

something very wrong, and we have to deal with that. But that is not a reason to panic and believe that the effort in which the other 135,000 are engaged is wrong or is falling apart and cannot be achieved.

It is rather a time for us to go back to our moorings, what Americans believe in and what we understand was the purpose of this effort, and do what we can do in this effort, which is to support the effort, to support the decisionmakers, to support the Commander in Chief and, most of all, to support the troops.

I think of Pat Tillman, who played football in my home State, who decided to forego a lucrative football contract with the Arizona Cardinals because he wanted to do his part in this effort. He went to Iraq and then went to Afghanistan and was killed there. He did his part. The challenge to us is, what can we do? We cannot go over there and fight, but we can sure do something to support those who are doing the fighting. I do not mean we cannot question. That is our job. We do not just meekly go along with what everybody says about this, but we can certainly not do anything to undercut the effort of those putting their lives on the line. That is what we can do. That is our part. And it starts with not panicking, as Charles Krauthammer said.

Things go wrong in war. They went wrong in every war we fought. We practically got pushed off the Korean peninsula in the Korean war. Then General MacArthur, in a brilliant move in Inchon, landed behind enemy lines, drove the enemy back, and did what Americans always do in the end: We succeed when we do not panic.

I suggest to those who are wringing their hands today about what is going on in Iraq to just take a deep breath, stiffen your spine, and remember what this country has gone through in its great history. We have sacrificed a lot and it has been for good, moral purpose, and such is the case in Iraq.

Let me quote again from the Krauthammer op-ed:

We are obsessing about the wrong question. It is not: Is our purpose in Iraq morally sound? Of course it is. The question today, as from the beginning, remains: Is that purpose achievable?

Then he goes on to say this:

Doability does not hinge on the pictures from Abu Ghraib. It hinges on what happens on the ground with the insurgencies. The greater general uprising that last month's panic-mongers had predicted has not occurred. The Sadr insurgency appears to be waning. Senior Shiite clerics, local leaders and demonstrators in the streets of Najaf have told Moqtada Sadr to get out of town. Meanwhile, his militia is being systematically taken down by the U.S. military.

As for Fallujah, we have decided that trying to fully eradicate Sunni resistance is too costly in U.S. lives. Moreover, this ultimately is not our job but one for the 85 percent of Iraqis who are not Sunni Arabs—the Shiites and Kurds who will inherit the new Iraq. We have thus chosen an interim arrangement of local self-rule in the Sunni

hotbeds. And if that gets us through the transition of power to moderate Iraqis, fine.

This seems entirely lost on the many politicians and commentators who have simply lost their bearings in the Abu Ghraib panic. The prize in Iraq is not praise for America from the Arab street nor goodwill from al-Jazeera. We did not have these before Abu Ghraib. We will not have these after Abu Ghraib. The prize is a decent, representative, democratizing Iraq that abandoned the pan-Arab fantasies and cruelties of Saddam Hussein's regime.

That remains doable. What will make it undoable is the panic at home.

As I said, as usual, he is right on target.

So what does that teach us? Getting back to the beginning of the discussion of the Secretary of Defense and his responsibility, let's be careful of the message we send to the rest of the world. Some of my colleagues have said the Secretary must resign because we need to send a message to the Arab world. What message is it? That we are sorry? We have sent that message. That we take responsibility? We have already taken responsibility.

I think it sends a message of weakness. Remember what the mantra of Osama bin Laden is—that there are weak horses and strong horses, and the world will respect the strong horse. He believes he is the strong horse, that we are the weak horse. He cites over and over Lebanon, Somalia, Vietnam, and he believes that Iraq falls into the same category; that if his al-Qaida and their allies in Iraq can continue to inflict casualties on us, if we continue to have self-doubt, disunity, undercut our leadership, panic over what a few of our soldiers did in the prison, in the long run he will prevail because he is the strong horse and we are the weak horse. That is his entire philosophy, and it motivates a lot of people in that part of the world who hate us.

The way to defeat that philosophy is to be the strong horse because of our morality as well as our military power, because of what we stand for in terms of returning freedom to people who did not have it, and because we do not mean to gain anything personally from it except an additional degree of security from terrorists.

