

global warming. IGCC—integrated gasification combined cycle—power plants, for example, may allow us to capture the carbon dioxide in coal before it is released to the atmosphere, so that the CO₂ can be used or can be sequestered deep underground.

With creativity and commitment, there are many actions that we can take that will substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions and help to turn the tide of global warming.

Countless generations of human beings have in my State enjoyed this beautiful planet. But it is not certain that our grandchildren and great grandchildren will be able to enjoy snowcapped peaks, mountain streams, Colorado skiing, lush green forests and fields of grain. If we want them to see and enjoy Colorado's beauty and enjoy our State's natural resources, then we need to act—now. And what is true for Colorado is true for the Nation. Those of us who walk the Earth today are not solely responsible for the fact of global warming—the roots of this crisis go back to the Industrial Revolution—but it falls to us to do something about it. We must not fail.

The three great energy challenges that confront us at the dawn of the 21st century are daunting—national security, economic sustainability and the future of our planet. But we know we can and will confront these challenges. And part of the solution to each of these challenges lies in renewable energy and efficiency and other clean energy technologies. For the past 25 years, America has lacked the consistent political leadership and public commitment to pursue these new technologies, but their time has come and today we can unite America in the spirit of bipartisanship to confront these challenges.

STATE AND LOCAL LEADERSHIP

Much of the leadership in the areas of renewable energy and energy efficiency has come from local and state efforts. In November, 2004, the people of Colorado were the first in the Nation to enact a renewable energy standard by popular vote with the adoption of Amendment 37. Our General Assembly and our new Governor have taken up the baton and carried it forward with exciting new programs that will expand wind and solar power in Colorado. Other states have done the same.

ENERGY IN THE 110TH CONGRESS

So I applaud and encourage this kind of state and local leadership, but the ultimate success of our new energy policy and our new energy economy will also require national leadership in this 110th Congress.

I am proud to be a sponsor, with Senator Chuck Grassley, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3 to adopt 25 25 as a national goal. Many of you know about this initiative. The goal is to produce 25% of our total energy needs from our farms, ranches and forests by the year 2025. Independent studies confirm we can achieve that goal. 25 25 makes economic sense. Achieving this goal will yield over 700 billion dollars in economic activity and create more than 4 million new jobs. A combination of energy conservation, energy efficiency and renewable energy can get us to our goal. We should establish the 25 25 resolution this Congress.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am also working on the 2007 Farm Bill with Senator Tom Harkin and my colleagues on that Committee. This new Farm Bill will include an expanded Energy Title that will create new programs and build upon existing programs to make the goal of 25 25 achievable. Just two weeks ago, Senator Harkin, Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, traveled to Colorado for two purposes: to visit NREL and to hold a Committee hearing on the Farm Bill. Sen-

ator Harkin and I agree that good farm policy means good energy policy in this new world.

I am also enthused by Senator Max Baucus and my colleagues on the Finance Committee as we do our part to address the energy challenges of our time. I have introduced a series of bills that will help us I produce more renewable energy, adopt more energy efficient technologies and combat global warming.

Senate Bill 672 is the Rural Community Energy Bonds Act. I support our big wind farms, but we need a lot of small wind farms, too, and we need a lot of small biomass and solar and other renewable energy projects. This bill will allow small renewable energy projects with at least 49 percent local ownership to qualify for tax-exempt bonds. That will make it easier for locally and community owned renewable energy projects in rural and small town America to find investors. And local ownership means that more of the profits from those projects will stay on Main Street in Colorado's small towns.

I have also introduced the Rural Wind Energy Development Act, Senate Bill 673. This bill will create a tax credit for every residential wind turbine installed and will also allow for accelerated depreciation on those turbines. For turbines under 100 kilowatts, there's a tax credit of \$1,500 for each half-kilowatt of generating capacity. As I said earlier, we need more distributed generation, and this bill will help us develop it.

I am also working on several other bills to encourage renewable energy production and energy efficiency investments. The Securing America's Energy Independence Act will extend the energy tax credit for solar technologies and for residential energy efficiency improvements through 2016. If we want manufacturers to build these technologies and we want homeowners to buy them, we need to create reliable incentives that encourage planning and investment.

I am also proud to co-sponsor the DRIVE Act with Senator Bingaman and nearly 30 co-sponsors, with equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats. The Drive Act stands for Dependence Reduction through Innovation in Vehicles and Energy. This bill, Senate Bill 339, and other related legislation, will reduce oil consumption by 25% by 2025, impose Federal fleet conservation requirements, support research on electric vehicles, require the Federal government to purchase 15% of its electricity from renewable sources by 2015, and would phase-out incandescent light bulbs in favor of more energy efficient technologies. I am hopeful that this bill will pass in this Congress.

I'm also working with other members of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to draft a bill to require the use of 30 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2020, to increase the funding for bioenergy research and development, and to offer financial support for renewable fuel production facilities, including cellulosic biofuel plants and biorefineries.

We should all recognize that we are going to be dependent on fossil fuels for a significant portion of our energy for the next several decades, so I'm sponsoring legislation to conduct a national assessment of our carbon sequestration capacity. As we continue to burn fossil fuels, we must find a way to reduce the volume of carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere. IGCC technology can achieve its promise only if we can effectively sequester the carbon dioxide that's captured.

CONCLUSION

Together, the 110th Congress can lead our State and our Nation to a new energy future.

Mr. SALAZAR. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1591, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1591) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 641

(Purpose: An amendment in the nature of a substitute)

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 641.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, today we take up a supplemental bill to fund our troops in the field, to send a strong message about the direction of the war in Iraq, to improve the veterans and defense health care system, to help the victims of Hurricane Katrina rebuild, to secure the homeland, and to provide emergency relief to farmers impacted by major drought and freezes. We are now in the fifth year—the fifth year—of the war, this terrible war.

I was against it. I voted against it. We are there. We are now in the fifth year of the war in Iraq. The debate about the war has deteriorated into a series of buzz words—preemptive war, mission accomplished, exaggerated intelligence, inadequate body armor, and surges—and on and on. Our job in the Senate is not to look backward but to look forward.

The Constitution clearly gives the Congress the power—yes, it does; it clearly gives the Congress, us, the power—to decide when this Nation should go to war, and it gives Congress the power of the purse, money. Money talks. Funding such conflicts is the responsibility of the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee. The buck stops here, and don't you ever forget it, the

Senate Appropriations Committee. Because of that power over the purse, it is certainly our duty to debate the future of the war in Iraq.

