

Regrettably, the President declared he would veto this bill even before Congress completed action on it. He has been talking about this for several weeks. As conditions on the ground continue to deteriorate, that position has become increasingly isolated. In the face of this continued deterioration, this Congress stands firm with the American people. We are resolved to do what we can to see if the President will change course. We ask the President to listen to Congress, to the American people, and to his own military experts.

The President requested \$91.5 billion for continued military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. We provided every penny of that request and much more for the military. We provided, in addition, funds for emergencies here at home such as rebuilding the gulf coast, recovering from agricultural disasters, repairing gaps in homeland security, and keeping the children healthy and insured. Most importantly, we provided a way forward to end the war in Iraq responsibly.

The way forward is consistent with what our military leaders are telling us, including General Petraeus, who repeated again last week on several occasions that this war can only be won politically, not militarily. The plan, and the conference report that will be sent to the President tomorrow, immediately transitions the U.S. mission away from policing the civil war, begins a phased redeployment of our combat troops no later than October 1, 2007, with the goal of removing all forces by April 1, 2008, imposes tangible, measurable, and achievable benchmarks on the Iraqi Government, launches the kind of diplomatic, economic, and political offensive the President's strategy lacks, and rebuilds our overburdened military.

Today we renew our call to President Bush. There is still time to listen. There is still time to come to grips with the facts on the streets of Baghdad and throughout Iraq. There is still time to sign this bill and change course in Iraq. In the 4 days since we passed the conference report, new facts have come to light that make our call for a new direction even more urgent.

This past weekend the United States death toll in Iraq for April now is at 104, with all reported deaths not yet known, making it the deadliest month of the year and one of the deadliest of the entire war. That bears repeating. Despite the President's claims of progress, this has been one of the deadliest months of this 4-going-on-5-year war.

Also this weekend the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction released his quarterly report that paints a dispiriting picture of our \$20 billion rebuilding efforts. It was all over the news; today all over America. The report concludes that rebuilding efforts are falling far short of their targets. As a result, after more than 4 years of these efforts, Iraq is "plagued by power

outages, inadequate oil production, and shortages of clean water and health care."

The report also tells us that despite spending more than three-quarters of our allocated funds to increase electricity production, Iraq's power grid now produces far less electricity than before the invasion, with Baghdad averaging 6.5 hours of electricity per day, down from almost 24 hours before the war. The report tells us that despite spending nearly 2 billion American dollars, our efforts to provide Iraqis with clean drinking water are falling miserably short. This report tells us oil production, a critical component of any future stable Iraq economy, is still way off target.

President Bush continues to ask for our patience and continues to boast of progress, but this report gives us no reason to believe conditions for the Iraqi people are improving any more than they are for our troops. This morning the Washington Post reported that Iraq's Prime Minister al-Maliki is behind the removal and disruption of the duty of some of the Iraqi Army and police force's top law enforcement officials. Why? The apparent reason for the dismissal is they are doing a good job of combating violent Shiite militias. This has "angered U.S. and Iraqi leaders who say the Shiite-led government is sabotaging the military to achieve sectarian goals."

It is yet another reason for us to seriously question whether the Iraqi Government has the ability or even desire to make the political compromises so essential to ending the conflict.

Finally, this weekend, of all places, the Portland, ME Press Herald published an editorial. This is one of many from around the country. They wrote:

It is time to bring our troops home from Iraq. This stand represents a shift in the newspaper's editorial position. Until now, we have supported the military mission in Iraq, though at times we have been harshly critical of President Bush in his role as commander in chief. Now, it is our opinion that major U.S. military operations should cease . . .

It seems as though every day new facts emerge that give us ever greater insight into the astonishing disaster unfolding in Iraq. Just 4 days since the Senate passed the supplemental conference report, the four grim new facts I mentioned have emerged, and this is only the latest and not all of the latest.

The President wonders why the American people have lost patience. It is because the news out of Iraq grows worse by the day. When we send the supplemental conference report to President Bush tomorrow, we ask that he take time to reflect on the fact of that veto. We ask him to listen again to the American people. From Maine to California, from Minnesota to Florida, we ask him to listen to the American people and his own military experts. We ask that he finally summon the courage to admit he made mistakes and take the steps we propose to heal

the grave wounds caused by this war. This bill gives him a path forward. We ask him to follow it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

SUCCESS IN ANBAR PROVINCE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, my good friend the majority leader neglected to mention the front-page story in the New York Times yesterday about the extraordinary success our troops are having in Anbar Province, the center of much of the al-Qaida activity in Iraq, with Sunni sheikhs, tribal leaders coming together to support, not just verbally but in terms of supplying military personnel, fighters to take on al-Qaida in Anbar Province. It is a piece of good news in admittedly a cloudy picture in Iraq. It is also the case, I am confident, that a majority of Democrats in both the House and Senate believe that funds should be supplied for the troops. That certainly has been the view of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, CARL LEVIN. Hopefully, we will find a way forward after the bill that regrettably has the surrender date in it tomorrow is sent down to the President and vetoed. Beginning Wednesday, we will be discussing how to go forward. The majority leader and I have had some preliminary discussion about that. Hopefully, we can resolve this matter in the very near future to provide the funding for the troops so General Petraeus's mission, for which we confirmed him 81 to nothing, will have the resources to be completed later this year.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business until 4:15, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Arizona.

