outside interest groups, and party structures reward conflict and the tak-
ing of irreconcilable positions. There is little reward for reconciling principled posi-
tions 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, from each party, offering to work
together with him to help every American have affordable health insur-
ze.

Although there is no much atten-
tion paid to this kind of legislative ac-
tivity, 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
conundrums of the war in Iraq. Americans
are tired of what they perceive as Sen-
ators playing petty, kindergarten, par-
tisan games while there are big issues
that must be solved by one party
alone. Americans know we need a poli-
tical solution to Iraq in Washington,
DC, as much as we need one in Bagh-
dad.

The irony is that last week’s cul-
mation of 2 years of work on the Amer-
ica 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 in-
terest groups, and the political party
apparatus for encouragement to do it.
Virtue, as ever, will be its own re-
ward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and
I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore, 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quorum call be rescinded.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 tem-
pore. Without objection, it is so or-
dered.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. Without objection, it is so or-
dered.

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 tem-
pore. Without objection, it is so or-
dered.

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 hop-
ing that perhaps we will be able to ex-
tract our troops from Iraq in a year.
There is not a requirement that Amer-
ican troops be pulled out of Iraq. It es-
tablishes a goal that we wish to talk
about today is the part of the bill
that provides a higher level of funding
for the troops than the President re-
quested.

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 troops. We
have not asked the American people
to pay for the war. We sent the sol-
diers to war with the understanding
that when they come back, they will
inhabit 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 com-
mitment? 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 mobi-
lized. There was Rosie the Riveter.
There were three shifts at the manu-
facturing plants. We had our capability
humming in this country producing ev-
exiting, everything 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 de-
scribes what we did. He said this:

From an initial keel-to-delivery time of
over 200 days, Henry Kaiser cut the aver-
age 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. During the
first 212 days of 1945, they completed 247
cargo ships, better than one a day.

We had this country’s productive cap-
cacity revved up full speed. When Sta-
lin met with FDR and Churchill in the
mid-1940s before the end of the war, he
told FDR: Thank God for America’s produc-
tive capability, America’s manufactur-
ing 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
produced about 45 of these vehicles a
month. At a time when the Com-
mandant of the Marine Corps says we
need 6,700 in Iraq to safeguard the sol-
diers 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 in-
crease 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 Crowe,
Commandant of the Marine Corps,
understanding I am talking about this
MRAP:

The MRAP vehicle has a dramatically bet-
ter record of preventing fatal and serious in-
juries from attacks by IEDs. The Com-
mander of Multinational Force West esti-
mates 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 pro-
duce 4,000 warplanes a month in sup-
port of our fighting men and women, and
we produce 45 MRAPs a month in this
country? Why is it we surge our troops
in Iraq but don’t surge our production
of the MRAP vehicle, just as one exam-
ple, that would provide dramatic in-
creased 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:
In more than 300 attacks since last year, no Marines have died while riding in the new fortified armored vehicles the Pentagon would like to rush to Iraq, the Marine Commandant in Annapolis said. And other vehicles cause more than two casualties per attack, including deaths.

IEDs are responsible for 70 percent of the casualties in Iraq. Yet, while this country has mobilized its soldiers to war, it has not mobilized the country. We do not have third shifts with the lights on 24 hours a day. We don't have Henry Kissing producer 1 ship a day, 4,000 warplanes a month. In fact, this relates to something we have talked about on the floor of the Senate. Only two U.S. steel mills are qualified to produce the special armored steel for the Defense Department at this point—two. Both have been acquired by foreign companies in the past year and a half.

Let me say that again: Only two U.S. steel mills are qualified to produce armored steel for the Defense Department. Both have been acquired by foreign companies in the past year and a half. Oregon Steel is now owned by Evraz Group S.A. of Russia. The International Steel Group was acquired by the Dutch conglomerate Arcelor Mittal.

The Defense Department has requested that the armor steel made by both firms be categorized with what is called a “DX” rating for the MRAP program. DX stands for the highest national urgency. Under the 1950 Defense Production Act, any item with a DX rating gets top priority and must be furnished to the U.S. Government in advance of any other customers. Several other items that are critical to the MRAP vehicles—ballistic glass, transmission, and Mack Truck chassis—are also supposed to receive the DX rating.

I am told Defense officials are in negotiations with both the steel mills I mentioned, that are foreign owned, to make sure there will be enough steel available for the various kits they need for the MRAP vehicle.

The point I want to make is simple: In the Second World War, we had some unbelievably brave soldiers, men and women who went halfway around the world to fight because their country asked them to fight for this country's freedom. But it was more than just soldiers; it was in virtually every manufacturing plant in this country and with every citizen, through rationing, through production, through the capability to produce what the soldiers needed.

Contrast what we did in the Second World War with what we do today. We decide to send the soldiers to war, but we make only a few of the MRAP vehicles that would save so many of those lives that are now being lost to IED explosions. We can’t do this. This ought not be acceptable to anybody in this country. If we are going to war, the country should be working as one to prepare the soldiers. When the President sends us an appropriations request and says, Oh, by the way, the MRAP is a lower priority, we are not going to fund it, we are not going to ask for what the Marine Corps Commandant says is necessary in the field, we will ask for slightly less than a third of that number of vehicles—this Congress fortuitously said no, Mr. President, that was not what we had accepted. We decided to invest in these vehicles as quickly as we can and move them to Iraq so when soldiers are on patrol and they are hit with an IED, they have better armor and a better opportunity to protect their lives.

There will be a lot of discussion in the coming days about who is right and who is wrong on all the funding issues with respect to Iraq. I want my colleagues to understand a couple of things. First, we have actually increased the funding requested by the President. We have increased the funding for couple of reasons. No. 1, we added funds for safer vehicles that the President did not request enough of. Full speed ahead: No. 2, we had to add funds for military and VA medical care because the President did not request enough money to care for the injured soldiers coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan. We increased the funding for both. We have actually increased the funding for the troops.

I understand there is a disagreement about the language with respect to Iraq. Ours establishes a “goal,” not a requirement, a goal, hoping we can extract ourselves from the middle of a civil war in Iraq within a year. That is a goal. I know the President and others suggest that somehow fully funding the troops and even adding more where it was necessary and establishing such a goal is pulling the rug out from under the troops, but nothing could be further from the truth. What I think injures our troops is to decide we are going to surge the troops but we will not surge the equipment necessary to protect them. That is wrong. This Congress has said it is wrong in the legislation we have passed.

I hope in the coming days and in the coming conflicts, whether it is dealing with Iraq or dealing with the terrorist threat around the world, we will decide in the future never again to send our soldiers in a manner that allows us not to use the full impact, the full capability of the American people to produce that which the soldiers need to protect them. That is wrong. This Congress has said it is wrong in the legislation we have passed.
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