The bill before the Senate includes a provision that would give the war a new direction, and it points the way out—out, out—of the civil war in Iraq. There is no restriction on funding for the troops—no restriction on funding for the troops. We fully fund the needs of the troops. We do that, yes. In fact, the bill provides more funds than the President requested for the Department of Defense, with an increase of \$1.3 billion for the defense health care system, \$1 billion for equipping the Guard and Reserve, and \$1.1 billion for military housing.

The language in the bill narrows the mission of our troops in Iraq, keeps pressure on the Iraqi Government to meet benchmarks on national reconciliation, requires the President—yes, hear me now; requires the President—to send Congress a phased redeployment plan. It sets a goal for the redeployment of most of the U.S. troops from Iraq by March 31, 2008.

This country was not attacked by Iraq on 9/11. There was not a single Iraqi, not one, involved in the devastation in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania on that fateful day. According to our own Government, the perpetrators of 9/11, Osama bin Laden and his organization, are alive today and rebuilding in Afghanistan and Pakistan at this moment, as I speak, so help me God. Language in this bill would allow the President to refocus our military and our intelligence on the terrorists who actually attacked us on 9/11.

During the debate on this bill, assertions will be made, yes, that it is inappropriate to add to this bill funding to meet domestic needs. In fact, the White House has claimed that efforts to add funding for our veterans, for Katrina victims, and for homeland security will hold hostage the funds for the troops. What nonsense—hear me—nonsense. Just more buzzwords.

In fact, funding for the war is not the only critical need worthy of supplemental funding this year. The war must not obliterate every other concern. Last week, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Rob Portman, said the President would veto the bill if the Iraq language and additional spending remain in the bill. He said:

We're disappointed the Senate is allowing politics—

humbug—

to interfere with getting needed resources to our troops.

Politics? Politics? I ask the Senate, is it politics to ensure that the VA has a health care system that can provide first-rate care for the wounded? Is it? No. It is a moral imperative—yes, a moral imperative.

Is it politics to provide critical resources to help the gulf region rebuild after Hurricane Katrina? Is it? Is it

politics? No, it is not politics. It is compassion—compassion.

Is it politics to help rural America recover from drought and freeze? Is it? No. It is common sense, do you hear me, common sense and good economics.

This bill meets some of the most urgent needs of our country. It includes \$1.7 billion to ensure that the VA has the resources it needs to help the brave men and women wounded in the war. The VA needs resources in order to provide first-rate care to profoundly wounded, terribly wounded, horribly wounded soldiers. We are morally bound—hear me; yes, we are morally bound, aren't we, to care for our wounded troops. This is not politics. No. Shame. This is not politics; it is common decency.

This bill also includes \$3.3 billion above the administration's request for the victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. The President proposes to pay for the increased costs of repairing the existing levees in Louisiana by cutting the funding that Congress provided to improve the capacity of the levees to protect New Orleans from future hurricanes. Shame. That makes no sense.

The bill provides new resources to repair the levees. We will not follow a nonsensical strategy of repairing the existing levee system that failed during Katrina by cutting funding already appropriated for actual improvements to the levee system. We will not. We also include funding for health and education, for law enforcement, and for transit systems in the gulf region to help rebuild, to bring people back to work, and to bring the region back to life. Not politics, just plain old common sense.

The bill includes \$4.2 billion for agricultural disaster relief. The agricultural economy has been hit with drought and freezes. In 2006, 69 percent of all counties in the United States were declared primary or contiguous disaster areas. Fourteen States had 100 percent of their counties declared disaster areas by the Department of Agriculture.

I commend Senator DORGAN and Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BOND for their hard work on this disaster package.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger requesting agricultural disaster assistance be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 8, 2007.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.
Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID, CHAIRMAN BYRD, SENATOR MCCONNELL AND SENATOR COCHRAN: As you prepare to begin work on the Emergency Supplemental to fund vital government programs, I implore you to include the Emergency Farm Assistance Act of 2007. The Farm Assistance Act provides much needed relief to California's multi-billion dollar agricultural industry, which has suffered devastating losses due to the recent record setting freeze, as well as the extreme heat wave in 2006 and flooding in 2005.

As you know, on January 11, 2007, an arctic air mass moved into the state and extreme cold air conditions pushed nighttime temperatures to record and near record lows throughout the state for the next 8–10 days. These extreme weather conditions had a devastating impact on California's agricultural industry, exacting catastrophic losses on our citrus, avocado, vegetable and strawberry crops. Agriculture plays a central role in our local economies, and as a result of the freeze, many farm communities and related businesses have suffered massive losses. To provide immediate relief, I directed state agencies to make state facilities available to local agencies for use as warming centers. We also contacted agricultural associations to ensure that growers were aware of cold weather, so that appropriate protective actions could be taken.

In response to these dire events, I directed the execution of the State Emergency Plan. In accordance with Section 401 of the Stafford Act, on January 12, 2007, I proclaimed a state of emergency for all 58 California counties. I also issued additional proclamations to specifically address the impacts of the freeze on the agricultural industry, small businesses and individuals in an effort to expedite federal assistance to the counties that were hardest hit. I have since requested that the President declare a major disaster for 31 California counties.

In spite of these significant efforts to protect crops, agricultural communities in California have sustained substantial crop losses and unknown long-term tree damage in excess of \$1.14 billion. With the loss of a major portion of our agricultural crop, thousands of farmworkers and their families in impacted counties have been displaced due to job loss and loss of income. Despite the assistance farmers and ranchers are now receiving through the United States Department of Agriculture and the Small Business Administration, more aid is needed. It is clear that the full impact of this disaster will be ongoing and systemic.

The California Delegation has played a critical role in the development of the Farm Assistance Act. I applaud their bipartisan work to provide crucial assistance to our farmers and ranchers in need. To that end, I strongly support the Farm Assistance Act and its inclusion in the Emergency Supplemental. The unfolding crisis in our agricultural communities requires swift assistance and attention. California agriculture literally feeds the nation, and I urge you to include the Emergency Farm Assistance Act of 2007 as part of the Emergency Supplemental.

Thank you for your consideration of this important request.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER.

Mr. BYRD. Providing agricultural disaster relief is not politics, no. It is good policy.