IRAQ

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, speaking on the same matters addressed by both the majority and minority leader, I remind our colleagues that last week this body passed by a very narrow margin what amounts to a strategy for defeat in Iraq. This course of action was not a surprise. After all, the majority leader had announced to the world that the war was lost. This, of course, was news

to people in Iraq, our soldiers in the field included.

For example, SGT George Turkovich was quoted in the Las Vegas Review-Journal, saying:

We're not losing this war. Unfortunately, politics has taken a huge role in this war affecting our rules of engagement. This is a guerilla war that we're fighting, and they're going to tie our hands. So it does make it a lot harder for us to fight the enemy, but we're not losing this war.

This is from a 24-year-old a half a world away.

I suspect the announcement that we had lost the war was also a surprise to General Petraeus. Remember, we confirmed him unanimously in this body. We knew what his strategy was. He has testified about it when he came here for his confirmation hearings. In fact, he had written a book about it.

Many in this body, I fear, have forgotten what he said. In a Pentagon briefing, last week, when he returned from the theater to brief us on the status of the conflict, he reminded us:

[A]s I noted during my confirmation hearing, military action is necessary but not [a] sufficient [condition]. We can provide the Iraqis an opportunity, but they will have to exploit it.

Now, I mention this because the majority leader and others have quoted General Petraeus as saying this war can only be won politically, not militarily. What General Petraeus actually said was: "Military action is necessary but not sufficient." He has pointed out over and over that the political compromises and decisions and agreements that need to be made cannot be made in the context of the violence and instability that exists in Iraq today.

Let me quote him again. He said:

The situation is, in short, exceedingly challenging, though as I will briefly explain, there has been progress in several areas in recent months despite the sensational attacks by al Qaeda, which have, of course, been significant blows to our effort and which cause psychological damage that is typically even greater than their physical damage.

He said:

And I again note that we are really just getting started with the new effort.

He concluded by saying:

Success will take continued commitment, perseverance and sacrifice, all to make possible an opportunity for the all-important Iraqi political actions that are the key to long-term solutions to Iraq's many problems. Because we are operating in new areas and challenging elements in those areas, this effort may get harder before it gets easier.

He predicted this. He said, likely we will have more casualties as we ramp up our efforts because the fighting will be more intense, and that is a necessary precondition to creating the peace and stability which we hope to achieve by this increase in our activity.

So it is mystifying to me those on the other side of the aisle can say we should withdraw now because the war is lost and that the only solution is a political solution, but we are going to

pass a bill denying the President and General Petraeus, the State Department, and others much of the economic reconstruction funding we need to achieve the political solution. As the majority leader noted, there is still much to be done in Iraq, other than on the military side of the equation, just getting things up and running there.

But this is the bill sent to the President, after months of delay, including 2 weeks when the other body was in recess. There, of course, was no recess for our troops, nor for the Pentagon, which, according to Secretary Gates, in an April 11 letter to Congress, told of the disruptions already taking place.

Let me describe what some of those disruptions from this lack of funding are: reducing Army quality-of-life initiatives, including routine upgrade of barracks and other facilities; reducing the repair and maintenance of equipment necessary for deployment training; curtailing the training of Army Guard and Reserve units within the United States, reducing their readiness levels.

This may be just the beginning of what is to come if this supplemental funding is further delayed. The National Journal, this morning, reported: "Democrats have set a Memorial Day deadline to send Bush a reconstructed supplemental." Memorial Day—a month away. Why the further delay, when everyone knows the detriment to the training and equipment availability for our troops that has resulted already from the delay in funding? This would be dangerously irresponsible, and the impacts will get only more significant over time.

Here are some of the additional results that will occur: reducing the pace of equipment overhaul work at Army depots, which will likely exacerbate the equipment availability problems facing stateside units; curtailing training rotations for Brigade Combat Teams currently scheduled for overseas deployment. Such a step would likely require the further extension of currently deployed forces until their replacements were judged ready for deployment. The self-fulfilling prophecy that would result from the lack of funding is: Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we are going to have our troops have to be in theater a longer period of time. Answer: Yes, if you continue to deny the funding, that is exactly what will happen.

