

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Republicans and the final 30 minutes under the control of the majority.

## IRAQ SUPPLEMENTAL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think this is certainly one of the most important bills we have had before us and one, frankly, that is the most time-constrained of any we have had before us. Normally, we have a good deal of time to talk about bills and we have budget bills that won't go into effect until next year, but the fact is, this bill, which is for the funding of troops, these dollars need to be available within the next couple of weeks, as we understand it, of course. So it is important that we recognize that and that we understand the purpose of this bill is to fund our troops.

Whether you agree with the troops being there, the troops are there, and the fact is that it is up to us to provide the support they need and the dollars which are necessary to provide them the support they need in the position they are in. If there were ever a bill that should be recognized as having a unique purpose and should not be attached to other kinds of nonpertinent issues, I believe this is one. We are going to have the opportunity to decide whether we want to attach other issues to this bill and extend it, whether we want to have a situation where there is a veto and all those time-consuming things or whether we indeed want to have a clean bill that provides for the support of our troops who are now in Iraq and Afghanistan.

For weeks now, the President has repeatedly said he will veto the bill if it ties the hands of the generals on the ground. What he is saying is he and the generals have a plan, and the fact is the plan seems to be making more advances and accomplishments than we have had in the past, so we need to allow that to continue to work. We have all said the President needs a different plan. The President now has a different plan. There is new leadership in Iraq.

So I think we need to understand where we are with respect to this bill because we certainly have been on notice and are well aware of the looming veto. That veto would simply take more time and keep this money from getting where it needs to be to support the troops.

Not passing this legislation, of course, would only delay the critical resources and the necessary equipment and training for our soldiers who are getting ready to deploy or have, in fact, deployed. Secretary of Defense Gates has warned the Congress that if we delay emergency spending for our troops already deployed, many will not be able to come home. This is a very serious statement, and we need to pay attention to it.

I don't want to portray the President's plan in Iraq as being a success so far, but our commanders on the ground are reporting good news and that we are making progress, and that is what it is all about, of course. We need to be there until we have completed our task. I understand that explaining what the completion of the task is may not be easy, and people have different views about what that should be, but it is pretty clear we need to be able to get the Iraqis in a position to govern themselves before we can return. I am for returning as soon as possible, but I think setting an artificial definition for when they return is not appropriate anywhere and particularly not appropriate on this bill.

I just do not understand how Members on the other side can say one thing in their States and then stand and do the opposite thing—stand for supporting their troops in their States and then come here and have exactly the opposite position in Washington. At this point, we are where we are, and we need to have funding for our troops in the field, no question. Nobody would argue that, and I think no one would dispute that is a time sensitive issue as well.

We are going to be here this week on this bill. We are going to be gone next week. If the bill were to be vetoed, then we would have to go through that whole process. One can see that if we are going to get this done by the date which we have all heard, which is April 15, it is important we take off these kinds of things that are holding it up. We should not play political one-upmanship when it comes to funding our men and women who are in theater or are ready to deploy—I don't think there is any question about that—nor should we attempt to move legislation by buying votes for things that would be at the expense of our troops.

Unfortunately, the emergency legislation we have before us has been larded up with all manner of non-emergency spending and extraneous measures. Not only are we attempting to tie the President's hands by micro-managing the war, but we are trying to push through pet projects at the expense of our troops. I understand the politics of this place. When someone has something they would like very much to have done, the greatest thing to do is to put it on the bill that has to pass, and even though it is inappropriate, even though it is not a part of the purpose of the bill, of course, I understand that helps get it done. But the

request submitted to the Congress was to have \$100 billion for troops and hurricane relief. The bill we are considering contains an additional \$20 billion—\$20 billion—for individual Member requests, a minimum wage increase, and small tax packages. The last time I checked, none of these is an emergency, so they do not qualify for this bill. I understand the merits of many of these things, and they should be considered. But, again, in terms of how we do things here, this is an emergency bill, and things that are in here ought to qualify as emergencies or else not be on the bill.

So we have to say: Do they have merit? Of course they have merit. There is no question that many of them do and should be individually addressed in the normal legislative process. They should be considered because they have merit and, indeed, are worth consideration. However, we are also faced with the question that the majority has said we must get our fiscal house in order. That is what we have been hearing, but that is not what we have been doing. It is easy to say that, but it is hard to do it.

We do need to take a look at spending. This is an emergency bill—this is outside the budget—and so it is a wonderful place to pen on a lot of things that are additional spending that really aren't within the limits of spending, which all of us seem to be so proud to be putting on in this Congress. So I think we have to take a look at all those things. Almost to a person, everyone has come to the floor and promised the American public that future spending would be paid for. These things that are added are not paid for. So we are not keeping that promise that has been made.

I think this week the majority will have an opportunity to stand by their words. We must keep Federal spending under control and accountable. To add things that are inappropriate, that do not fit on the bill, that are outside the budget—to use this opportunity is not being accountable. To add projects to emergency spending, which by definition is outside the normal budget process, is not the right way to accomplish this goal.

