

PELOSI. I go back to the Washington Post editorial. I must read in its entirety the final paragraph, because it lays it out far better than I can.

The paragraph refers to a statement by NANCY PELOSI:

We came in friendship, hope and determined that the road to Damascus is a road to peace.

Then the editorial says, and I quote:

Never mind that that statement is ludicrous: As any diplomat with knowledge of the region could have told Ms. Pelosi, Mr. Assad is a corrupt thug whose overriding priority at the moment is not peace with Israel but heading off U.N. charges that he orchestrated the murder of the former Lebanese prime minister. The really striking development here is the attempt by a Democratic Congressional leader to substitute her own foreign policy for that of the sitting Republican President. Two weeks ago Ms. Pelosi rammed legislation through the House of Representatives that would strip Mr. Bush of his authority as commander-in-chief to manage troop movements in Iraq. Now she is attempting to introduce a new Middle East policy that directly conflicts with that of the President.

We have found much to criticize in Mr. Bush's military strategy and regional diplomacy, but Ms. Pelosi's attempt to establish a shadow Presidency is not only counterproductive, it is foolish.

That happened while we were on break. There are some who hope it disappears in memory, and in the words of George Orwell, that it goes down the memory hole and never gets called up again.

I was going to talk entirely about the economy, but I think this is something, now that we are back in session, that we should take time to talk about. I hope with this kind of scolding from the Washington Post—I understand there were other newspapers also that took the same position, newspapers that are not favorable to Republicans generally—I would hope the Speaker would realize she has made a rookie mistake and that she will not do it again.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, listening to the distinguished Senator from Utah, I could not help but agree with him that it is refreshing to go back to our States to talk to people whose priorities are different from those in Washington, DC, and to sort of decompress a little bit and get in touch with reality once again.

Washington, DC is a fascinating place, but it is kind of like coming to Disneyland in some ways. It is not real in many respects, although as we all know, important decisions are made here that affect the lives of all 300 million people in the United States and people all across the world.

It is one of those decisions, or should I say nondecisions, that I will rise to speak on briefly this morning. It is more in sorrow than in anger, but I am speaking specifically of the fact that it has been more than 60 days since the

President sent up an emergency war spending bill to Congress. Now 60 days, more than 60 days, have passed, and the troops still do not have the money and the House of Representatives has yet to appoint conferees so we can move forward on getting that money to our troops. In fact, the House is in recess for an additional week. Our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, of course, do not have the liberty of taking a recess in the middle of the battle they have so nobly and valiantly committed themselves to fight. While they are living up to their responsibilities, I think it is important for Congress to live up to its responsibilities too. Of course, the message they are seeing is more than a little bit confusing, and I regret that, honestly, because while the Senate majority leader, Senator REID, at one point has said we are not going to do anything to limit funding or to cut off funds—he made that comment on November 30, 2006—on April 2, 2007, he made the announcement that, in fact, he was going to cosponsor Senator FEINGOLD's legislation that would do exactly what he said he wouldn't do a few short months before; that is, cut off funds to support the troops.

Notwithstanding that position, we did, in fact, pass the funding bill, but, unfortunately, it contained unnecessary spending and in effect a surrender date for our enemy to see. I cannot bring myself to understand how someone can say they support the troops with the surrender date or porkbarrel spending necessary to secure the votes to pass it, because it could not pass on its own merits.

I have, in fact, joined the rest of the Senate and House Republican leadership in sending a letter to Speaker PELOSI, urging her to call the House back into session immediately so Congress can finish its work on this important emergency spending bill.

Keep in mind, funding for these troops has been pending since February 5, and because of the unnecessary strictures on the President's authority as Commander in Chief, where Congress has, in effect, deemed to act like an armchair general, all 535 of us, to dictate the tactics of the battle 6,000 miles away, the President said he is likely to veto the bill unless it is changed substantially through a conference committee. The Senate, of course, appointed conferees on March 29, but the House never did, despite passing the bill a week earlier.

Senator HARRY REID, the Senate majority leader, said he hoped the conference committee would begin on March 30, but, unfortunately, that hasn't happened, and again our troops still do not have the resources they need.

Lest there be any doubt, this is what the Army Chief of Staff, General Schoomaker, has said: Without approval of the supplemental funds in April, we will be forced to take increasingly Draconian measures which will impact Army readiness and impose hardships on our soldiers and their families.

Secretary of Defense Gates also emphasized the danger of delay. He 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.

Some have suggested this is all a bluff, and that our military can wait until July to get the funding from this emergency supplemental. That is simply not correct. As a matter of fact, Secretary Gates listed the specific cuts the Army would be forced to consider in the upcoming months. He said: If the supplemental is not passed by April 15, the Army—which has the majority of all forces in Iraq—could have to curtail and suspend home station training for National Guard units, slow the training of units headed to the wars, stop paying for facilities upgrades at home bases, and stop repairing gear needed for predeployment training.

He said: If May 15 comes and goes without passage and seeing the funds go to the troops, even more devastating cuts would result, including a slowdown in depot repair work, slowing brigade combat team training, which would force the extension of units in theater—in other words, the troops could not rotate back on a timely basis as they and their families expect they will—and it would cause the implementation of a hiring freeze, among other moves.