Mr. President, what we say matters. We need to conduct the debate and, indeed, a debate is entirely appropriate, but we need to conduct the debate in a way that will not undercut the effort of those who are putting their lives on the line. Sometimes even words in this Chamber go over the top. Sometimes words of my colleagues go over the top.

Certainly, there are many outside of this Chamber who reveal a panic of the kind that Charles Krauthammer has written about, which will undercut our ability to carry out our mission, and that, at the end of the day, is the important point.

So I urge my colleagues and all others who are discussing this issue to try to conduct the debate and discussion in a serious, responsible way that does not undercut the efforts of our leaders

and our troops on the ground. If we do that, then we will have done our part in achieving victory. We will have been responsible. We will not have undercut the effort, and I think we will have distinguished ourselves in the one way that we can act to achieve victory.

Teddy Roosevelt made a comment that kind of wrapped up what he did in life with all of the actions in which he engaged. Somebody asked him a question about his life and he said: I just have appreciated the opportunity that I have had to work on work worth doing.

What we are doing today is work worth doing. We need to remember that, be supportive of it, and be supportive of those we have asked to do the work.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, this week brought the disturbing news that the Senate, the House, and the White House might not be able to agree on a new transportation funding bill, that we would have to set it aside then until next year to be acted upon. That would be disastrous for my home State of Minnesota, and I suspect for many of the States my colleagues represent.

Traffic congestion in our main metropolitan areas in Minnesota has worsened at alarming rates during the past decade. The deterioration of our roads, highways, and bridges throughout greater Minnesota, more rural areas of our State, has also reached crisis levels. More and more of our highways have become unsafe due to this deterioration and congestion.

More motorists are dying, being injured or maimed as a result. Business owners and farmers find that transporting their goods and products to market takes longer and is more costly. Some of the seasonal national weight restrictions force major employers such as Polaris, Artic Cat, and Marvin Windows, which are located in northwestern Minnesota, to have to re-route their trucks, adding time, expense, and unreliability that become major drawbacks to operating a business in Minnesota.

Businesses executives, their employees and their families, have to take longer to drive to and from work, school, and weekend cabins, and they are less safe in doing so. Every day and night, many thousands of Minnesotans endure these delays and disruptions.

They are angry and frustrated, and they rightfully want their Government to act on their behalf now. They have paid and they will continue to pay their Federal gasoline tax dollars into the highway trust fund, and they want that money fully expended on vitally needed highway improvement projects starting now.

Our Senate bill, the one we passed some time ago, responded to their needs. Our bill increased the highway and transit funding significantly over the next 6 years compared to the last 6 years. For my State of Minnesota, the increase is 81 percent, thanks to the overall increase which was passed with bipartisan support at the committee and the full Senate level, and with special appreciation to Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, for correcting the ethanol penalty which was penalizing Minnesota and other States that placed a mandate on ethanol consumption as part of every gallon of gasoline.

Senator COLEMAN, my colleague from Minnesota, and I worked together to keep these provisions benefiting Minnesota in the Senate bill. Unfortunately, the House scaled back their overall bill from what even most of their Members wanted themselves, at the insistence of the White House. But the President said even that reduced level in the House bill is too high, and the Senate's version is too high a figure. In fact, the President set a level of funding that is \$60 billion less than in our Senate bill. That is \$10 billion a year less for highway and other transit projects throughout America.

We are told that every \$1 billion of spending on transportation projects creates 47,500 jobs. So \$10 billion a year less spending means 475,000 fewer jobs this summer, next summer, and throughout the next 6 years—475,000 jobs, American jobs, jobs that we could be putting into place right now. People in my State and your State would be going to work right now to perform vitally needed infrastructure improvement projects with dollars that have already been committed and received and are set aside for this purpose. Why doesn't that matter to the White House? Why can't we act as we should anyway to move this matter forward?

The President has his rightful prerogative to veto a bill with which he does not agree. I am told by the manager of the bill in the Senate that he believes we have the votes to override that veto because these projects are so important to so many Members, and rightfully so. He believes the House has the necessary votes to override a Presidential veto because the projects in the bill are vitally important to their districts. That is the way the system is supposed to work. If the President vetoes, we can attempt to override so the public interest is served.

