of the 1st Calvary Division, who recently lost his life while on patrol in Iraq.

Upon learning of about his life, I was struck by all the adventures that Corporal Kowalczyk had undertaken. He had been the captain of the swim team at Macalester College, where he had lived a life full of adventures. He was a young man that already figured life out. He was in such a hurry for life, that he leap from an iceberg and swam in the frigid waters of the Arctic Ocean. Clearly, this was a young man that realized to speak.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senator DORGAN be recognized to speak.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I stand today in strong support of H.R. 391, the congressional supplemental bill. In casting our votes on this important measure, all of us must ask a fundamental question: Do we support a change in course in Iraq or do we want more of the same?

This supplemental bill delivers over $100 billion in necessary funding, an increase of $4 billion over the President’s request for our military forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, fully meeting the President’s request. More important, the bill provides a change in course for our policy in Iraq by transitioning the mission of American troops away from involvement in a growing civil war to a more targeted mission, one focused on counterterrorism, training and equipping Iraqi forces, and force protection for American troops.

The supplemental bill that was voted on today offers a path away from the current quagmire in Iraq, a state of bloodshed and destruction throughout Europe, the Middle East, including working as a handyman in Jerusalem. I understand that he even leaped from an iceberg and swam in the frigid waters of the Arctic Ocean. Clearly, this was a young man who seized all that life had to offer.

Three years ago, at the age of 29, he began a new adventure and joined the Army. According to his family he loved it.

During a recent memorial service in Iraq, one of his comrades SSG Richard Coombes stated: “He was a man who taught me that there was still beauty in our everyday life, even in Iraq. I looked at him and wondered if he had already figured life out. He was such a gentle, kind soul. I cannot think of anybody who did not love this man.”

And yet he never forgot why he was deployed to Iraq—to help the Iraqi people. This commitment was reflected in the letter that he would write home. He asked for history books that he could give to Iraqis that he met, and pencils, notepads, and Hershey bars for Iraqi children.

What a fine man. What an extraordinary life.

I will always remember him and his family in my prayers.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senator DORGAN be recognized to speak.

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

There is no military solution to a problem like that in Iraq, to the insurgency of Iraq . . . A political resolution of various differences . . . will determine, in the long run, the success of the mission in Iraq.

GEN Barry McCaffrey recently returned from his latest trip to Iraq. One of our most widely respected former military officers, General McCaffrey fought in Vietnam with distinction, commanded a division in the 1991 Gulf War, and led U.S. operations in Latin America. He submitted a formal report on his trip, which is very sober reading. One line stands out for me, and I quote from General McCaffrey’s report:

No Iraqi Government official, coalition soldier, diplomat, or even the non-governmental organization, nor contractor can walk the streets of Baghdad, nor Mosul, nor Kirkuk, nor Basra, nor Tikrit, nor Najaf, nor Ramadi, without heavily armed protection.

This supplemental bill provides the Congress and the White House a chance to do their part to ensure success in our mission in Iraq. It brings to an end the “stay the course” mentality that defined our approach for the past 4 years in at least three ways.

First, the supplemental revises our mission in Iraq away from policing a civil war toward training and equipping Iraqi security forces, protecting U.S. forces, and conducting targeted counterterrorism operations.

Second, it initiates a phased redeployment of our troops no later than October 1 of this year, with a goal of removing all combat troops by April 1 of next year. These steps were called for in the bipartisan Iraq Study Group and represent the will of the American people. I am pleased that the Congress is following the will of the American people.

Third, the supplemental at least holds the Iraqi Government accountable by setting measurable and achievable benchmarks on the Iraqi Government for ending the sectarian conflict, reaching political reconciliation, and improving the lives of ordinary Iraqis.

If the Iraqi Government refuses to meet these benchmarks, they will put at risk future U.S. assistance and the continued presence of U.S. troops. We have repeatedly seen past benchmarks established by the Bush administration and the Iraqi Government come and go without progress and without consequence. Just this week, a revealing article in USA Today pointed to the growing lack of confidence among Iraqi Parliamentarians in the al-Maliki government, and one legislator was quoted as saying:

This government hasn’t delivered and is not capable of doing so.

This bill, once and for all, establishes a series of accountable benchmarks.

Finally, the supplemental recognizes the toll this war has taken on our uniformed military, especially the Army and the Marine Corps. It establishes a set of troop-readiness standards that establish minimum levels between deployments for our troops and limits the duration of those deployments.