I cannot understand how we can claim to support our troops and yet put them in increased jeopardy as a result of our failure to act. That is why I believe it is so important that we get these funds to the troops as soon as we can, stripped of these extraneous strictures on our troops, artificial deadlines sending a white flag of surrender, letting our enemy know when we are going to quit. It needs to be stripped of those provisions as well as the porkbarrel spending our troops ought not to have to bear, in addition to the other burden they and their families bear on our behalf.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN MEMORY OF COACH EDDIE ROBINSON

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today in morning business to speak about the passing of an extraordinary man. Today, in Baton Rouge, in the capital, the son of a sharecropper will lie in state. It is a fitting tribute to Coach Eddie Robinson, the winningest

coach in the history of football, but a man who excelled beyond the playing field, a man whose life touched hundreds and thousands of athletes, on the field and off, and millions of lives in a positive way around the world.

I rise to pay him tribute today. He is a true American hero. He began coaching in 1941 at Grambling State University. During his 57-year coaching tenure, he won more than 400 football games—more than any other coach before him—and 17 championships in the Southwestern Athletic Conference.

Coach Robinson shattered the glass ceiling that had always held back the true potential of African-American players and coaches. He did it with a strong and indomitable spirit and with determination and love of country.

In a time before the civil rights movement, when overt and state-sponsored racism was the order of the day and permeated both college and professional sports, Coach Robinson proved that all athletes deserve to compete on the same playing field.

Through the years, more than 200 of his players have played in the NFL, including Paul “Tank” Younger, the first NFL player from a predominantly African-American college.

Coach Robinson was personally responsible for paving the way for hundreds of African-American players to have the opportunity to play in the NFL and, as well, to play in majority White colleges and universities throughout the country.

His legacy includes one of the most exciting annual matchups in college sports held every year: the Thanksgiving Bayou Classic football game, held usually in New Orleans, LA, between Grambling State, his beloved university, and Southern University of Baton Rouge.

But his achievements are not limited to his athletic victories. He taught the players the meaning of teamwork and patriotism, self-respect and hard work. He provided them with real lessons of life that extended far beyond the playing field.

After their experience at Grambling, I know how proud he was to see his young athletes excel and move all over the world, impacting the wider community in business and in athletics, as well as in general community service in multiple ways.

He leaves behind a vibrant legacy. He leaves behind a legacy of mentorship that is truly unmatched. He leaves behind a loving and wonderful family, a faith that permeated his entire life and had impact throughout the community. He leaves behind a life well lived and a model for all.

One of his former players said it best when he said: “Everyone wanted to be like Eddie.”

Mr. President, I close these remarks today by saying that I, like most everyone in Louisiana, knew Coach Robinson. We had been in his presence. We had watched him coach. We had heard him laugh. I had the great privilege of

spending some time with him recently at his home in Grambling, with his wife Doris and some of the family members. I could not help to be, even at his late age of 88, impressed with his strong and wonderful spirit. When he was just a few years younger, as he walked into the room, you could feel that spirit immediately.

So it is with great sadness that we say good-bye to Coach Eddie Robinson. But it is with great joy we share with the world this man, the son of a sharecropper, a man who refused to let the limits of even the laws of those times and the limits of the culture in which he lived to stop him or to stop his belief in the young men and women he coached and served.

So we say good-bye today. But he is getting a proper tribute lying in state at our State capital in Baton Rouge, and we are confident his legacy will live on.

In my last visit with his family, I hoped and suggested we could build a museum in his honor. I am hoping it is something in which Members of this Congress will join with our leaders at home—not just any museum but a museum that will honor his life and legacy; a place where athletes, professional and amateur, could receive ongoing training and support both academically as well as in terms of general leadership, so his legacy could live on. Perhaps this place or the center of learning and leadership should be located either on or somewhere very near the Grambling campus where he served for so many years.

So, again, it is with great sadness we say good-bye, but with great pride in a true American hero, Eddie Robinson.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the remaining time in morning business.

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

AUTHORIZING LEGAL COUNSEL REPRESENTATION

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 140, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 140) to authorize legal representation in In the Matter of the Application of Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for representation of the Committee on Finance in a proceeding in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The Finance Committee has obtained from that court, in connection with a hear-

ing the committee is holding this Thursday, a writ compelling the production of a Federal prisoner, whom the committee has scheduled to appear as a witness before it.

Notwithstanding the long history of congressional committee seeking, and the court's approving, such writs to authorize the production of Federal prisoners to provide needed testimony before Congress, the U.S. Department of Justice has moved to quash the writ in response to objections made by the Bureau of Prisons to decisions the committee made about the organization of its hearing and presentation of its witnesses. The Justice Department's motion to quash challenges the authority of the court to issue a writ compelling a federal prisoner to be produced to appear in a congressional as opposed to a judicial proceeding.

This resolution will authorize the Senate legal counsel to represent the Finance Committee in connection with this proceeding in order to protect the committee's interests in obtaining testimony it needs.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements related thereto be printed in the RECORD, with no intervening action.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 140

Whereas, in a proceeding styled In the Matter of the Application of Committee on Finance for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum, Misc. No. 07-134, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the Senate Committee on Finance filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum;

Whereas, on April 4, 2007, the Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia issued the writ sought by the Committee;

Whereas, the United States Department of Justice has raised questions about the Committee's application for the writ and the writ that was issued;

Whereas, pursuant to section 708(c) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. § 288g(c), the Senate may direct the Senate Legal Counsel to perform such duties consistent with the purposes and limitations of title VII of the Ethics in Government Act as the Senate may direct: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the Committee on Finance in the proceeding styled In the Matter of the Application of Committee on Finance for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum, Misc. No. 07-134 (D.D.C.).

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, or today, the debate with respect to the stem cell bills be in alternating segments of 60 minutes as follows:

Sixty minutes under the control of Senator HARKIN or his designee; the