you're going to have a debate, you want to have it on your issue and block out the Republicans who wanted to talk about supporting the troops and funding for the troops.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator Biden, how do you feel about what happened yesterday?

Senator JOSEPH BIDEN (Democrat, Delaware; Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee; 2008 Presidential Candidate): Well, look. The American people, I think are right. Iraq, Iraq, Iraq, Iraq, and they want us to discuss it, they want us to debate it. I was disappointed, quite frankly. It's clear that even the--I think, that a significant number of Republicans think the president is going in the wrong direction. I just am sad that we didn't have a debate. I think it's more the voices than the votes that are going to make a difference, and the only way the president is likely to begin to rethink what he's doing is if it's clear the whole Congress disapproves of the way he's proceeding.

And the way--the way to support our troops is not to surge them in with too little and too late and in to too vast a territory, but it's to have some hard-headed diplomacy to get a political solution. That's what's going to save the troops, a political solution. And the president seems not to want to discuss that at all. And we get into this whole discussion, Bob, about, you know, funding and caps and all the rest. Well, the truth of the matter is that, you know, the real--there's a--there's a two-word question, what next? What after we do all those things?

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me--let me just ask you that question, what next, Senator Biden? We hear that you are preparing to offer a resolution to repeal the resolution that Congress passed at the beginning of the war which gave them the authority, gave the administration the authority to go into Iraq. Is that your plan now?

Sen. BIDEN: Yes, it is. I've been working with some of my colleagues to try to convince them that's the way to go, to repeal and restate the president's authority. Make it clear that the purpose that he has troops in there is to in fact protect against al-Qaeda gaining chunks of territory, training the Iraqi forces, force protection and for our forces. It's not to get in the midst of a civil war. And Bob, as you know, I've been on your program many times, I still believe that there is a need for a political solution, and that is based in a federal system for Iraq.

SCHIEFFER: Well...

Sen. BIDEN: And so the combination of those two things are the only way to get us through this, in my view.

SCHIEFFER: Well, let me just ask you this. Some might say it's kind of a waste of time, because the Republicans blocked a vote on what was a nonbinding resolution. Clearly, you have some Republicans that were ready to debate that yesterday, seven of them, I think. What makes you think that you have any

chance of getting something like that passed, Senator Biden, or you just think it ought to be out on the table?

Sen. BIDEN: The American people. No, I think, A, I think it ought to be out on the table, but number two, the American people. I predict to you you're going to see pressure mount, and it's going to be significant. Look, when I first called for this nonbinding resolution between Christmas and New Year's, and drafted the first one along with Senator Levin, everyone said, 'Nonbinding means nothing.' Well, why is the president working so hard? Why're the Republicans blocking the vote on it if it doesn't mean anything? You know, I can't think of a time--there may be one--where, in the midst of a war, the Congress, on a whole, wanted to repudiate an action being taken by the president. And that's a pretty strong, strong statement.

SCHIEFFER: Well...

Sen. BIDEN: And so I think public pressure's going to build, Bob.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator Lugar, do you think that sort of a resolution, to repeal the authority Congress gave to the president to go to Iraq, does that have any chance of passing?

Sen. LUGAR: I don't believe that it does, and I think the president would veto it, and the veto would be upheld. I think the point that Senator Biden is making, however, is that there is public pressure--certainly, public opinion is out there that influenced the votes that we've just seen. I would make a suggestion, and picking up from Speaker Pelosi the other day, in which she said, 'We realize this may not affect anything,' that is the nonbinding, 'but nevertheless, maybe the president will have to pay attention.' I think the president is paying attention.

I think there've been some fledgling efforts to see whether a group might be formed in a bipartisan way. Couple of them haven't worked out, and I think Speaker Pelosi herself wrote a letter to the president saying, 'If you want to have these talks, these are some of the people that ought to be there, the leadership.' But for example, perhaps the president's situation is improved if he calls on Senator Biden and Senator Levin, Senator McCain, Speaker Pelosi, for example, and says, you know, 'We are in a war. We're in a situation of rather fractured political circumstances right now, and we need to think through this situation.' I think that would be very, very helpful.