The bill that is before the Senate also includes \$2 billion for securing the homeland. In the State of the Union, the President said:

The evil that inspired and rejoiced in 9/11 is still at work in the world. And so long as that's the case, America is still a nation at war.

Despite hundreds of innocent people being killed in train bombings in London, Madrid, Moscow, Tokyo, and Mumbai, India, and despite the aviation sector remaining at a high terrorist threat level since August, the President did not request one extra dime—not one thin dime—in the supplemental for securing the homeland. This bill includes funding for purchasing explosive detection systems for our airports, for grants to help secure our rail and transit systems, and for securing our ports and borders. The money is needed now.

For 5½ years, since the attack on 9/11, this administration has raised fears of another terrorist attack. The administration has announced a high, or orange, threat level for possible terrorist attacks on eight different occasions. In every State of the Union Address, the President has stoked the fires of fear. Periodically, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the FBI Director helped to fan those flames. Yet the President consistently sends to Congress budgets for homeland security that do not reflect this perceived threat. Rather than spreading fear, the administration should be reducing vulnerabilities by doing everything it can to deter another attack. Providing funding to secure the homeland is not politics; it is an essential duty.

The President's "rob Peter to pay Paul" approach to funding domestic agencies has real and demonstrably severe consequences. The failed response to Hurricane Katrina proved that. The inability to provide first-class health care to our wounded veterans proved that. But we never learn.

Another important aspect of this bill is in the oversight and accountability that it mandates. For far too long—far too long—oversight has been a lost cause, yes, around this Congress. Tough questions are ditched in favor of softballs. Honest answers are buried in political spin. This legislation says "no more." Real oversight is back, and it will not be denied. This legislation makes major investments in inspectors general, from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction to inspectors general for the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Justice. Let's hope we can begin to get the waste, fraud, and abuse in Government under control. The legislation presses forward with GAO audits of the use of these dollars as we try to put an end to the contractors' bonanza of big dollars free from the prying eyes of Congress or the

public. Insisting that U.S. tax dollars are wisely spent is not politics. What is it? It is our duty. Hear me. It is our duty.

The Appropriations Committee has made careful choices. The White House assertion that spending in this bill is excessive or extraneous or political—humbug. It simply has no foundation. The committee has chosen to provide first-rate care to the war wounded, to provide resources to help the gulf region rebuild after Katrina, to improve homeland security, and to provide agricultural disaster assistance. This is a good bill. I urge prompt action on this legislation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, this appropriations bill reported by our Committee on Appropriations responds to the President's request for supplemental funding for the Department of Defense and other departments and agencies. The bill provides \$121.6 billion in emergency spending. Of this amount, \$102.48 billion is provided to support Iraqi security forces to continue operations in Afghanistan and to wage the global war on terrorism. In testimony before our Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, we were told this funding is needed by the end of April.

I am disappointed the bill contains language that sets forth a timetable for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq. The language amounts to a restatement of S.J. Res. 9, which a majority of Senators voted against, 50 to 48, on March 15. The Senate has spoken on this issue. Inclusion of this language as reported by the Appropriations Committee last week will only slow down the bill and invite a Presidential veto. We need to approve the funding now. Unnecessarily extending this debate is not going to serve the national interests. I will offer an amendment to strike this language from the bill.

In this bill, the Appropriations Committee also approved \$14.8 billion for additional emergencies, including \$7.9 billion for continuing the recovery from Hurricane Katrina. The affected States are making good progress, slow but steady and sure. But additional Federal resources are needed. The bill also includes \$1.7 billion for veterans health care facilities, which signals the committee's continuing interest in ensuring that our veterans receive the quality care they deserve.

I applaud the chairman's goal, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, of completing work on the bill this week. I am concerned, however, that the bill is almost \$19 billion above the President's request. We need to be sure this spending is necessary and responsible. I look forward to working with my good friend from West Virginia to ensure that this is the case. It is imperative that we provide funding to our troops promptly, and it will remain my goal to put a bill on the President's desk that he can sign.

AMENDMENT NO. 643 TO AMENDMENT NO. 641

Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], for himself, Mr. McCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WARNER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. ENZI, proposes an amendment numbered 643 to amendment No. 641.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 643

(Purpose: To strike language that would tie the hands of the Commander-in-Chief by imposing an arbitrary timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq, thereby undermining the position of American Armed Forces and jeopardizing the successful conclusion of Operation Iraqi Freedom)

On page 24, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 26, line 24 and insert:

"SEC. 1315. BENCHMARKS FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ."

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, this is an amendment to the committee substitute which is now at the desk. The amendment will strike part of section 1315 of the bill titled "Revision of United States Policy on Iraq." The majority of section 1315 of this act is a restatement of S.J. Res. 9, the United States Policy in Iraq Resolution of 2007.

Two weeks ago, the Senate voted against adopting S.J. Res. 9 by a vote of 50 to 48. Section 1315 calls for a prompt transition of the mission in Iraq to a limited mission; a phased redeployment of U.S. forces from Iraq within 120 days of enactment of this act; a goal of redeployment of all U.S. combat forces from Iraq by March 31, 2008, except for a limited number essential for protecting U.S. and coalition personnel and infrastructure, training, and equipping Iraqi forces, and conducting targeted counterterrorism operations.

Section 1315 also calls for a classified campaign plan for Iraq, including benchmarks and projected redeployment dates of U.S. forces from Iraq. Finally, it also includes an expression of the sense of Congress concerning benchmarks for the Government of Iraq, along with a reporting requirement by the commander, multinational forces, Iraq, which is currently General Petraeus, to detail the progress being made by the Iraqi Government on the benchmarks contained in this section.

This amendment does not remove the sense-of-the-Congress provision that is important to a number of Senators. I think all Senators share an earnest desire that the Iraqi Government move aggressively to undertake the measures necessary to ensure a stable and

free Iraq. The language to be removed by my amendment is essentially a re-statement of S.J. Res. 9, which, as I said, on March 15 Senators defeated by a vote of 50 to 48.

Before announcing his new plan in Iraq, the President sought input from his top military and civilian advisers, along with Members of Congress, foreign leaders, and other military and foreign policy experts. He acknowledged there was no easy solution to the situation in Iraq and the Middle East, and he determined a temporary deployment of additional U.S. troops in Iraq to support Iraqi security forces would provide a new window of opportunity for Iraqi political and economic initiatives to take hold and reduce sectarian violence. This plan provides the best hope to bring stability to the country and to hasten the day when our troops will come home.

