

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 troops 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 cosponsored 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,

outside interest groups, and party structures reward conflict and the taking of irreconcilable positions. There is little reward for reconciling principled positions into legislation.

Here is another example: The work of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group was consigned almost immediately to the shelf as a bookend. Somewhere, there is a letter to President Bush from 10 Senators, 5 from each party, offering to work together with him to help every American have affordable health insurance.

Although there is not much attention paid to this kind of legislative activity, I am convinced the American people and most Senators are hungry for it. I believe the last election was as much about the conduct of business in Washington, DC, as it was about the conduct of the war in Iraq. Americans are tired of what they perceive as Senators playing petty, kindergarten, partisan games while there are big issues that cannot be solved by one party alone. Americans know we need a political solution to Iraq in Washington, DC, as much as we need one in Baghdad.

The irony is that last week's culmination of 2 years of work on the America COMPETES Act demonstrates that the Senate is capable of tackling big, complex issues in a bipartisan way, but that we will have to look beyond the influences of the media, special interest groups, and the political party apparatus for encouragement to do it.

Virtue, as ever, will be its own reward.

Mr. 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 legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WEBB be recognized following me for a period of 15 minutes in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IRAQ FUNDING

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there is a lot of discussion today, and has been in the last week or two, and perhaps there will continue to be discussions about the funding for our troops in Iraq. I think it is important to say that the Congress has passed legislation that will go to the President that actu-

ally requests more funding than the President requested for the troops in Iraq. It also establishes a goal of hoping that perhaps we will be able to extract our troops from Iraq in a year. There is not a requirement that American troops be pulled out of Iraq. It establishes a goal. But what I wish to talk about today is the part of the bill that provides a higher level of funding for the troops than the President requested.

It is regrettable that in this country we have gone to war in Iraq and to war in Afghanistan. We have asked very much of our soldiers to go into harm's way—3,300 plus of them have been killed in Iraq—but we have not asked for similar circumstances from the American people. We have not asked for a commitment from the American people. In fact, the very funding the President has requested, once again, as emergency funding is not paid for. The President says: Let's have emergency funding and add it to the debt.

We have not asked the American people to pay for the war. We sent the soldiers to war with the understanding that when they come back, they will inherit the debt and pay for this war. That doesn't make sense to me.

Even more than that, the President says one can contribute to this country by going shopping, going to the mall. So we send soldiers to war, and we go to the mall. Where is the national commitment? Where is it that we have asked the American people to go to war against terrorism, to go to war in Iraq with the American soldiers?

I remind everyone that what we did in the Second World War—and by the way, this war has now lasted longer than the Second World War. But in the Second World War, our country mobilized. There was Rosie the Riveter. There were three shifts at the manufacturing plants. We had our capability humming in this country producing everything we needed for that war. We had rationing. We had factory lights on 24 hours a day.

William Manchester wrote a book, "The Glory and the Dream." He describes what we did. He said this:

From an initial keel-to-delivery time of over 200 days, Henry Kaiser cut the average work time on a liberty ship to 40 days. In 1944, he was launching a new escort aircraft carrier every week, and they were turning out entire cargo ships in 17 days. During the first 212 days of 1945, they completed 247 cargo ships, better than one a day.

We had this country's productive capacity revved up full speed. When Stalin met with FDR and Churchill in the mid-1940s before the end of the war, he said: Thank God for America's productive capability, America's manufacturing capability.

Here is what they did. Manchester, in "The Glory and the Dream," described this. I want us to think about this just for a moment: From 1941 to 1945, We turned out 296,000 warplanes, 102,000 tanks, 2.4 million trucks, 8,700 warships, and 5,400 cargo ships. America

went to war. In the last year of the Second World War, we were producing 4,000 warplanes a month in our factories. Contrast that with what is happening today.

The reason I ask these questions, the reason I come to the floor to ask those questions is because of this picture. This is a picture of something called an MRAP, Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle, which is much safer than the humvee. This version of the MRAP is what the Commandant of the Marine Corps said we need in Iraq, 6,700 of them.

There have been 300 IED attacks in Iraq against this version of the MRAP. Not one death. Let me say that again. There have been 300 attacks by an IED against this vehicle in Iraq; not one death in those attacks.

We have had 3,342 U.S. troops killed in Iraq, 70 percent of them caused by IEDs, improvised explosive devices. The Commandant of the Marine Corps says this vehicle will save three-fourths of the lives that are being lost. Eighty percent of the casualties from IEDs will be saved with this safer vehicle.

Why do I raise this question in the context of what we did in the Second World War? Because we have been producing about 45 of these vehicles a month. At a time when the Commandant of the Marine Corps says we need 6,700 in Iraq to safeguard the soldiers going on patrol in Iraq, with the capability that this vehicle will save three-fourths of the lives that are now being lost, we are producing 45 a month. They say they want 6,700 in Iraq, and the President has requested less than a third of that amount. We wrote money in this appropriations bill, \$1.2 billion, to substantially increase the number of MRAP vehicles that must be produced and must be sent to Iraq to save lives.

Let me read, if I might, James Conway, Commandant of the Marine Corps, understanding I am talking about this MRAP:

The MRAP vehicle has a dramatically better record of preventing fatal and serious injuries from attacks by IEDs. The Commander of Multinational Force West estimates that the use of MRAP could reduce the casualties in vehicles due to IED attacks by as much as 80 percent.

This is from the Commandant of the Marine Corps. Why is it we could produce 4,000 warplanes a month at the end of the Second World War in support of our fighting men and women, and we produce 45 MRAPs a month in this country? Why is it we surge our troops to Iraq but don't surge our production of the MRAP vehicle, just as one example, that would provide dramatic increased protection against the lost of life from IEDs? Why will we not surge this? Why is this less important? I don't understand this at all. We go to war, but it is just the troops, not the country?

There was a story in USA Today, April 19: