On this sad occasion, I extend my condolences to his family, to his many friends, and to all of us who served with him. We will not forget his legacy.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, recently we learned the Ohio National Guard could face early redeployment. We learned the National Guard is being asked to train without the proper equipment. Our Guard will do the job well regardless of the circumstances, but it is wrong to send them to Iraq with incomplete training and inadequate equipment and with insufficient downtime.

The supplement passed today echoes what many of us in Congress and military families across the country have been saying: We need a new direction for Iraq. Make no mistake, we take a backseat to no one in supporting the brave men and women fighting in Iraq. We absolutely support their families. However, more of the same is not a solution for our troops and will not end this war in Iraq. This war has made our world and our country less safe. The Iraq war has cost 142 Ohioans their lives. It has wounded another 1,000 Ohioans.

Congress will continue to fight for our Nation’s military by working to see they have the resources and support they need and leadership they deserve. The supplemental did that today. The supplemental fully funds and fully supports our troops, while establishing conditions that will bring our troops home. It provides desperately needed funding to the VA, something the President simply has not asked for, to help care for the hundreds of thousands of new veterans created by this war.

In the Veterans’ Committee yesterday, we heard from families about tragedy after tragedy, from families who have lost loved ones in this war, who didn’t get the proper care from the VA because of underfunding, who didn’t get the proper direction when they returned home from Iraq because the White House simply did not schedule in the way they should have the kind of help for returning Iraqi veterans. If the President were responsible, for those failures and lead our troops home, then Congress must. We owe it to our soldiers, sailors, air men and women, our marines, and especially to their families.

The President should listen to the military leaders and listen to the American people and work with Congress to change course in Iraq instead of threatening vetoes. I hope the President reads this legislation before he makes his final determination whether to support or to veto it. Vetoing this legislation would deny funding that our military needs and that our veterans desperately need.

The President and the Pentagon and civilian leaders of this country have fallen shamefully short in their failures to provide the body armor for our troops. We have heard too many stories. I have heard them in Steubenville and Toledo and Dayton about soldiers’ families telling us they didn’t have the proper body armor they needed.

The VA would get $1.7 billion more than the President’s VA proposal. We know the VA is underfunded at least that much. They have increased only about 10 percent in terms of employees but have a workload of returning Iraqi war veterans of at least 2.5 times that number. There is $39 million in our supplemental budget for polytrauma rehabilitation funding. There is $40 million for blindness and visual impairment. There is $100 million—and this is essential—for VA mental health services and $25 million for prosthetics. None of those did the President include in his request, and none of those were the resources we prepared for properly in the previous Congress and in the White House.

When we add up the numbers and we see 3,300 soldiers and marines in our country have lost their lives in the Iraq war, when you understand the tens of thousands of injuries, we see that our VA is simply not prepared. They are not prepared for this year and next year, let alone for the 50 years down the road when taxpayers are going to be taking care of these deserving veterans. We are not prepared for none of that. We should be providing. We are going to see we are not prepared over the next 50 years to do that, either for health treatment or for treatment of mental health injuries.

In addition to the Iraq spending and the spending for our Nation’s returning veterans, there are other things in this emergency spending bill, as there were in Republican bills in the past, drafted by the White House, passed by the Republican Congress. There is other crucial emergency spending that needs to be dealt with: $1.3 billion for Katrina relief, $100 million for FEMA and emergency management performance grants, $425 million for securing rural schools, $13 million for mine safety. We have seen some of the most dangerous times in our Nation’s mines in the last couple of years. There is $625 million for pandemic flu response, something public health authorities say we need and will be short of things so here. There is $400 million for LIHEAP to take care of deserving elderly and indigent who simply cannot afford their heating and cooling bills and another $683 million for emergency relief grants—all that this Congress needs to do.

The President has set our Nation on a path that leads in the wrong direction in Iraq and fails to meet the needs of our returning veterans. It is time to change course in Iraq instead. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SEPARATION OF POWERS

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, the Founders of our country did not believe in monarchy. They put up with one under the Articles of Confederation and didn’t want to have to put up with another one down the line. Meeting in Philadelphia about 220 years ago, about 30 miles from my home in Wilmington, DE, our Founding Fathers did not invest all power over national affairs in our national destiny in the hands of any one person. Rather, they created a separation of powers. They created, as we all know, three coequal branches of Government.

I don’t sit down every day or night and actually open the Constitution and read it. But every now and then I think a review of some of it and its parameters is instructive. For those who take the time—particularly looking at the debate we have had in recent days on whether it is appropriate for us to provide some guidance and expression with respect to the expenditure of these moneys in the supplemental appropriations, especially in Iraq—it is helpful to look at the Constitution and go a sense of what our Founding Fathers had in mind.

In looking at article II in this copy of the Constitution, section 2, there is about a sentence where it talks about the power of the President. This is what it says:

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States.

That is what it says. You can go back a couple pages before that to article I, section 8, and our Founding Fathers talk about the powers and responsibilities of the legislative branch in this regard. Here is what it says, in part:

The Congress shall have the power To all laws listed, such as lay and collect taxes, borrow money, regulate commerce, and so forth, with foreign nations. It also says the Congress shall have the power:
To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;
To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer term than two years;
To provide and maintain a Navy;
To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;
To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States.

It goes on and on.

The point I am trying to make is that the Constitution makes it clear that there is a division of responsibility, a sharing of responsibilities. Part of it lies with the executive branch, and a great deal lies with the legislative branch. For those of us who are trying to figure out which is the right side to come down on with respect to each issue, keep in mind the words of the Constitution.

When it comes to charting our Nation’s course in Iraq, all three branches of Government do have responsibilities. The President goes to war in Iraq, he had to come to us in Congress for approval, for authorization. Now, to continue that war he has had to come back to the Congress each and every year to request and receive approval for more funding.
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