Earlier this year the National Intelligence Estimate entitled “Prospects for Iraq’s Stability: A Challenging Road Ahead,” was delivered to the Congress. The National Intelligence Estimate indicated—and I am quoting now from an unclassified version:

Coalition capabilities, including force levels, resources, and operations, remain an essential stabilizing element in Iraq. If coalition forces were withdrawn rapidly during the term of this Estimate—

Which is 12 to 18 months—

we judge that this almost certainly would lead to a significant increase in the scale and scope of sectarian conflict in Iraq, intensify Sunni resistance to the Iraqi government, and have adverse consequences for national reconciliation.

If such a rapid withdrawal were to take place, we judge that the Iraqi security forces would be unlikely to survive as a non-sectarian national institution; neighboring countries—invited by Iraqi factions or unilaterally—might intervene openly in the conflict; massive civilian casualties and forced population displacement would be probable; Al-Qaida in Iraq would attempt to use parts of the country—particularly al Anbar province—to plan increased attacks in and outside of Iraq; and spiraling violence and political disarray in Iraq, along with Kurdish moves to control Kirkuk and strengthen autonomy, could prompt Turkey to launch a military incursion.

It is clear to me that it is in our national interests to support the President’s new strategy, to help provide an opportunity for political and economic solutions in Iraq, and for more effective diplomatic efforts in the Middle East region. Of course, we know there are no guarantees of success, but according to the National Intelligence Estimate and the perspective of some of our most experienced foreign policy experts, maintaining the current course or withdrawal without additional stability in Iraq will be harmful to our national interests and to the entire region.

We need to do what we can to help stabilize this situation and bring our troops home. As a beginning point, for this strategy to work, we should show a commitment to success. I support the new initiative and urge the Senate to

give it a chance to work. This does not mean we should not monitor the situation or that the plan should not be adjusted as new developments occur, but we need to let the forces move forward to brighten the prospects of stabilizing Iraq and bringing our troops home.

As Commander in Chief, the President needs our support. I support his efforts and the efforts of our troops. The Senate should provide the resources necessary to accomplish this mission, and these funds are included in this bill. Troop levels and missions need to be left to General Petraeus and his commanders who ought to have the flexibility to react to the situation on the ground in determining how to deploy troops as needed. Congress should not be tying the hands of our commanders or limiting their flexibility to respond to the threats on the battlefield.

The inclusion of unnecessarily restrictive language will ensure a Presidential veto, we are advised. In testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, we were told that the funding provided by this bill is needed by the end of April. We need to speed this funding to our troops, rather than slow it down by returning to a debate already settled by the Senate by a recorded vote.

Madam President, I urge the support of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I expect that a number of Senators will want to debate the Iraq amendment tomorrow. I look forward to a good debate on this matter.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I wish to speak to the amendment that was laid down by Senator COCHRAN from Mississippi, an amendment to strike language from the bill that is pending before us, language that would inhibit the ability of our commanders on the ground to carry out the message we have asked them to perform in Iraq.

As we are all aware, this security supplemental is designed to provide money for the conduct of our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. There is a timetable here. The commanders have said they need, by April 15, the beginning part of this funding so they can carry out the missions we have asked them to perform. When I was there about a month ago, this message was given to me over and over when I would say: Is there anything I can do for you: Senator make sure we get the

funding without the strings attached when we need that money.

So the President requested this security supplemental appropriations bill. The House has acted. The Senate has the bill before us this week. Madam President, this funding bill will do no good if it has limitations imposed in it that prevent us from carrying out the mission, and the President has already said if language that sets a timetable for the withdrawal of our troops is included, he will be forced to veto the bill. We understand that.

It makes no sense to me that we would go ahead and pass such a bill, knowing the President will veto it, because there would be no way for us to go back and redo it all before the April 15 time, when the troops begin to need this money. Many have suggested that this is actually a slow-bleed strategy on the part of some to put a poison pill in the bill, forcing the President to veto it, knowing it means the troops would not get the money they need when they need it. I would rather like to think that this is a genuine point of view on the part of some of my colleagues who believe we should put strings attached on this funding and somehow that will provide a more clear way for us to achieve our mission. I don’t understand it, but I suspect somebody could argue that.

What I would like to do is support Senator COCHRAN’s amendment to simply strike this language from the bill. If the President is able to continue to carry out the Petraeus plan and we have funding to do that, we will know soon enough whether it will enable us to achieve the mission. By the summertime or thereabouts, if it appears this surge is not working, then we will know that as well.

What I cannot understand is why anybody would want to pull the rug out from under the troops just at the time it appears the President’s strategy is beginning to work. When I was there, there was already cautious optimism, signs of success of the plan—nobody wants to declare success or victory, of course, but that those elements of success continue to be manifested and be reported on.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a piece by William Kristol and Frederick Kagan from the Weekly Standard of April 2, 2007, entitled “Wrong on Timetables.”

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

Mr. KYL. Madam President, this piece by William Kristol and Frederick Kagan tries to take the arguments that have been offered by the opposition in favor of a timetable and demonstrate why those arguments are incorrect. The first of the arguments is that the Iraqi Government needs stimulus by us, or a threat by us, that if they don’t hurry up and do what they are supposed to do, we are going to pull out. This kind of strings attached, therefore, makes some sense. They point out

the fact that, first of all, the resolution itself that was defeated in this body a week or so ago by a vote of 48 to 50, that resolution, which would have established timetables, was defeated, among other things, because the Iraqis have already gotten the message.

It is not so much about sending a message to them as it is about sending a message to our enemies and to our allies and to our own troops, which says regardless of what you do, we are going to be out by a certain date. The problem with the goals and with the specifics that are supposed to be achieved, the benchmarks, so-called, in the legislation is that it matters not how well the Iraqi Government performs; we are still going to be out by a date certain. So it is not the kind of message we want to send to the Iraqi Government and, clearly, not the kind we want to send to our enemies who simply know they have to just wait us out.