It will also delay the acceleration of additional modularized Army brigades necessary to expand the Army unit rotational pool and reduce the stress on existing units. This must be what GEN Peter Schoomaker, who is the Army Chief of Staff, meant when he stated, the Army "will be forced to take increasingly draconian measures which will impact Army readiness and impose hardships on our Soldiers and their families."

These political delays are keeping much needed lifesaving equipment out of the hands of our troops as well. I

supported the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware to add an additional \$1.5 billion for the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles, the so-called MRAPs, which, on top of the \$1.83 billion for the services the President requested, would get these vehicles into the field now. As the senior Senator from Delaware said:

MRAP could reduce the casualties in vehicles due to IED attack by as much as 80 percent.

So why would we further delay the funding to get these vehicles into the hands of our troops? Delaying this all the way to Memorial Day simply means further delays in getting this equipment to the troops.

Meanwhile, though we cannot get this funding to the troops, the majority is feverishly at work adding unrequested, nonemergency spending to the bill—all in an apparent effort to try to cobble together enough votes to actually pass the bill, since the underlying surrender date is so unpopular.

The bill includes over \$21 billion in unrequested items—\$21 billion. Among them is title V, which provides \$3.5 billion in emergency agricultural assistance—things such as \$60 million for salmon fisheries. The bill also includes provisions such as—and by the way, neither the Senate nor the House put these provisions in the bill; they were added in the conference committee—such as an extension of the Pharmacy Plus program in Wisconsin. Now, I am on the Finance Committee, and we did not consider this in the Finance Committee. It is, obviously, not an emergency, but, apparently, there were some folks from Wisconsin who could be brought along in support of the vote if this was added to the bill.

These provisions have no place in the bill. They should not return in the final bill after the President has exercised his veto tomorrow and the majority decides to get serious and pass legislation which the President can actually sign.

My recommendation to the President, if they are included, is to veto the bill. The military troops should not be forced to carry the pork of Members on their backs. This bill should be vetoed both because of the surrender date and because of the pork. It is time to end wasteful Washington spending, especially when it is being carried on the backs of our troops in an emergency supplemental bill.

I saw the items: the spinach farms, the peanut storage, the tropical fish, bailouts for sugar beets. Let these provisions go through the normal channels. If they have merit, their sponsors should be able to carry the day and get them supported. If not, then we should not be supporting them anyway. But let's not slow down the money for the troops just in the name of some special parochial earmark.

One thing that has been lost, I would add, in the race to enact this strategy for defeat is the consequences for this premature—this setting a deadline for

surrender. Remember, this is the first time ever in the middle of a war we would set a date and say: At this time we will be out of there. The message it sends to the enemy is—well, it is unthinkable. But think about the message it sends to the Iraqis who have fought along our side and to our troops and their families. It would be a nightmare for the Iraqi people were we to leave. As President Bush said:

[T]o step back now would force a collapse of the Iraqi government, tear the country apart, and result in mass killings on an unimaginable scale.

Do we want to be responsible for that in this body, the mass killings that would result—exactly what we criticized Saddam Hussein for when he was in power? It would not end with an American withdrawal in Iraq, either. As General Anthony Zinni said:

This is no Vietnam or Somalia or those places where you can walk away. If we just pull out, we will find ourselves back in short order.

Failing in Iraq would set back the entire region. The Brookings Institution—no big supporter of the President, I would add—argues, in their study, that:

Iraq appears to have many of the conditions most conducive to spillover because there is a high degree of foreign “interest” in Iraq. Ethnic, tribal, and religious groups within Iraq are equally prevalent in neighboring countries and they share many of the same grievances. Iraq has a history of violence with its neighbors, which has fostered desires for vengeance and fomented constant clashes. Iraq also possesses resources that its neighbors covet—oil being the most obvious, but important religious shrines also figure in the mix. There is a high degree of commerce and communication between Iraq and its neighbors, and its borders are porous. All of this suggests that spillover from an Iraqi civil war would tend toward the more dangerous end of the spillover spectrum.

We know Iran and Syria are fostering instability in Iraq. Al-Qaida and Hezbollah are both active there as well. Chaos in Iraq could draw in Saudi Arabia, and Saudi officials have threatened “massive intervention to stop Iranian-backed Shiite militias from butchering Iraqi Sunnis.” Kurdish succession could well cause Turkish intervention in the region.

Failing in Iraq would be a dramatic setback in the war on terror. Iraq must not be divorced from its context—the struggle between the forces of moderation and extremism in the Muslim world.