Now, at the end of the day, it could be the Republicans and Democrats, polarized by the presidential campaign, would say, 'No, we're playing for keeps, for all of it.' But at the same--my guess is that the president might make headway, and he would be well served by having a bipartisan policy which does pass, then, the House and the Senate, as really a stamp of the American people at a time in which they see the urgency of Iraq.

SCHIEFFER: Well, Senator Biden, let me just ask you quickly, would that change your mind in any way? Would that be a helpful thing for the president to do?

Sen. BIDEN: Well, I think it would be a helpful thing. As Dick Lugar knows I've asked, I've literally suggested that to the president. I suggested back around Christmastime, what we should do is just get a dozen of us, the people who are most involved in this in both parties and take us to Camp David or take us down to the White House and put our cell phones away and actually have a full-blown, open discussion about a way forward here. Look, there is no circumstance I can think of, Bob, where you have a country where there's a cycle of sectarian violence that gets stopped by other than one of three ways: either an occupying power, which we're now about to be; two, a return of a strong man, a dictator; or three, a federal system, giving the--giving the parties breathing room, like we did in Bosnia, like the Dayton Accords. And I believe there is a basis upon which we could move forward without embarrassing the president and with, in fact, really protecting our troops by getting them out, begin to get them out in a way that leaves behind something that's stable.

SCHIEFFER: Let me ask both of you about the proposal that Congressman Murtha is making, and that is that you put certain restrictions on the coming supplemental, the money that the president is asking for to pay for our situation in Iraq. He wants to do things like limit the troops there to only 12 months of duty, to stop extending the tours of those who are there, to stop extending the enlistments of people who have come into the Army. He wants a year between combat assignments, and he wants proper training and armor. He believes that that's the way to basically choke off sending more troops to Iraq.

Would you favor something like that, Senator Lugar?

Sen. LUGAR: No, I wouldn't favor it, but I would just say again that it will not be passed by two Houses and signed by the president. It is once again a debating tool which makes the point.

I just get back to the thought--both Senator Biden and I heard former Secretary of State Jim Baker before the Foreign Relations Committee talk about the Social Security compromise of roughly 1983, I think, is when this group came together on an impossible problem in a bipartisan way and miraculously came out with a solution to save Social Security at least for 20 years. We are back to the problem again. I was impressed with the fact that that came up in the context of Baker testifying about Iraq. I think we're at one of those moments again in which we really need to have that kind of thinking at the highest levels, as opposed to people playing games with unusual motions.

SCHIEFFER: Do you think Mr. Murtha's playing games here, Senator Biden? Has he got--is he on to something or not?

Sen. BIDEN: No, you know, I know Jack well and you know as well as I do that Jack's worried about a broken Army. It has--I think Jack's plan is less to do with stopping the president's plan than it has to do with saving the Army. Look, we are breaking the Army. Schonover and others have, generals, have indicated that it's in deep trouble and you cannot keep extending these

people. You cannot keep doing what you're doing here. You cannot be sending them back without the proper equipment. As The Washington Post indicated, this last surge, even in Iraq, has not fully equipped these people. What Jack's doing, is Jack's kind of--they're breaking Jack's Army. This is a guy who bleeds for the Army...

SCHIEFFER: Let me ask you...

Sen. BIDEN: ...and for the military and the Marines.

SCHIEFFER: ...let me ask you both quickly about Iran, what's going on here. We hear these reports now of Iran shipping in new and more sophisticated weapons to Iraq. The president is being very public about it. It seems to me we heard about this same thing two or three years ago. Is this repackaged information, Senator Biden, or is this something new and different than what we've been hearing about?

Sen. BIDEN: It's repackaged. Two years ago, I was briefed on this, a year ago I was briefed by General Chiarelli on these shape charges and how they're different...

SCHIEFFER: Well, why is he putting it out now then?

Sen. BIDEN: ...and how--and how...

SCHIEFFER: Why are we hearing about it again?