The legislation includes a Presidential waiver authority, but it would require the President to certify that the continued strain on our military forces is in our national interest. These provisions will force the President to think long and hard about the impact of the Iraq war on the readiness of our military to handle other pressing challenges, including the need to fight and kill al-Qaida terrorists wherever we find them.

The congressional debate that has helped produce this supplemental bill has been attacked by the President and his supporters. However, our Secretary of Defense last week described our debate as helpful in “communicating to the Iraqis that this is not an open-ended commitment.”

Two of my distinguished colleagues, on a recent visit to Baghdad, explicitly
informed Iraqi leaders that growing congressional pressure on the need for a phased redeployment signified that it was time for the Iraqi Government to get serious and start taking the hard steps needed for political reconciliation, including a fair distribution of the oil revenues. With the steps this Congress has taken, without the pressure it has applied, the Maliki regime would continue to be receiving an open-ended blank check from the White House, with our soldiers paying the ultimate price.

The President has regrettably chosen to distort and malign our intentions in sending him the bill that is before us today. I wish to take a few minutes to briefly address those charges and demonstrate why it is the President—and not the Congress who has cynically held hostage the funding and well-being of our troops.

First, the President has repeatedly charged that our military forces needed the supplemental funding immediately and any delay to pass the supplemental in his exact specifications would harm their readiness. A number of my colleagues already cited authoritative research from the Congressional Research Service that demonstrates that the needed funding is available to the U.S. Army from mid to late July—let me say that again, mid to late July—without jeopardizing the war effort. However, there is a much larger cynicism here. There would be no need for a supplemental bill at all if this President had submitted an honest, regular budget request for this fiscal year.

Four years into the war, this administration should be able to tell the American people how much the war in Iraq cost. Yet the administration has refused to incorporate wartime costs into its regular budget request, instead seeking to finance our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through a series of supplemental bills. Of course, the President doesn’t want to do that because regular appropriations requests are subject to greater public and congressional scrutiny.

Financing the war through supplemental bills also allows the President to better hide the impact of the war on our Federal budget. It is not surprising that a President who has run up the largest deficits in modern history would want to hide that fact. Doing so would prevent the President from being forced to justify any independent judgment.

The second claim the President has made over and over again in recent weeks is that this supplemental bill is laden up with pork spending that is unrelated to our military operation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Yet, once again, the President is distorting both his own actions and those of Congress to ensure a political gain. We should not forget that the President’s original request for supplemental funding also included funds not related to the war in Afghanistan and in Iraq. The President’s request included money for debt relief in Kosovo, cultural exchanges, and assistance to refugees in Burundi. The President keeps calling for a clean bill, yet his own request to the Congress included extra items with no connection to Iraq or Afghanistan.

In light of the President’s request, the Congress has acted to ensure additional funding for a number of key priorities. The President has broadly tarred these projects as “egregious porkbarrel.” Does the President believe that label applies to the $1.2 billion in funds for accelerated production of mine-resistant vehicles so our soldiers have proper equipment in combat? Does he believe that label applies to the funding for our military bases in Iraq? Does he believe that label applies to funding for health care for our veterans and our farmers? Does he believe that $650 million to help with the children’s health insurance shortfall in 14 States is frivolous spending? I could also talk about the funding for victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita and other parts of the world, especially Iraq and Afghanistan. I expect there will be no controversy about the issue of funding, although we have provided more funding for the soldiers than requested by the President, but there are other portions of the legislation that are controversial. I understand that. But I wish to talk about something that has not been talked about nearly enough as we send our soldiers to war.

William Manchester wrote a book called “The Glory and the Dream.” I remember, when I read that book, thinking about what an unbelievable commitment this country made during the Second World War. We have now been at war in Iraq longer than we were at war in the Second World War.

Let me take a couple of brief comments from “The Glory and the Dream,” written by Manchester, about what this country did during the Second World War.

This country geared up. Its factories were humming. Rosie the Riveter was riveting, and we had output from our factories that was nearly unbelievable in support of the war effort. There was rationing. There were all kinds of things happening in which the country supported the war effort and supported the soldiers.

Let me quote:

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 new cargo ships in 17 days. We have now made over and over again in recent years that has not been talked about nearly enough as we send our soldiers to war.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Tester be recognized following my presentation.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senate has passed a piece of legislation that includes funding for our troops who are committed to action in Iraq and other parts of the world, especially Iraq and Afghanistan. I expect there will be no controversy about the issue of funding, although we have provided more funding for the soldiers than requested by the President, but there are other portions of the legislation that are controversial. I understand that. But I wish to talk about something that has not been talked about nearly enough as we send our soldiers to war.