From what I am reading this week, the majority leader and the Speaker of the House have said they will not take the conference committee report, the

final legislation, to the White House if the President is going to veto it. That means the President can dictate to the Congress the level of funding he will accept, and we have no choice but either to agree to that reduced level or to set the bill aside until next year.

That is not the way the process is supposed to work, if we believe in something—and we do. I commend Senator INHOFE, the manager of the bill, who has been tenacious and terrific at standing up for the needs of, I am sure, the State of Oklahoma, but also reflective of the urgent needs in my State of Minnesota and elsewhere, and saying this is the right thing to do.

On paper this may look like it is some kind of brand new fiscal responsibility that we certainly have not seen from the White House in the last 3½ years, with budget deficits extending now as far as the eye can see at record levels. But this is the wrong bill to sort of suddenly get fiscal religion and go on to make a spectacle of because these are capital expenditures that are going to benefit our country for an extended period of time, and as business owners, farm owners, homeowners know, the proper reason to go into debt is for capital expenditures for long-term improvements. If you are going to be fiscally prudent, then you pay cash for current consumption.

We have it backward. We are creating enormous deficits based on current consumption, and then when we get to a bill where we should legitimately be incurring debt, if we need to, for long-term capital expenditures, we are going in the other direction—for politics, for reelection politics, not for the public interest. We know that. I bet the Speaker knows that. Certainly the members in his caucus know that.

We need to stand up and speak out and insist that our voices be heard, that our proffer of responsibilities in this body on behalf of the people of our States be exercised. Our leader and the House leader should take this bill to conference and protect all the projects that are of concern to myself and members of my caucus—as the projects of importance to the members of the majority caucus will be, I am sure, protected, as they should be, just as is the tradition in the House. Writing those into the actual House bill will, I am told, ensure they will be protected, honored, for both the Republican and Democratic Members. That is the way the system has worked, I am told, in the past.

Frankly, I think we should dispense with all of those earmarked projects which benefit some States far more than others—more than my State—because of the way the memberships on committees and seniority falls, but that is a discussion for another day.

Given that is the system we have, I certainly understand why I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle need to and should have the right to assurances that our projects are going to be treated as they have been in the past

and not just discarded in the committee, as so many of our amendments and proposals have been in other legislation earlier this year and last year.

But that is something that can readily be resolved. That is a very minor consideration compared to what, I am told, is the real obstacle right now, and that is to get the leadership of the Senate and the House to be willing to take a bill to the President that we say is the right thing to do. We know what that is. It is what our Senate bill provided overall and for our respective States. It is a fiscally responsible bill because it uses every dollar in the highway trust fund over the next 6 years—not more than that, not less than that. We know our States need those expenditures.

Let the President veto the bill if that is his decision. Then let's override it here and in the House and then it becomes law. Then those 475,000 Americans who are either drawing unemployment benefits—or many of them, I believe, have probably exhausted their unemployment benefits; just this week we found the Senate unwilling to provide an extension of those benefits—can go back to work in construction jobs and related jobs.

This bill more than anything we have done in tax adjustments will put Americans to work—now, this summer, right away—when they need work. We can't turn our back on that opportunity and that responsibility. Let's make the system work the way it is supposed to work. Let's pass this bill. Let's get it to the White House. Let's take it back and do what is necessary to make it law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Rhode Island.

DEATH OF HOPE HARRIS

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I speak about a true friend and colleague. For 26-years, Hope Harris served the people of Rhode Island as a member of my staff, and prior to that, on the staff of my late father, Senator John H. Chafee. Hope Harris was known to thousands of Rhode Islanders who have visited and telephoned their Senator as the sympathetic and trustworthy professional answering the phone and the door at the front desk in their Senator's Providence office. She was without peer in her ability to convey, in a brief encounter, that the mission of the Senator's State operation is to help people in any way possible. On May 12, Hope died after a difficult struggle with cancer.

Hope's impact on my ability to represent the people of Rhode Island cannot be overstated. Her impact was felt by every anxious senior citizen who experienced a problem with Social Security, by every parent calling to plan a family trip to Washington, every young