Sen. BIDEN: Well, you know, the--Bob, the truth is, because the president lost his credibility on a lot of this stuff, I don't know. I don't want to be cynical about it, but it worries me. And, by the way, here you have Hakim, the Shia leader, coming to the White House, visiting with the president as a possible means by which we could get accommodation in Iraq, and then a month later, the number two guy, the Quds force, the very bad guys we're talking about, is arrested in Hakim's compound in Iraq, and we let the guy go. I mean, I don't--I don't--I can't quite figure where all this is going, the direction it's turned.

Sen. BIDEN: What do you think--where do you think it's going, Senator Lugar?

Sen. LUGAR: Well, I don't think it's going anywhere. And my hope is that it would not, but I would just say, to back to what Senator Biden has said, that essentially, a good many people are very suspicious that it comes out with a thought that then we might follow Iranian soldiers, it suggests, even across the border. There might be a wipeout of the plant that makes these situations. In fact, the Shiite business between Iran and Iraq is very complex. There's no doubt that Iranians have tried to help out Shiites on there other side and sometimes we get in the--in the way and we're the targets of the whole business. But I think the fear and the debate is that this war will be extended to Iran.

SCHIEFFER: And you're not ready to invade at this moment.

Sen. LUGAR: No, no, I certainly am not. And I would hope very strongly that the diplomatic course is followed, that Europeans help some more. But clearly, we have got to go the diplomatic route.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, gentlemen, I want to thank both of you. We'll be back in a moment with our roundtable discussion.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: And we're back now with Doyle McManus of The Los Angeles Times, and Josephine Hearn of thepolitico.com, the Web site that has all politics all the time.

You all just heard the two senators in kind of an outburst of bipartisanship, saying that the president ought to get everybody together and try to work something out. Is that just talk? Would something like that actually change anything, Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE McMANUS (Washington Bureau Chief, The Los Angeles Times): Well, it's a wonderful idea, and it's the sort of thing that's characteristic of Dick Lugar and Joe Biden, but it's not going to work. As Senator Lugar said, we're already in an election campaign. Neither party really can get to that high point of bipartisanship. I think the larger question here is that both parties are divided over this war. There's a danger there for the Democrats if Congressman Murtha goes ahead and presses on reducing funding; that's going to split the Democrats in the House. The Republicans are split, as we saw in both the House and the Senate, and there are Republicans who are deeply worried that even if things go well in Iraq, they're going into a presidential campaign with a real millstone around their necks.

SCHIEFFER: Josie, you were at the Capitol, you followed that debate over in the House, and the debate that took place yesterday in the Senate. Who won here?

Ms. JOSEPHINE HEARN (The Politico): Well, I think, you know, it looks--on the surface it looks like it's a win for the Democrats, because they ran on being opposed to the escalation, or at least being opposed to the way the war is being conducted. But you know, you have to look at how things start out, and how they ultimately ended. They start out with a plan to pass a resolution in the Senate, then go to the House, and maybe get 40, maybe some were even talking about 60 Republicans. They ended up with really a muddled outcome in the Senate, the resolution itself never even came up for a vote. In the House, they only got 17 Republicans, which was far off of, I think, their own hopes. So already, you're seeing that this is being characterized as a vote that was mainly along party lines, largely along party lines as opposed to a really bipartisan--strongly bipartisan message to the president, which is what they had initially hoped. So I think it's got to be disappointing for Democrats that they didn't get more Republicans.

SCHIEFFER: But once again, the Republicans get that headline in papers across

the country, "Republicans Block Vote on the War." You have to say that has got--well, it's unlike chicken soup, it's not going to hurt, or maybe it's not going to help.

Ms. HEARN: Right.

SCHIEFFER: But it just seems like that's a bad headline for the Republicans.

Ms. HEARN: Well, it certainly could be a liability further on. There's some marginal members like Chris Shays in Connecticut, Heather Wilson in New Mexico, who voted against this resolution, and it may ultimately hurt them. I mean there's only so long that they can be seen as siding with the president on what is a losing war effort right now.

SCHIEFFER: You know, Doyle, one thing I guess everybody on all sides would agree on is this campaign is going to be the single most expensive presidential campaign in history, probably up to a billion dollars will be spent on it, and it's started earlier than any one that I can remember. What--how do you size things up right now?

