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 available 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 way of meeting the immediate needs of our men and women in harm's way. The same Senators and Congressmen who opposed the original emergency supplemental legislation. 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 need emergency supplemental legislation. It is used to meet the immediate needs of the men and women in the Armed Forces on our frontlines.

The bill is not only 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, such as for agricultural 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 I cannot support a bill that is not based on a long 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 many 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 power plant. 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 mission. It is a slap in the face to 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 he gave his report. 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 Iraq 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 are setting an 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 our thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and coworkers.

Trooper Brinkerhoff and Trooper Richard Mattson were shot at about
Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I want to take some time, as we contemplate what is going to happen with the supplemental bill we just passed because, frankly, I am in a state of shock over the casual dismissal of the opinions of the American people, in huge majorities, who say: We have had enough of this war, and we want to make a change. They want us to start to position ourselves in a manner that would allow us to bring our people home.

Not far from this Senate floor, in the middle of the National Mall, is a place of stone and water, of strength and reflection. It is a place that is important to me and, I think, important to the country as a whole. It is where we honor those who served and those who died in World War II.

I proudly wore the uniform of my country during that war. I do not consider myself a hero, although I tried my very best to the best of my ability. I and 16 million others went to war because our mission was clear: defeat the enemy who attacked us. And while the battles were fought across the ocean, the enemy our troops are fighting against today are all here. That was the message: sacrifice, sacrifice at home, use less gas, turn off the lights, reduce energy consumption, black out the beachfront places or coastal areas so the enemy could not see the lights of the cities. Even with rising injuries and casualties, in World War II, America kept its resolve because we believed in our leaders.

How times have changed. There are some in this room in the deaths of thousands of Americans who have lost faith in this war effort: It has become clear our leaders are not providing us with the truth. And the chief purveyor of misstatements is Vice President Cheney.

He chooses to say whatever he wants to, to advance his agenda. But the American people have lost faith in this war, but we do know the following: They presented false intelligence behind this administration's drive to Iraq, but we do know the following: They presented false intelligence to the American people and our allies.

We have seen some of the irresponsible, credible people, who believed in the case that was being made by the intelligence reports—look at one of the great figures in American contemporary history, Colin Powell—a genuine Chief of Staff. I remember his speech at the United Nations providing evidence of materials that confirmed there were weapons of mass destruction there. And now this man, who has a lifetime built on honesty and credibility, said there was a connection.

I want to look at some of the outlandish statements the Vice President has made about this war. On the eve of the invasion, in March 2003, Vice President DICK CHENEY assured the Nation that “we will be greeted as liberators.”

I ask the question: How dare he make that statement such as that—without any knowledge, without any idea of what the consequences of that action might be. We will be greeted as liberators?

He went on to say the fight would be “weeks rather than months.”

In June of 2003, Vice President Cheney assured the insurgency in Iraq is “in the last throes.” That was almost 2 years ago. Ask our people in uniform, ask our people in combat, ask those who are facing another deployment after having been there once or even twice—ask them what they think about that statement, about the accuracy of those remarks.

Earlier this year, even after the Pentagon admitted there was no evidence at all of a connection between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaida, the Vice President said there was a connection. If you say it, maybe you can convince people, even if it is not the truth.

And now, this week, we have our Vice President speaking out against this bill we just passed, again making outlandish claims.

You have to ask yourself a question: Who is still listening to those comments and giving them any credibility? Unfortunately, there are people, despite his outrageous and unsubstantiated comments—claims such as the “incredible outcome” of the situation in Iraq—people who tend to believe him. He is, after all, the Vice President of the United States. It is a prestigious job. There is an automatic assumption that credibility goes to the occupant of that position.

Perhaps we may never know the real motivation behind this administration’s drive to Iraq, but we do know the following: They presented false intelligence to the American people and our allies.

We have seen some of the responsible, credible people, who believed in the case that was being made by the intelligence reports—look at one of the great figures in American contemporary history, Colin Powell—a genuine Chief of Staff. I remember his speech at the United Nations providing evidence of materials that confirmed there were weapons of mass destruction there. And now this man, who has a lifetime built on honesty and credibility, said there was a connection.

I want to look at some of the outlandish statements the Vice President has made about this war. On the eve of the invasion, in March 2003, Vice President DICK CHENEY assured the Nation that “we will be greeted as liberators.”

I ask the question: How dare he make that statement such as that—without any knowledge, without any idea of what the consequences of that action might be. We will be greeted as liberators?

He went on to say the fight would be “weeks rather than months.”

In June of 2003, Vice President Cheney assured the insurgency in Iraq is “in the last throes.” That was almost 2 years ago. Ask our people in uniform, ask our people in combat, ask those who are facing another deployment after having been there once or even twice—ask them what they think about that statement, about the accuracy of those remarks.

Earlier this year, even after the Pentagon admitted there was no evidence at all of a connection between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaida, the Vice President said there was a connection. If you say it, maybe you can convince people, even if it is not the truth.

And now, this week, we have our Vice President speaking out against this bill we just passed, again making outlandish claims.

You have to ask yourself a question: Who is still listening to those comments and giving them any credibility? Unfortunately, there are people, despite his outrageous and unsubstantiated comments—claims such as the “incredible outcome” of the situation in Iraq—people who tend to believe him. He is, after all, the Vice President of the United States. It is a prestigious job. There is an automatic assumption that credibility goes to the occupant of that position.

Perhaps we may never know the real motivation behind this administration’s drive to Iraq, but we do know the following: They presented false intelligence to the American people and our allies.

We have seen some of the responsible, credible people, who believed in the case that was being made by the intelligence reports—look at one of the great figures in American contemporary history, Colin Powell—a genuine Chief of Staff. I remember his speech at the United Nations providing evidence of materials that confirmed there were weapons of mass destruction there. And now this man, who has a lifetime built on honesty and credibility, said there was a connection.

As my family and I reflect on the reflection, coming from the President or the Vice President of the United States.

The administration knowingly misled the country about Iraq’s nuclear ambitions in President Bush’s 2003 State of the Union Address.

In a recent CBS News poll, 66 percent of the American people disapproved of the way President Bush is handling this situation with Iraq. That disapproval has continued to build. If you look at some of the polling data we have seen over the last couple years, less and less of the people in the country believe we are doing a good job with the situation in Iraq, as portrayed by the President.

On Monday, President Bush said:

There’s been some progress.

That statement shows the President is not in an alternative reality.

On that same day—Monday—10 American troops were killed, 9 of them in a single attack. Since the beginning of this war, more than 3,300 of our people in uniform have died.

One of those people was a fellow from Toms River, NJ, Marine Cpl Thomas Saba. He served with the Marines’ Flying Tigers. He volunteered to extend...