Another argument is that American forces would be able to fight al-Qaida, and we don't need to be involved in the civil war of the Iraqis. It would take a lawyer to figure that out. You are going to have to have a lawyer with every squad on patrol to figure out whether they are fighting al-Qaida or somebody else or what kind of action can be taken. It is very hard to distinguish whom you are fighting when the fighting is going on. Al-Qaida is definitely a problem. What did al-Qaida do? They went over to bomb the Golden Mosque in Samarra, which got the Shiites to decide they had to provide protection with militias, which went over and attacked the Sunnis, who then went over and attacked the Shiites and achieved the objective that al-Qaida wanted: to foment violence among different factions within the country.

Where do you draw the line against fighting al-Qaida and someone else if someone else is doing al-Qaida's bidding? It is a very convoluted proposition. Clearly, you cannot have troops there to fight one specific enemy but not another, especially when they are so difficult to identify.

Finally, some think it is too late, that we have already lost, and we might as well figure out a way to get out. I haven't heard my colleagues talk that way because, under that scenario, you ought to cut off funding today and not wait for the 6 or 8 or 10 months called for under the resolution. As I said, the Senate defeated the virtually identical provision 2 weeks ago. One of the reasons is because our military is making progress. It is finding that, for example, in Sadr City, the mayor of Sadr City essentially invited the Iraqi and coalition forces in without a shot being fired. The forces of Moqtada al-Sadr have either gone underground or disbanded. Al-Sadr himself is believed to have gone to Iran. Prime Minister Maliki has made it clear he is not going to relent against the forces of the Sadr army. He has fired the Deputy Health Minister, one of Sadr's allies. He has turned a deaf ear to the com-

plaints of al-Sadr. He oversaw the cleaning out of the Interior Ministry, which was a stronghold that was corrupting the Iraqi police. He has worked with other coalition leaders to deploy the Iraqi units pursuant to the Baghdad security plan. Interestingly, he has also visited the sheik in Ramadi, which is the capital of Anbar Province and formally the real base of al-Qaida operations, and has gotten cooperation with the tribal leaders in that area to join us in the effort against al-Qaida and other insurgents.

All of this is demonstrating cooperation of the Government in Baghdad, clearly refuting the notion that somehow the American policy has to be to threaten the Iraqis to cooperate with us or else we will leave and the only way to do that is by expressing that through a timetable. Clearly, the Iraqi Government is cooperating, and setting arbitrary deadlines would send exactly the wrong message both to our allies and, of course, to our enemies.

We need to express the view to our allies that we will be there to protect them when the going gets tough. The enemy is not simply going to lie down and allow this plan to continue to work. They will fight back. As somebody said, there are going to be good days and bad days, but our allies need to know that we will be there in the bad days and that we won't set an absolute deadline for getting out.

The other point I made earlier is the services need this supplemental appropriations bill, and that is why it is necessary for us to strike provisions of section 1315, provisions which would deny that funding without the strings that are attached.

To this point, I also alluded to the fact that section 1315 is internally contradictory and self-defeating. As I said, it provides benchmarks for the Iraqi leaders to meet and then says it doesn't matter whether they meet them, we are out of here. The resolution would not send any message that is constructive in any way and certainly is not changing the behavior of the administration.

There are some who might believe they could support section 1315 because it is less restrictive than the House language. Indeed, it is somewhat less restrictive, although essentially a distinction without a difference.

This bill has to go to conference. There has been a great deal of discussion by pundits and others that the more liberal element in the House of Representatives is going to insist upon, at a bare minimum, the language that passed the House of Representatives which they felt was too moderate to begin with. We are likely to get change in a conference that is language the President will have to veto, language which is closer to the House language than the Senate language. I think, therefore, Senators should not be acting under the illusion that we can go ahead and pass this language and make sure that either in conference every-

thing gets taken out or at least this language, rather than the more difficult House language, will be what is sent to the President.

The reality is these are real bullets. This is not something with which to play around. I don't think we can be voting for something just because maybe in the conference committee we can try to make it a little bit better.

Madam President, I wish to get to this point that will, perhaps, put this in perspective. I can't remember another time in history when the United States in the middle of a war has set a deadline and basically told the world: We will be out by this specific date. To state the proposition is to illustrate how odd and destructive a proposition it is. If someone can come to the floor and tell me when this has been done in the past and when it has had a salutary effect on the conflict, I would be very interested and would certainly be willing to listen to how that might have a positive effect here. But even colleagues on the other side of the aisle several months ago expressed themselves on the matter of timetables and deadlines, and they know who they are; they acknowledge this is not the way to fight a war. One thing you cannot do is tell the enemy when you are going to be leaving because it simply allows the enemy to wait you out. Nothing has changed. That fact still remains, and it seems almost inconceivable to me that Members now would be deciding it is now OK to set a deadline and to set timetables.

Some might argue that it is just a goal, it is not a timetable. But the reality is there are both embodied in this section which we seek to strike. The beginning phrase is, "The President shall commence the phased redeployment of United States forces from Iraq not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the act." That is not a "maybe," it is not an "if everything goes well" or "if everything doesn't go well," it is a "shall commence" redeployment. The goal is "with the goal of redeploying by March 31, 2008," but the "shall commence" is pursuant to that goal. So you have to start it, and then you keep going, and your goal is to get it done by March 31, 2008. The only exception is for the limited purposes of leaving troops behind to protect our infrastructure and coalition personnel, training and equipping Iraqi forces, and conducting targeted counterterrorism operations.

How do you decide how many troops you need to leave behind to conduct targeted counterterrorism operations when virtually everything we are doing in Iraq right now is counterterrorism? How do you decide we are going to be able to cut, say, in half the number of troops and still be able to effectively conduct targeted counterterrorism operations? If you are driving down a street to conduct a targeted counterterrorism operation and somebody begins firing on you, do you have to ask them whether they are a terrorist before you can return fire? Do you turn

to your lawyer sitting in the humvee with you: I want to comply with the law, so can I shoot back or not?

This is ludicrous. We cannot impose these kinds of conditions on our troops in the middle of combat and expect them to perform their mission safely. We send the best trained and best equipped troops into harm's way, and we need to give them the other tool they need to prevail; that is, the ability to carry out their mission as their commanders have defined it for them, not as it is micromanaged by a bunch of lawyers in Washington or Members of the Congress.

