

have faced hardship and health consequences in the aftermath of the attacks.

Today, we have achieved a great victory—but it must only be a first step to make sure those that gave so much on that terrible day are not forgotten and receive the help they deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and that the following Senators be recognized in the following order: Senator SHELBY, 3 minutes; Senators FEINSTEIN and FEINGOLD, 10 minutes total; Senator BUNNING, 15 minutes; and Senator SCHUMER, 15 minutes.

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

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

THANKING STAFF

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, before the Senator proceeds, I wish to take a minute and thank all of our staffs who worked tremendously hard to get this bill to the floor, the staff on the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD's personal staff—many Members worked very hard, along with their staff members but particularly those people who sit in the back row back there and are not recognized who stay up very late to get this to all of us. To all of our floor staff, I say thank you for your tremendous work in getting us to this point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, in passing this emergency supplemental appropriations bill this afternoon, the Democratic-controlled Senate has sent a message—one that the war is lost, that we have given up, and that we have no hope of victory.

Today, we have also put an arbitrary deadline on our military. I believe it is unequivocally wrong to do this, the wrong message at exactly the wrong time. I believe we must give our troops the opportunity to win. We cannot tie the hands of our commanders on the ground. We cannot have 535 generals micromanaging the war from the Halls of Congress.

This war is a test of wills. Our defeatist message states that today our will has been broken. This is not the message we want our enemy to hear. Our actions in the Senate have consequences. I believe we have just sent a message—the wrong message—that our efforts were not enough. We have sent

a message that the enemy has won. I believe we have sent a message of surrender, a message of submission, a message of failure. And this message was not just sent to those fighting against us in Iraq, it reverberates around the globe. Today, I believe the Senate has illustrated raw partisan politics at its worst.

I believe the American people deserve better. Our troops deserve better. Our Armed Forces need the support of the people—us—who sent them into a war zone, not partisan politics. They need the time to succeed, not a timetable for retreat.

George Orwell once said: The quickest way to end a war is to lose it. Yes, the quickest way to end the war is to lose it. With today's vote, we are well on our way. Yet fortunately, for our troops, the President will veto this bill, and Congress will have enough votes to sustain it.

In the coming weeks, when Congress crafts a new supplemental appropriations bill, I believe we must not use the same narrow-minded approach. We must not send another message of defeat, of surrender.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE PARITY ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, on April 17, just over a week ago, I rose, along with the Senator from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up and adopt S. 223, which was reported unanimously by the Rules Committee on March 28. Senator ALEXANDER objected on behalf of a Republican Senator. As a result, the bill remains in limbo. To this date, that Republican Senator has declined to come forward to say why the bill should not become law.

This is such a simple, direct bill with respect to transparency. It is an idea whose time has long come. It is very hard for us to understand who could oppose this good government bill and what their reason for opposing it could be.

After last week's roadblock halted passage, the minority leader's spokesman told the Washington Post:

Senators are now reviewing the bill in anticipation of legislative action.

We would hope that review is complete. We could now get down to business and today, by unanimous consent, just as we did in the Rules Committee, pass this bill, send it to the House, and have it become law. At our hearing on March 14 and our markup on March 28, it was clear there was no public opposition whatsoever to this bill. It is really time for the Senate to act.

The bill is titled the "Senate Campaign Disclosure Parity Act." It is sponsored by Senators FEINGOLD and COCHRAN and 33 additional Senators. It would simply require that the Senate

campaign finance reports be filed electronically rather than in paper format, just as everyone else is doing now.

Currently, House candidates, Presidential candidates, political action committees, and party committees are all required to file electronically. And they do. But Senators, Senate candidates, authorized campaign committees, and the Democratic and Republican senatorial campaign committees are exempt. As a result, we have a cumbersome system in which paper copies of disclosure reports are filed with the Senate Office of Public Records, which scans them to make an electronic copy and sends the copy to the FEC on a dedicated communications line. The FEC then prints the report and sends it to the vendor in Fredericksburg, VA, where the information is keyed in by hand and then transferred back to the FEC database at a cost of approximately \$250,000 to the taxpayers. This is \$250,000 which is needlessly spent to continue an archaic system. It is long past time to bring the Senate into the modern era.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to let this bill go today.

I yield the floor to the author of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I certainly thank the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, once again for being so committed to getting this bill passed. It has been, as she said, over a week since we came to the floor to try to get the Senate to pass the Senate Campaign Parity Act.

Last Tuesday, the senior Senator from Tennessee objected "on behalf of a Republican Senator." Now we have waited to hear from that Senator, whoever he or she is, about his or her concerns about the bill. So far, not a word. It would not take very long to review this bill. It is very simple.

In fact, it seems as if the source of the objection is hoping never to be identified because a citizen effort to find out who the objector is, supported by a number of blogs from both the right and the left, has so far come up empty.

There has been a lot of discussion in the press and the blogs about whether the objection we heard last week constitutes one of those so-called secret holds, which have rightly come under attack in recent years. Well, someone anonymously blocked the bill from being passed last Tuesday, that person has made no effort to resolve his or her concerns with us, and the Republican leadership will not tell us who that person is. Now, that is a "secret hold," in my book. It is time for some sunshine here. If someone has a problem with this bill, he or she should step forward and discuss it with us. I am hopeful that after a week to take a look at the bill, the objector will have realized how completely noncontroversial it is and will let it go through this week.

This bill simply puts Senate campaigns under the same obligations to file their reports electronically that House and Presidential campaigns have been under for years. There is simply no reason the information in Senate campaign finance reports should remain less accessible to the public than any other campaign finance report.