Al-Qaida has been in Iraq since before the United States invaded and has dedicated itself to fomenting sectarian violence there. Much of the violence between Shia and Sunni is a result of prodding by al-Qaida, starting primarily with the blowing up of the Golden Mosque in Samarra.

Osama bin Laden himself referred to Iraq—I am quoting him—as the “capital of the Caliphate,” arguing that “The most . . . serious issue today for the whole world is this Third World War . . . [that] is raging in [Iraq].” Those are not my words. That is what Osama bin Laden said.

One of the terrorism experts, Peter Bergen, said this:

[U.S. withdrawal] would fit all too neatly into Osama bin Laden’s master narrative about American foreign policy. His theme is that America is a paper tiger that cannot tolerate body bags coming home; to back it up, he cites President Ronald Reagan’s 1984 withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon and President Bill Clinton’s decision nearly a decade later to pull troops from Somalia. A unilateral pullout from Iraq would only confirm this analysis of American weakness among his jihadist allies.

Failure in Iraq will encourage further attacks against the United States and provide a base from which to plan and train for attacks.

I must remind my friends, if you are going to push this legislation through, the strategy for defeat, you have a responsibility to tell the American people what the consequences will be and to tell them how you would respond. These are the burdens of being in the majority. These are the burdens of making the difficult decisions we make in this body.

I urge my colleagues to work together to develop a supplemental appropriations bill that President Bush can quickly sign, that will get the funding to our troops and enable us to give the strategy a chance to succeed so that the horrible consequences I have described will not be the result of our actions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

AMERICA COMPETES ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, last week, while the media covered Iraq and U.S. attorneys, the Senate spent 3 days debating and passing perhaps the most important piece of legislation of this 2-year session. Almost no one noticed. The America COMPETES Act, which was the name of the legislation, authorized \$60 billion over 4 years to, among other things, double spending for physical sciences research, recruit 10,000 new math and science teachers, and retrain 250,000 more, provide grants to researchers, and invest more in high-risk, high-payoff research.

These were recommendations of a National Academy of Sciences task force that had been asked to tell Congress—to tell us—exactly what we needed to do to help America keep its brainpower advantage so we can keep our jobs from going to China and India.

Last year, the Senate—but not the House—enacted task force recommendations to encourage “insourcing brainpower” by giving legal residency to skilled foreign students and researchers. Both Houses extended the research and development tax credit.

The process for this legislation was as exemplary as the substance. Senators and their staffs worked across party lines for 2 years. Senior committee members, chairmen and ranking members, waived jurisdictional

prerogatives. The administration participated in extensive homework sessions with Senators and outside experts. The effort was so bipartisan that when the Senate shifted to the Democrats in January, the new majority leader and minority leader introduced the same bill their predecessors had in the last Congress. Seventy Senators co-sponsored the legislation. Even though no cloture motion was filed, 9 amendments were voted upon, and 32 more amendments were addressed within 4 days. The final vote was 88 to 8.

Anyone who knows the Senate knows that the final margin masks how difficult passage was. There were concerted efforts to derail the bill by those with different ideas about policy and about spending. Yet this success with competitiveness suggests three lessons for dealing with other issues that are simply too big to be solved by one party alone, such as immigration, to which the majority leader has indicated we will turn in May, such as health insurance, such as energy independence, such as terrorism, and such as Iraq.

These are the three lessons as I see them:

First, most ideas in the Senate fail for lack of the idea. The first step in our success was when Senator JEFF BINGAMAN and I asked the National Academy of Sciences the following question more than 2 years ago:

What are the top 10 actions, in priority order, that Federal policymakers can take to enhance the science and technology enterprise so that the United States can successfully compete, prosper and be secure in the global community of the 21st century?

The Academy’s 21-member task force, headed by former Lockheed Martin chairman and CEO Norm Augustine and including 3 Nobel laureates, gave up their summer, reviewed hundreds of proposals, and presented us with 20 specific recommendations in response to our question. These 20 recommendations, along with the work of the Council on Competitiveness and the President’s ideas, gave us something to work with other than pet projects of various Members of Congress.

The second lesson is that bipartisanship is possible, even on complex issues. From the framing of the question to the introduction of the final legislation by the majority and minority leader, every effort was bipartisan. When Senator DOMENICI, for example, went to see President Bush, he invited Senator BINGAMAN, a Democrat, to go, as well as me, a Republican. Staffs worked so closely together that no one could say whether it was a Republican bill or a Democratic bill.

Third, and finally, the last lesson is that, unfortunately, bipartisan success, even on the biggest, most complex issues, has an excellent chance of remaining a secret. Despite the size of the accomplishment, the passage of the 208-page America COMPETES Act was barely noticed by the major media. This is not a complaint, merely an observation. More than ever, the media,