So, No. 1, this isn't just a wish that we redeploy. It begins "shall commence the phased redeployment not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this act," and the goal is to have it all done by March 31 of next year. That is so destructive in the middle of war that I just can't believe my colleagues would actually contemplate doing that or that they can believe putting these kinds of limitations on our troops is a realistic way to fight a war—conducting targeted counterterrorism operations but not returning fire against, what, against somebody defined as an insurgent, maybe? I don't understand it, and I don't know how many lawyers it is going to take to understand it. Our troops on the ground who are in the middle of a conflict certainly are not going to be able to fight and defend themselves under restrictions such as these, which is, I gather, precisely why the President says he will have to veto it.

That gets me to my last point. I can understand why, Madam President, if you felt this was a lost cause, you would want to just say: Let's have a vote to get out and be done with it and not fund the troops. But instead, there are some—and I am not suggesting in the Congress but there are some who have talked about this as a very clever strategy. They say the opponents of the President and the Congress are going to be able to say they voted to support the troops because they voted for a supplemental appropriations bill for that purpose, knowing all along, however, that it is a false exercise because it puts restrictions on the troops fighting the war that they can't possibly live with, so the President has to veto it. But he will get the blame, not them.

Well, that is too clever by half. The American people understand this. I urge, if any of my colleagues are considering supporting this for that reason, that they fail to appreciate that the American people, yes, would like to bring our troops home, they would like to see this conflict ended, but, no, they do not want it to end with an American defeat. They do not want to see us defeated and, most especially, I can't imagine anybody who wants to have our troops continue the war for a limited duration of time under rules which put them in great danger, which is what this would do. So the President has to veto it.

What happens when he vetoes the bill, if this is the form in which we pass it? We are now beyond April 15, the time the troops need the money, and yet Congress has still not acted to provide the security supplemental funding. The Defense Department now has to terminate contracts so they can switch money from this account over to this account and begin a very costly and time-consuming process of trying to make do while Congress makes up its mind, to make sure they can get the money to the troops so they can continue their operations.

Maybe secretly there are some out there who hope all of this will gradually reduce the ability of the troops to perform their mission so that it becomes a proposition where our strategy, even under the best of circumstances, can't succeed. In other words, the Petraeus plan fails because we couldn't get the support to the troops when they needed the support.

I hope that certainly my colleagues in the House and Senate will not buy into that proposition, will not pull the rug out from under our troops just when it appears this plan is showing signs of success. That slow-bleed strategy would not only ensure that we would lose everything we have gained so far, including the prospect of a success, but that our troops would be put in more danger now than they would be either by supporting them or simply by leaving. It would leave them in a middle ground, in the middle of a fire but without the ability to properly defend themselves.

Maybe some believe that would force our hand and just bring them home anyway, acknowledge defeat, and be done with it. I don't think that is what the American people want. If anybody is thinking that is the strategy behind this proposition, I think they are not only misreading American public opinion but do not have the best interests of our troops in mind.

Since that is the rationale behind this resolution, as offered by my colleagues, I am sure that is not the case. But that is why we need to strike this particular section from the bill.

We will talk later about some other items that need to be stricken as well. It is amazing to me, and I won't get into all the pork that is in this bill, but here we have a security supplemental, emergency funding to support the troops, and we decide to lard it up with all manner of items that are not emergencies, have nothing to do with supporting the troops, but because everybody knows this is a must-pass bill, they figure this is a real good opportunity for them to get things in the bill that might otherwise be very difficult to pass in the Congress.

Just a couple ideas: \$3.5 million related to guided tours of the U.S. Capitol. I am all for guided tours of the U.S. Capitol, but is this an emergency?

There is \$13 million for mine safety research. I am sure mine safety is important to research. Is this an emer-

gency which can't be put in a regular appropriations bill?

We are targeting funding for sugar beets. I presume I like sugar beets—I am not sure—but I don't think it is an emergency for which we need to spend \$24 million.

There is another \$3 million funding for sugarcane, which I understand goes to one Hawaiian cooperative.

Here is something which would appeal to all the politicians: \$100 million for security related to the Republican and Democratic Presidential nominating conventions. Is that next month, Madam President? I have forgotten. Nominating conventions would be in July and August, not of this year but the following year—not exactly an emergency we need to fund in an emergency security supplemental to conduct this war.

Do my colleagues hear what I am saying? Politicians have decided this is a good train to get on board because it has to move, we have to fund the troops. Since it is hard for us to get the Senate and the House to act on these items otherwise, we will just try to attach them to this bill.

We will have other amendments to try to remove these extraneous matters from this funding bill. But what I wanted to talk about today was primarily my concern that if we don't strike this section which has the timetables for withdrawal, then one of two things is going to happen: Either the President vetoes the bill and it then takes us forever to get a clean bill to the President, with the result that the troops don't have the funding they need and the strategy that is currently working becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy for those who say it can't work because they have denied the funds for it to work, or these provisions remain and, of course, it is impossible to conduct operations with these strings attached for our troops. Either way, it is a heck of a way to fight a war. And it illustrates to me that we ought not try to micromanage this conflict from the Halls of Congress. We have plenty of other things that should occupy our time than developing a strategy and the rules of engagement for fighting a war when we have perfectly good people, such as General Petraeus who was unanimously confirmed by this body, to develop a plan and see to it that it is properly executed. We have sent him over to do it. I suggest we give him and his troops the support they need to get the job done.

I would support the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi to strike this section from the bill.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

[From the *Weekly Standard*, Apr. 2, 2007]

WRONG ON TIMETABLES

(By William Kristol and Frederick W. Kagan)

Let's give congressional Democrats the benefit of the doubt: Assume some of them earnestly think they're doing the right thing to insist on adding to the supplemental appropriation for the Iraq war benchmarks and

timetables for withdrawal. Still, their own arguments—taken at face value—don't hold up.

Democrats in Congress have made three superficially plausible claims: (1) Benchmarks and timetables will “incentivize” the Maliki government to take necessary steps it would prefer to avoid. (2) We can gradually withdraw over the next year so as to step out of sectarian conflict in Iraq while still remaining to fight al Qaeda. (3) Defeat in Iraq is inevitable, so our primary goal really has to be to get out of there. But the situation in Iraq is moving rapidly away from the assumptions underlying these propositions, and their falseness is easier to show with each passing day.

(1) The Iraqi government will not act responsibly unless the imminent departure of American forces compels it to do so. Those who sincerely believe this argument were horrified by the president's decision in January to increase the American military presence in Iraq. It has now been more than ten weeks since that announcement—long enough to judge whether the Maliki government is more or less likely to behave well when U.S. support seems robust and reliable.