William Manchester wrote a book called “The Glory and the Dream.” I remember, when I read that book, thinking about what an unbelievable commitment this country made during the Second World War. We have now been at war in Iraq longer than we were at war in the Second World War.

Let me take a couple of brief comments from “The Glory and the Dream,” written by Manchester, about what this country did during the Second World War.

From the same book, “The Glory and the Dream,” quote:

In the 5 years following the French collapse, America turned out: 296,000 warplanes, 120,000 tanks, 2.4 million trucks, 8,700 warships, and 5,400 cargo ships.

Now, why did that happen? Because the country mobilized. This country’s factories were humming.

At a meeting, Joseph Stalin observed to the American President—the American President, FDR, Joseph Stalin, and Winston Churchill. Stalin said: We couldn’t win this war without America’s production. This country mobilized.

Now, let me read something. Just understanding that in 1944, we were producing 4,000 warplanes a month, 50,000 warplanes a year. Let me read something. Colonel Grammes came and testified last year at a policy committee hearing I chaired, and here is what he said:

In April 1944, the President issued a directive, C-247, that will be no controversy about the issue of funding, although we have provided more funding for the soldiers than requested by the President, but there are other portions of the legislation that are controversial. I understand that. But I wish to talk about something that has not been talked about nearly enough as we send our soldiers to war.

William Manchester wrote a book called “The Glory and the Dream.” I remember, when I read that book, thinking about what an unbelievable commitment this country made during the Second World War. We have now been at war in Iraq longer than we were at war in the Second World War.

Let me take a couple of brief comments from “The Glory and the Dream,” written by Manchester, about what this country did during the Second World War.

From the same book, “The Glory and the Dream,” quote:

In the 5 years following the French collapse, America turned out: 296,000 warplanes, 120,000 tanks, 2.4 million trucks, 8,700 warships, and 5,400 cargo ships.

Now, why did that happen? Because the country mobilized. This country’s factories were humming.

At a meeting, Joseph Stalin observed to the American President—the American President, FDR, Joseph Stalin, and Winston Churchill. Stalin said: We couldn’t win this war without America’s production. This country mobilized.

Now, let me read something. Just understanding that in 1944, we were producing 4,000 warplanes a month, 50,000 warplanes a year, let me read something. Colonel Grammes came and testified last year at a policy committee hearing I chaired, and here is what he said:

In April 1944, the President issued a directive, C-247, that
Since the improvised explosive devices exploded in Iraq in the summer of 2003, we as a country have known—

I am quoting him—

we have known there are better and safer vehicles available than the armored HUMVEE—for instance, the M-1117 armored security vehicle. Yet in 3 years, the Pentagon has purchased less than 1,000 of them. I find it remarkable that a Nation that could produce 4,000 warplanes a month during World War II can produce 45 armored vehicles per month today.

Continuing to quote:

We didn’t ask soldiers to invade France in 1944 with inferior equipment. They had 4,000 planes ready to bomb and they had 8,762 warships. We didn’t do that.

March 2007. This is from the Marine Corps Commandant about a vehicle called the MRAP vehicle. Three versions of the MRAP. The Defense Department experts say that soldiers who ride in the version of the MRAP 80 percent of the soldiers who would otherwise lose their lives from IED explosives will be saved. Think of that. With 300 attacks against this vehicle, not 1 life has been lost. Yet we continue to kill in Iraq with vehicles much less safe, and 70 percent of the 3,325 troops who have been killed have been killed as a result of IEDs, riding in vehicles that are not as safe as this vehicle, and until recently we were producing 45 a month. That is unbelievable. A country that could send everyone into its factories and have those factories humming three shifts a day and produce 4,000 warplanes a month and a liberty ship a day, every single day, the country that won the Second World War with its prodigious productions, supporting its troops and the men and women who were fighting fascism and beat back the forces of fascism and defeat Adolf Hitler and where we produced 296,000 warplanes—think of it—and 8,762 warships. We didn’t do that. We didn’t do that. We didn’t do that making 45 MRAPs a month. This country mobilized then, but it is not doing it now.

Now, why do I raise all this? Well, we have 3,325 U.S. troops who are on patrol in Iraq. Until recent months, we were producing about 45 a month. Let me say that again. We are sending soldiers to war, and there is a vehicle that the Commandant of the Marine Corps says will save 80 percent of the lives now being lost in these IED explosions because this is a much safer vehicle than the humvee. It is called the MRAP. But we are not mobilized to produce the MRAP. No one has said: This is urgent, let’s produce the best equipment for these soldiers.