As the Senator from California said, we now have 37 bipartisan cosponsors, and not a single concern about the bill was heard in the Rules Committee. The bill passed the committee by a voice vote, and no one has come up to us with any concerns, even in this last week. So the time has come to get this done.

I once again thank the Senator from California for her persistence. It is a pleasure to work with her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I would like to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his leadership and for his continuing interests. Hopefully, this will pass today.

In that vein, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar item No. 96, S. 223, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designated statements and reports in electronic form, and that the committee-reported amendment be considered and agreed to, the bill as amended be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action.

Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, on behalf of the Republican side, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. We will be back and back and back again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, I was precluded from speaking prior to the vote taken on the Iraq supplemental. I am going to speak for about 15 minutes at this time and voice my strong opposition, as Senator SHELBY, to the conference report that just passed this body. This bill is a highly irresponsible bill showing both a disregard for taxpayer money and our American service people. It is probably the most dangerous bill I have seen in over 20 years of service in the Congress of the United States.

I don't say that lightly. Last month I came to the floor to voice my opposition to the emergency supplemental spending bill. I wanted a clean bill that the President could sign into law. Instead, today we passed a bill that ties troop funding to arbitrary withdrawal deadlines and billions and billions of dollars in unrelated spending.

Now, 3 weeks later, we find ourselves with essentially the same piece of leg-

islation. It is an insult to the men and women who serve in our armed services. Funding our troops is not a political game. We are a nation at war. There are unexpected costs and needs that must be continued to promote our freedoms and troops at home and help them succeed in Iraq. That is why we have emergency supplemental legislation. It is used to meet the immediate needs of the men and women in the Armed Forces on our frontlines.

The extra spending goes beyond emergency needs and, instead, adds additional nondefense funds that are not necessary right now. There is a lot of fat in this bill that the Senate should consider under the regular appropriations process. That is what appropriations bills are all about. The hurricanes of 2005 were truly devastating. I have supported the Government's rebuilding efforts in the region. But the bill before us today includes billions of dollars in unrequested and unnecessary funding for the Corps of Engineers. These provisions are inappropriate for a wartime supplemental.

Another area of extra spending relates to agriculture. I have been a strong supporter of America's farmers, but the programs in this bill do not belong in a supplemental wartime bill. I cannot justify \$20 million for dairy farmers and \$60 million for salmon fisheries in the Pacific Northwest. This bill is about our troops, not our farmers. There are even more glaring examples in this conference report: \$18 million for drought assistance in the upper Midwest; \$25 million for NASA facilities in the gulf region; \$10 million for historic preservation funds. This bill doubles the 20 million I opposed for asbestos abatement at the Capitol powerplant. The list goes on.

I am ashamed that this Congress believes it can solve its own budgetary problems on the backs of our fighting men and women.

Finally, instead of helping our troops, this supplemental bill only ends up offending them. We ought to be sending a clear message of support for our men and women in harm's way. It should be clear that this Congress and this country will make sure that the men and women of our Armed Forces have the necessary supplies and resources to carry out their missions. Unfortunately, this legislation only serves to undermine our military missions. It pulls the rug right out from under our troops, just as we are at a point of seeing some signs of increased security in Baghdad.

To me, this bill is a strategy for defeat. It sends a detrimental message to our troops and only serves to embolden our enemies. It tells the terrorists: Mark your calendars with our date for withdrawal from Iraq; sit and wait for us to get out.

Like many of my colleagues, I had the opportunity to hear firsthand from my good friend, David Petraeus, yesterday about the current situation in Iraq. I am sorry it was a very highly

classified briefing or I would share those things with the Senate. But I want to give the mood of his report. He was very frank in his report. The situation in Iraq is not any closer to being resolved than it was 2 months ago when his mission started. The country still suffers from violent sectarian strife and is at war with a cluster of enemies, including primarily al-Qaida, Osama bin Laden, Sunni insurgents, and Shia radicals. The other side of the aisle has already said the war is lost. But we haven't even given the President's plan a chance to work. We still have a long way to go in Iraq, but sectarian killings have dropped dramatically since January. There is greater cooperation between the U.S. forces and the Iraqi Army, and we are beginning to see the Iraqi people work toward complete sovereignty.

We should not dictate arbitrary guidelines for the future. The Iraqi Government is still in a critical development stage. It must be given the time and room to grow with our guidance. The same Senators and Congressmen calling for an immediate withdrawal from Iraq or setting an arbitrary withdrawal date do not discuss the ramifications of such an action. It may be because they know that immediate withdrawal from Iraq would be disastrous to the Middle East and threaten international stability and our national defense. Withdrawal is not a viable option. If we leave Iraq prematurely, we lose. Peace-loving people in Iraq lose, and Islamic radicals and al-Qaida win. That is the situation we are in today. We need to be honest about it as we proceed forward.

I have voted against past withdrawal language and voted against it again today. Setting a withdrawal deadline will have grave consequences for the United States. It will put our national security at risk. After the President vetoes this bill—and we sustain his veto—we need to refocus our attention and our productive manner on how to best help our commanders on the ground to achieve success in Iraq. No arbitrary timetable, no billions of dollars in unrelated pork—we need a clean bill that funds our men and women in uniform and gives them a chance for success.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

HEROIC NEW YORK STATE TROOPERS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise to speak on a very sad occasion that occurred in my State in the last 2 days and to recognize the three heroic New York State troopers shot in an act of cold-blooded violence. Sadly, one trooper, David C. Brinkerhoff, a member of the specially trained mobile response team, has been killed. Tonight my thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and coworkers.

Trooper Brinkerhoff and Trooper Richard Mattson were shot at about