In fact, since January 11, Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki has permitted U.S. forces to sweep the major Shiite strongholds in Baghdad, including Sadr City, which he had ordered American troops away from during operations in 2006. He has allowed U.S. forces to capture and kill senior leaders of Moktada al-Sadr's Mahdi Army—terrifying Sadr into fleeing to Iran. He fired the deputy health minister—one of Sadr's close allies—and turned a deaf ear to Sadr's complaints. He oversaw a clearing-out of the Interior Ministry, a Sadrist stronghold that was corrupting the Iraqi police. He has worked with coalition leaders to deploy all of the Iraqi Army units required by the Baghdad Security Plan. In perhaps the most dramatic move of all, Maliki visited Sunni sheikhs in Ramadi, the capital of Anbar province and formerly the base of al Qaeda fighters and other Sunni Arab insurgents against his government. The visit was made possible because Anbar's sheikhs have turned against al Qaeda and are now reaching out to the government they had been fighting. Maliki is reaching back. U.S. strength has given him the confidence to take all these important steps.

(2) American forces would be able to fight al Qaeda at least as well, if not better, if they were not also engaged in a sectarian civil war in Iraq. The idea of separating the fight against al Qaeda from the sectarian fighting in Iraq is a delusion. Since early 2004, al Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) has sought to plunge Iraq into sectarian civil war, so as to critically weaken the government, which is fighting it. AQI endeavors to clear Shiites out of mixed areas, terrorize local Sunnis into tolerating and supporting AQI, and thereby establish safe havens surrounded by innocent people it then dragoons into the struggle. Now, heartened by the U.S. commitment to stay, Sunni sheikhs in Anbar have turned on AQI. In response, AQI has begun to move toward Baghdad and mixed areas in Diyala, attempting to terrorize the locals and establish new bases in the resulting chaos. The enemy understands that chaos is al Qaeda's friend. The notion that we can pull our troops back into fortresses in a climate of chaos—but still move selectively against al Qaeda—is fanciful. There can be no hope of defeating or controlling al Qaeda in Iraq without controlling the sectarian violence that it spawns and relies upon.

(3) Isn't it too late? Even if we now have the right strategy and the right general, can we prevail? If there were no hope left, if the

Iraqis were determined to wage full-scale civil war, if the Maliki government were weak or dominated by violent extremists, if Iran really controlled the Shiites in Iraq—if these things were true, then the new strategy would have borne no fruit at all. Maliki would have resisted or remained limp as before. Sadr's forces would have attacked. Coalition casualties would be up, and so would sectarian killings. But none of these things has happened. Sectarian killings are lower. And despite dramatically increased operations in more exposed settings, so are American casualties. This does not look like hopelessness.

Hope is not victory, of course. The surge has just begun, our enemies are adapting, and fighting is likely to intensify as U.S. and Iraqi forces begin the main clear-and-hold phase. The Maliki government could falter. But it need not, if we do not. Unfortunately, four years of setbacks have conditioned Americans to believe that any progress must be ephemeral. If the Democrats get their way and Gen. Petraeus is undermined in Congress, the progress may indeed prove short-lived. But it's time to stop thinking so hard about how to lose, and to think instead about how to reinforce and exploit the success we have begun to achieve. The debate in Washington hasn't caught up to the realities in Baghdad. Until it does, a resolute president will need to prevent defeatists in Congress from losing a winnable war in Iraq.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I agree with the Senator from Arizona that the consequences of playing politics with this important funding for our troops is simply the wrong strategy; that what we have is a game of chicken between the House of Representatives, which is larding up a supplemental appropriations bill with a bunch of extraneous pork, and the President, recognizing that there are nonsecurity provisions in that supplemental appropriations, has said if that and the timetable for withdrawal from Iraq is included as part of this emergency supplemental, he will veto it. So this is a high-risk game of chicken, with the impact of delaying passage of the supplemental being felt directly by our troops on the ground, if that is in fact the result.

Last week, Secretary Gates made clear the consequences of not quickly passing the supplemental funding necessary to support our troops. The downstream effects will directly impact our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. By not moving expeditiously to pass a clean supplemental bill that can pass the Senate and be signed by the President, the majority risks extending the tours of our troops scheduled to come home from Iraq and slowing the repair of equipment necessary to equip them, as well as the training of Iraqi soldiers who are designed to replace them.

Any delay in funding will not prevent a buildup of security forces in Iraq but, instead, threaten to dramatically impact forces already on the ground. Secretary Gates has said this kind of disruption to key programs will have a

genuinely adverse effect on the readiness of the Army and the quality of life for soldiers and their families. So I can't imagine why in the world our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the new majority, would want to risk that.

This supplemental is necessary to pay for training and equipping the soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan. If approved, the supplemental will pay for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, repairing and replacing equipment damaged or destroyed in combat, and new technologies to protect U.S. servicemembers. This last provision includes a new generation of body armor, better armored vehicles, and countermeasures against improvised explosive devices. IEDs have caused about 70 percent of the casualties in Iraq. The supplemental also will provide funding for training and equipping the Iraqi and Afghan security forces.

If this supplemental appropriations bill is not passed by April 15, the military will be forced to consider the following: curtailing and suspending home station training for Reserve and Guard units; slowing the training of units slated to deploy next to Iraq and Afghanistan; cutting the funding for upgrading and renovating the barracks and other facilities that support quality of life for our troops and their families; and stopping the repair of equipment necessary to support predeployment training. This is what Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has said on March 22, 2007.

If the supplemental is not passed by May 15, the military will be forced to consider the following: reducing the repair work done at Army depots; delaying or curtailing the deployment of brigade combat teams to their training rotations. This, in turn, will cause additional units in theater to have their tours extended because other units are not ready to take their place. Delaying the formation of new brigade combat teams; implementation of civilian hiring freeze; prohibiting the execution of new contracts and service orders, including service contracts for training events and facilities; and, finally, holding or canceling the order of repair parts to nondeployed units in the Army.

All of these, according to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, on March 22, 2007.

When the new majority took over Congress, they promised change. In fact, the first bill passed in the Senate was an ethics bill that, in part, helped improve transparency in the way we spend taxpayers' money in Washington. While that ethics bill remains in limbo, the 110th Congress has returned to the tried-and-true technique of inserting mystery earmarks that have nothing to do with funding our troops or fighting the war on terror into a war supplemental bill.