So what did we do? Well, in the 2007 Omnibus appropriations bill, we added money. Yes, we in Congress added money for it. In the bill we just voted for today, we added money for it because the President wasn’t requesting sufficient money. We have a need for 6,700 of them. The administration, with all of their requests, would fund less than a third of that. In their 2008 budget request, which would take effect next October, once again it is under-funded.

Let me show a picture, if I might, a photograph of what is called the MRAP vehicle. The MRAP vehicle has a dramatically better record of preventing fatal and serious injuries from attacks by improvised explosive devices. We estimate that the use of the MRAP could reduce the casualties in vehicles due to IED attacks by as much as 80 percent.

Now, think of that, 3,325 U.S. troops have been killed in Iraq, and 70 percent of those casualties have come as a result of IEDs. The Commandant of the Marine Corps says the MRAP vehicle would save 80 percent of those casualties. In the last 3 months, we have lost 330 in 300 separate attacks on MRAP vehicles by IEDs, according to BG John Allen, deputy commander of coalition forces in Anbar Province—300 attacks on MRAP vehicles and no marines have died.

Now, why do I raise all this? Well, we need about 6,700 of these MRAP vehicles if this country is intending to provide the best equipment for our troops who are on patrol in Iraq. Until recent months, we were producing about 45 a month. Let me say that again. We are sending soldiers to war, and there is a vehicle that the Commandant of the Marine Corps says will save 80 percent of the lives now being lost in these IED explosions because this is a much safer vehicle than the humvee. It is called the MRAP. But we are not mobilized to produce the MRAP. No one has said: This is urgent, let’s provide the best equipment for these soldiers.

Continuing to quote:

The administration has failed to replace the MRAPs and has asked for—and received—a budget increase of $2 billion to build MRAPs. The Defense Department experts say that soldiers who would otherwise lose their lives from IED explosives will be saved. Think of that. With 300 attacks against this vehicle, not 1 life has been lost. Yet we continue to kill in Iraq with vehicles much less safe, and 70 percent of the 3,325 troops who have been killed have been killed as a result of IEDs, riding in vehicles that are not as safe as this vehicle, and until recently we were producing 45 a month. That is unbelievable. A country that could send everyone into its factories and have those factories humming three shifts a day and produce 4,000 warplanes a month and a liberty ship a day, every single day, the country that won the Second World War with its prodigious productions, supporting its troops and the men and women who were fighting fascism and beat back the forces of fascism and defeat Adolf Hitler and where we produced 296,000 warplanes—think of it—and 8,762 warships. We didn’t do that. We didn’t do that. We didn’t do that making 45 MRAPs a month. This country mobilized then, but it is not mobilized now.

So we passed a piece of legislation here today. It has some areas the President says will persuade him to veto it. I assume this is not one of those areas. The President didn’t request this funding for MRAPs. He should have. He didn’t request enough funding in the coming fiscal year. He should have. If this country is going to send its soldiers to war, then we, all of us in this country, have an obligation to send them to war with the very finest equipment available to protect them and to help them. Regrettably, that is not now the case.

Early on in this war, I received e-mail pictures, photographs from Iraq, from soldiers showing me their humvees with welded pieces of metal on the doors, metal they pulled out of a scrap heap and welded to a door to try to strengthen it because those humvees weren’t up- armored. Even now, we are sending soldiers to war, then we, all of us in this country, have an obligation to send them to war with the very finest equipment available with the potential to save their lives.

I yield the floor.
wheat, barley, and alfalfa, and he used to run some cattle. But the continuing drought has hurt his operation. The reservoir near his operation, Bynum Reservoir, has been almost empty for the past 5 years because of this drought, and Tom had to run off his 120 head of cattle he used to run on his ranch. In February of this year, Tom wrote me this letter. What it says is:

I am writing to you in need of your assistance. I own and operate a small ranch in the ranch north of Chouteau. Because of the continuing drought conditions in this area, making it from one year to the next has been a real challenge. In my present circumstances, it may become impossible (to stay in business).

Now Tom is in danger of losing his crop insurance and is looking for help from us, and from the President, to help him through these difficult times.

Another farmer in Montana, from Dagmar, wrote about conditions last year during the growing season. He writes that it is a foggy morning, a foggy morning, and it was meaningful precipitation, but it cooled down some, which is good news in the heat of summer with little moisture. But the damage was done. Some of the late seeding re-crop had the top half of the head burnt right off.