Mr. McMANUS: Well, it did--it did start earlier, and those two phenomena are connected, because candidates like Hillary Clinton, who has a formidable fund-raising machine, decided to go ahead and bust the old caps, take no federal funding, knowing--confident that she could outraise most of her opponents. So money is even more important than before. On the Republican side, that puts John McCain in a--in a kind of a peculiar position, because of course, he's been the great campaign finance reformer. That's a position that makes him unpopular among a lot of Republican political professionals and a lot of state and county chairmen, and now he's got to go out and raise money under the system that he didn't like. So that has kind of cast a shadow over, over the McCain candidacy.

Here's a fascinating little piece of research that I, that I turned up in my reading. If you look at the polls, six times out of the last seven Republican contested races, the early front-runner goes on to win. Democratic races are more chaotic and prone to more changes. So one thing you might want to do is look at your own poll and see who's out ahead right now, and Rudy Giuliani doesn't look like such a bad bet to go all the way through.

SCHIEFFER: Well, it's very interesting. A CBS News poll that is out today, and these are new numbers, we asked Republican primary voters, and that is people who said they plan to vote in Republican primaries, Rudy Giuliani leads John McCain 50 percent to 29 percent. Now, I find that fairly surprising, don't you, Josie?

Ms. HEARN: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm. It is surprising. I think it shows how much Giuliani is still identified with his response to the September 11th attacks. That was strong leadership. He was seen as doing a great job in New York, and I think that he's identified with that more than he is with some of his personal baggage--I mean, three marriages and a lot of, I think around 30 percent of voters have said that they wouldn't vote for somebody with--who had

been married three times. And some of his more moderate stances on social issues. It seems that he is really--he's seen more as a strong leader for New York than some others.

SCHIEFFER: I wonder if it has something to do with people are just fed up with the people in office, and they're fed up with Washington. They certainly were during the last election. And then when you see the Senate fool around, and has spent literally weeks fooling around but is unable to even bring up a vote on whether they're for or against the war, maybe that's why we see these new faces like Barack Obama, Rudy Giuliani, doing so well in the--at least in the early going.

Mr. McMANUS: Well, that's sure true. Running against Washington has been good politics for a long time. But I think Josie put her finger on something. Ten years ago, you would've looked at a Republican race and said, 'Rudy Giuliani? He can't get through. He's not conservative enough on the social issues.' But you know what? The social issues aren't the center of this campaign; national security is. And Rudy Giuliani has national security.

SCHIEFFER: Quickly, both of you think Iraq is going to be, as you see it right now, the main issue in the coming campaign?

Mr. McMANUS: Absolutely.

Ms. HEARN: Yes. I mean, if it continues to deteriorate, which most people expect that it will, yes.

SCHIEFFER: All right. Well, I want to thank both of you for those insights.

And I'll be back with a final word in just a minute.

(Announcements)

SCHIEFFER: Finally today, and we talked about this this morning, Pennsylvania's Democratic Congressman John Murtha has a clever plan to block the president from sending more troops to Iraq. He is proposing a law that bars the president from sending troops in Iraq back to the war zone until they have spent one year being retrained at their home base. It forbids troops from being kept in Iraq longer than the one year tour they were promised, and it prohibits any troops from going to the war zone until they are fully trained and have the proper equipment.

To me, that is no way to stop a war. If Congress wants to stop the troops from going to Iraq, it should just cut off the money to send them there. But here is the other part: Everything that Murtha proposes should be done, should have been done, a long time ago. Not for Murtha's reasons, but because it is right and the troops deserve it. Too many times, the government has broken its word to the troops, held them in the Army beyond their enlistments, kept them in the combat zone longer than they were told they would be there, cut short their time between combat assignments and, worst of all, sent some of them into combat without the proper training or equipment.

We owe it to our troops to keep the promises we have made to them, and at the very least to ensure they are never sent into battle without the proper training and equipment. That should have been a given, regardless of whether we believe this war is right or wrong.

That's our broadcast. Hope you'll join us next week right here when we'll have two exclusive interviews: California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger and presidential candidate John Edwards. We'll see you then.