During the election season, many on the other side called the 109th Congress

the “do-nothing” Congress. The 110th Congress is quickly becoming the “say anything” and do-nothing Congress” when it comes to fiscal discipline. Last week, when the Senate debated the budget, the majority spoke of the need for fiscal discipline, even as it passed the \$700 billion tax hike for taxpayers over the next 5 years.

The chairman of the Senate Budget Committee was quoted as saying:

We have a responsibility to govern, and you can't govern without a budget.

But governing takes more than simply passing a budget. Governing also includes the discipline to live within a budget.

Unfortunately, both the Senate and the House failed in their first test by including billions more in the war supplemental than the President requested. As I mentioned, President Bush has already threatened to veto the House bill; not all because of the timetable it imposes for our troops' withdrawal from Iraq but also because the bill is full of pork.

In today's edition of the Politico, they did a fine job of identifying some of the most egregious examples of pork included in the House bill. They highlighted \$5 million for tropical fish breeders and transporters for losses from a virus last year; \$25 million for spinach that growers and handlers were unable to market, up to 75 percent of their losses; \$60.4 million for the National Marine Fisheries Service to be distributed among fishing communities, Indian tribes, individuals, small businesses, including fishermen, fish processors, and related businesses, and other persons for assistance to mitigate the economic and other social effects by a commercial fishery failure.

It also includes \$74 million for the payment of storage, handling, and other associated costs for the 2007 crop of peanuts to ensure proper storage of peanuts for which a loan is made, and the House bill also includes \$120 million for the shrimp and menhaden fishing industries to cover consequences of Hurricane Katrina.

Now, I have to confess, even though I like to fish a little myself, I had never even heard of menhaden, so I went on the Internet to something called the Menhaden Fact Sheet. This is, if you will recall, \$120 million for the shrimp and menhaden fishing industries to cover consequences of Hurricane Katrina. Well, as it turns out, according to the Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia on the Internet, the menhaden are fish of the—well, I can't even pronounce the Latin phrase, but they are of the herring family.

It says here, describing this menhaden that the taxpayer is being asked to pay \$120 million in this emergency war supplemental: to support the gulf menhaden and Atlantic menhaden which are characterized by a series of smaller spots behind the main, humeral spot and larger scales than yellowfin menhaden and finescale menhaden. In addition, yellowfin menhaden tail rays are

a bright yellow in contrast to those of the Atlantic menhaden, which are grayish. Menhaden range in weight up to 1 pound or more. At sea, schools of Atlantic menhaden may contain millions of members. Common names for Atlantic menhaden are mossbunkers and fatback. In Florida, yellowfin menhaden are called pogies, and are the preferred species for use as strip bait.

This is important. It talks about the range, since this is supposedly done as part of the Hurricane Katrina relief measure. It says gulf menhaden range from the Yucatan Peninsula to Tampa Bay, FL, with finescaled menhaden from the Yucatan to Louisiana—I guess we are getting a little closer now to where Hurricane Katrina hit—yellowfin menhaden from Louisiana to North Carolina, the Atlantic menhaden ranges from Jupiter Inlet, FL, to Nova Scotia. The various species of menhaden occur anywhere from estuarine waters outward to the Continental Shelf.

It says that menhaden are essentially filter feeders, straining microscopic plankton, algae, et cetera, from the water they swim through open-mouthed. Unlike mullet, they are not bottom feeders. Due to their feeding habits, they must be caught by cast netting to be used as live bait.

This is the most interesting part of the article. It says: menhaden are not used for human consumption. Most recently, menhaden has begun to be exploited as a source of omega-3 fatty acid fish oil for commercial human consumption, further threatening menhaden populations.

I certainly don't know what the purpose is of this \$120 million for shrimp and the menhaden fishing industries, but I can't see in this description, or anywhere else in this legislation, why this is an emergency or why it ought to be included in an emergency war supplemental. If anything, the inclusion of this kind of appropriation in this emergency war supplemental in the House bill trivializes the importance of providing the money that will help our troops deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq in harm's way.

Here is what the Senate bill included: \$24 million for funding of sugar beets; \$3 million funding for sugar cane, all of which goes to a Hawaiian cooperative; \$100 million for dairy product losses; an additional \$31 million for a 1-month extension of the Milk Income Loss Contract Program; 13 million for Ewe Lamb Replacement and Retention Program; \$115 million for the conservation security program; \$100 million for small agricultural dependent businesses; \$13 million for mine safety technology research; \$50 million for fisheries disaster mitigation fund.

There is so much pork included in this supplemental appropriations bill, both in the House version and in the Senate proposal, that it warranted a front-page story and editorial in USA Today. An editorial in USA Today questioned:

Which is worse: Leaders offering peanuts for a vote of this magnitude, or Members allowing their votes to be bought for peanuts.

The editorial went on to conclude:

These provisions demean a bill that, if enacted, would affect the lives of troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, the balance of power in the Middle East and America's long-term security.

In short, what we have is that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to put money into pet projects—which may or may not be worthy endeavors, we will never know—and yet are unwilling to adequately fund the needs of our military. For all their talk of earmark reform and transparency earlier this year, my colleagues seemed to have forgotten all of that when they put together the supplemental appropriations bill.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 8 minutes.

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

FIRING OF U.S. ATTORNEYS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, my late friend Alex Haley, the author of Roots, lived his life by 6 words: “Find the Good and Praise It.” I thought of those 6 words in connection with the current discussion about the firing of 8 United States Attorneys.

The Democrats are making political hay out of these firings at a time when the Senate should be focused on Iraq, terrorism, health care costs, excessive federal spending, energy independence and keeping our brainpower advantage so we can keep our good jobs here instead of seeing them move overseas.

U.S. Attorneys have always been political appointees serving at the pleasure of the president. President Clinton fired them all on his first day in office. Such partisanship is nothing new. Former Attorney General Griffin Bell recently said that the custom once was for U.S. attorneys simply to vacate their offices on the day a new president was inaugurated, knowing that new political appointees would soon arrive to take their desks.

In the summer of 1963, in between my first and second year at New York University Law School, I worked in Attorney General Robert Kennedy's office as an intern. I was so impressed that, after graduation, I drove to Chattanooga to apply for a job as an Assistant U.S. Attorney. The interview went fine until the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee asked about my politics.