What does that mean, in a nutshell? He is not going to cut much of a crop and it is not going to have much quality when he does get it in the bin. What does that mean in reality? That means no money to pay expenses, to pay for insurance, to pay for heating, to pay for feeding costs; no money to buy groceries, to pay that operating loan or mortgage loan.

That is why it is so critically important that the President of the United States sign this supplemental. Farmers and ranchers in Montana and throughout our country have suffered long enough. They have dedicated their lives to feed this world, and it is the very least we can do to provide them with the assistance they need to keep going.

Before I finish, I want to talk a little bit about our great men and women who are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have done everything we have asked and they have done it very well. This supplemental bill also gives our troops all the funding they need, and more, to meet the needs not addressed in the President’s request. It provides a plan to get our troops out of the Middle East in this civil war they find themselves engaged in, and back to fighting the real war, the war on terrorism.

If it serves a goal, not a deadline, of being out of Iraq by the spring of 2008. But it allows our troops to continue to train the Iraqi security forces, to conduct operations against terrorist groups, and to protect United States assets. This is hardly handcuffing the President of this country. This is a responsible plan to continue our fight against terrorism while getting our troops out of this Iraqi civil war.

For these reasons, I urge the President of the United States to sign this emergency supplemental into law. No more excuses, sign the supplemental. Our troops, our farmers, the people of this country, deserve no less.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I understand we are in morning business, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. ALLARD. Madam President, I came to the floor today to express my surprise that any Member of this body could attempt to characterize the current political situation as one in which the administration is failing to work with Congress. Any realistic discussion of today’s political climate must revolve around the fact that the current majority has refused to work in any meaningful way with the minority party. The most blatant example of this is in the use of cloture by the majority leader to avoid consensus on the consideration of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2007.

In the 110th Congress, the majority leader so far has filed 24 cloture motions. During the same timeframe in the first session of the 109th Congress, Republicans had only filed five cloture motions. In the 109th Congress, by this date Republicans had only filed five cloture motions.

Just as surprising were the circumstances that surrounded General Petraeus speaking yesterdays. What I found remarkable was the original instinct of the Speaker of the House and our Senate majority leader was to avoid meeting the general here on Capitol Hill. Can you imagine that? The most important issue of our day is Iraq and the man we unanimously approved to lead our efforts is not worth their time to hear from? The only explanation for this is that the disdain felt by the majority in working with the minority and the administration was also extended to working with our military.

Of course, once it was clear that there was public outcry in not meeting General Petraeus, they relented. But what was also evident is there was an effort to avoid actually believing anything the general had to say about the situation on the ground. General Petraeus is not giving us information that has been filtered through some political process. He is giving a factual and sobering account of what is happening, block by block, in Iraq.

Yet the other side of the aisle, with a few exceptions, wants to cover their ears and not listen to the facts. They would rather pretend they know what is going on in Iraq rather than hear it from the general again.

The situation in Iraq is a dynamic and ever-changing one, and after yesterday’s briefing, it is more clear to me than ever that we may have arbitrary deadlines to our fight in Iraq.

But my Democratic colleagues would rather play politics with our men and women in the field and score a few points for the far left wing of their party. They would rather play politics on the Senate floor than work to pass meaningful legislation.

I ask the majority leader and other side of the aisle to put politics aside and do the right thing, work in a truly bipartisan manner to do what the American people expect us to do.

This obstruction and unwillingness to work in a truly bipartisan effort to provide funding to our troops who are even now in harm’s way is outrageous and disappointing.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

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

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

FORMER SPEAKER JOHN O’BRIEN

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate and pay tribute to the life of a great Washingtonian, a great American, and someone who in the State of Washington will be remembered for his great contributions and his leadership. John L. O’Brien will be remembered across our country. I am talking about our former Washington State Speaker of the House, John L. O’Brien, who died this past week at the age of 95. Speaker O’Brien actually passed away on the last day of this year’s legislative session, almost an appropriate dedication for him for the remembrance of his service in our State government.

I am proud to say John L. O’Brien was a good friend, a mentor, and someone who imparted a great political wisdom in the State of Washington. He served in our State legislature for 52 years, from 1939 to 1993, and he served as speaker of the house for a chunk of that period, 1955 to 1963. He served under nine different Governors. At one point in time, I believe, he held the record in our country for the longest serving State legislator.

He did a tremendous job as majority leader; I am sure at times as minority leader; as speaker, as I mentioned, two terms he served on every single committee in our State legislature. He led our State’s government through some great challenges