It is going to be tough. We are going to have projects that everyone on both sides of the aisle thinks: Oh, that is good for my State—whether it is shrimp or spinach or whatever. So there will be support for those things. But the fact is, they do not belong on this emergency bill.

I remind my colleagues of the budget resolution for 2007 which explicitly defines what constitutes an emergency. It says all of the five following criteria must be satisfied in order for something to be considered an emergency: No. 1, is necessary, essential, or vital; No. 2, sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time; No. 3, a pressing and compelling urgent need requiring immediate action; No. 4, an unforeseeable, unpredictable, and

unanticipated issue; and, finally, not permanent but temporary in nature.

The Senate has to establish the criteria, and I think we ought to follow it in this budget area. I know we cannot fix the problems in just 1 week. There should be an effort to remove all the extraneous and nondefense spending. I look forward to bringing an important question before us, privatizing these things. The American people will soon learn whether the Members of the Senate have committed themselves to getting their financial house in order, whether they will back their words with action.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague from Wyoming in addressing the pending business of the Senate, which is the emergency supplemental to help fund our troops who are serving in harm's way. The problem with this particular legislation is it does more than that. In fact, contrary to its advertised purpose of supporting the troops, it undermines the ability of our commanders on the ground to actually succeed in the goal they volunteered to achieve and which we have asked them to do because it sets artificial timelines and attempts to micromanage the fighting of the war on the ground.

It ultimately jeopardizes the ability to get funds for the troops, to provide the necessary equipment, to provide the replenishment of used-up resources that are necessary as we rotate troops who are in the battlefield today. It would ultimately make it more likely that troops who are already there—who sacrificed a lot, along with their families—are going to have to sacrifice even more because the troops necessary and the equipment necessary to actually rotate in and relieve them of their responsibilities will not be available.

The other thing that is so unseemly, to me, about this whole process is, because this is the train leaving the station and colleagues know that this bill needs to pass, or at least some version of it—emergency spending to support our troops—that the House, in particular, and now the Senate has joined in a similar manner in larding this appropriations bill with various pork projects.

My colleague from Wyoming has pointed out that the nature of emergency spending means this money goes straight to the deficit. In other words, the bill is passed on to the next generation and beyond and not paid for.

We just went through an elaborate process in passing a budget resolution. Time and time again, the new majority has said they want to engage in some budget and fiscal discipline, but that stated goal, to try to deal with taxpayer dollars responsibly, to find offsets for spending and have pay-as-you-go rules is completely belied by the actions reflected in this particular appropriations bill.

The fact is, we did debate this issue just 2 weeks ago with regard to artificial timelines and micromanaging the war. The Senate voted 48 to 50 not to approve cloture on S.J. Res. 9, which was an effort by our Democratic colleagues to micromanage and set artificial timelines. They lost that vote by 48 to 50. Now they are back again, trying it another time.

Giving the enemy a timetable when American troops will withdraw from Iraq without regard to conditions on the ground, without regard to the early signs of progress that we are making, only helps the enemy plan on how to establish and accomplish their goals, not our goals. Our focus should be on how to succeed in Iraq, not how to tie the hands of our troops, jeopardize the funding that is necessary for their success, and to micromanage something that we have no business micromanaging from the Halls of Congress, thousands of miles away from the battlefield.

The tragedy of this is it now represents 18 different proposals by the Democrats in Congress on how to lose in Iraq and not a single proposal on how to succeed. The chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee on which I serve has pointed out that there are between 5,000 and 6,000 al-Qaida operatives now in Iraq. To pass legislation which sets an arbitrary deadline for withdrawing our combat forces without defeating al-Qaida makes no sense, no sense at all. It will create a power vacuum, much as Afghanistan was after the fall of the Soviet Union, which then gave rise to a failed state and a launching pad for terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001. We need to do everything in our power to prevent that from happening again and not forget the lessons of 9/11 and allow it to be repeated in Iraq.

The Iraqis know our commitment there is not open ended, and they understand the future of Iraq is in their hands. But to pass legislation that micromanages how our troops should fight the enemy and essentially allow the creation of safe havens for terrorists is the height of irresponsibility.

We pointed out before, but it is worth pointing out again, we unanimously confirmed General Petraeus, the architect of the counterinsurgency plan currently being carried out in Baghdad. He does not need the armchair generals in the Senate dictating military tactics to him. If the Members of this body really support the troops, we will provide, unencumbered, the resources necessary for our troops to accomplish the goals which they so valiantly and bravely volunteered to do, under the leadership of great generals such as GEN David Petraeus.

We all want our troops home as soon as possible. We all share that goal. But any decision to withdraw from Iraq before the Iraqis themselves are able to stabilize their country, with our help, to allow them to govern and defend

themselves, will not heighten America's national security but, rather, will jeopardize it.

We have had 18 proposals to date from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Every attempt they have had to try to pass one of these proposals has failed. But as Yogi Berra said, "It's *deja vu* all over again." Here we go again. We just voted last week 48 to 50 against legislation that would impose a deadline. I hope we will not have to continue to debate this over and over again and continue to send the message to our enemies: Yes, you are that much closer to breaking America's will in this contest of wills in something that is so important to our national security. We need to get this legislation passed and passed soon, so our troops do not have to guess whether the funding necessary to carry out their mission will be forthcoming.

Using the supplemental appropriations to play political games and to pay off domestic priorities, such as peanut subsidies and spinach subsidies, is not in the best interests of our men and women in uniform. That is why the President has threatened to veto this bill, due to the pork and the timelines that are included in it. I encourage my colleagues to think long and hard before moving forward in a way that would compromise the mission of our troops who are serving to protect all of us.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the amendment of Senator COCHRAN, the amendment to strike the language, of which I am a cosponsor. I raised this in the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense last week. Senator COCHRAN indicated then that he would do as he has done; that is, to move to strike the language in the supplemental requiring the phased withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq in 120 days, 4 months—120 days.

Mr. President, as you heard—and you have been a party to—4 months is clearly not enough time for General Petraeus or the brave members of our Armed Forces to have a chance to see if a surge in troop numbers could turn the war. I don't know for sure. I had, as a lot of us did, a conversation with General Petraeus before he took command about the troop surge, about the 20,000 troops. I personally think we need 100,000 troops, but we don't have them. General Petraeus is a very smart man. He is a combat soldier. He is in control. I believe to put on an arbitrary timeline of 120 days is the wrong message at the wrong time, where they are beginning—just beginning—to secure some neighborhoods. Will they continue to do this? We hope so. But we should bring every bit of stability we can to the Baghdad area.

I have no illusion about sooner or later coming home. I would like to see our troops come home. I don't think that will be the end of the struggle

with Islamic fundamentalists by any stretch of the imagination, but I think if we are able to stabilize that area of Iraq to some degree, perhaps there can be some kind of diplomatic resolution because ultimately none of us ever envisioned staying in Iraq. We have been there 4 years. I wish we were not there today, but we are and we are heavily engaged.

I think we need to give our Armed Forces every opportunity to succeed. We should not send an ambiguous message to them: We are going to support you today and tomorrow we want you to withdraw, in 120 days, or begin to withdraw. I think that is the wrong message, and I think it would undermine the morale of our troops.

Congress should not be armchair generals. We should not try to micromanage what is going on on the ground. That is why I support the Cochran amendment. We need to give our commanders and our soldiers every chance to succeed in Iraq, to bring stability there, where diplomatic maneuvers then perhaps could begin to work. Sending ambiguous messages to our Armed Forces is not the right way. They need our support both morally and materially. I believe at the end of the day they are going to get it.

The President has already signaled if this language were to stay he would veto this bill. I believe what he says he is going to do. But we can strike this language today. We can move on and get this supplemental passed to make sure our troops are well funded and that they have what they need to succeed. And they will succeed.

The members of our Armed Forces are in harm's way every day. We know the horror stories about war. But they bravely face a sometimes unknown enemy and have done everything asked of them—sometimes two and three times, Mr. President, as you well know. Micromanaging the war from the Halls of Congress is not the right thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to support the Cochran amendment and strike this language from the supplemental bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business. I know it is not our side's time. If there is no objection, I would appreciate using the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, this is going to be a very busy day. I have comments that will relate to what will happen when we bring the bill up on the floor, but I thought I would take

this time to talk about two things that are extremely important. First, with respect to the bill, I am the lead Republican cosponsor, with the Senators from North Dakota and South Dakota, on ag disaster. We have been 3 years without an agricultural disaster bill. We have had 3 years of agricultural disasters. Those of us from the Midwest know that we have been afflicted with droughts, tornadoes, tremendous losses by farmers, livestock producers, and others in agricultural production. I visited southwest Missouri this January and saw what some people described as countywide tornadoes. The ice storms were so severe they broke down trees, collapsed sheds, knocked out power, broke down fences, and put many livestock and poultry producers on the verge of financial disaster.

Similarly over the years, when drought has struck, the ag producers, livestock and poultry and crops, were hit severely. This ag disaster package is absolutely essential. I appreciate the lead of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in including our request for ag disaster.

In addition, I am a very strong supporter of the amendment of the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee to strike the limitations on the ability of General Petraeus to conduct the war in Iraq. Let us remember that General Petraeus came before the committees to outline his new ideas, his new plan for moving forward in Iraq. People had been saying: We need a new plan. Yes, clearly, we need a new plan. The Bremer plan, deBaathification, firing the Army, sending them home without pay and with their weapons, turns out to have been the absolute wrong thing to do. But General Petraeus, who was unanimously confirmed by this body, has gone back to Iraq with his new way of going forward.

They have made some significant changes in the rules of engagement. Now no longer are Shia death squads or militia off-limits. Moqtada al-Sadr has seen the light or felt the heat, and he has gone to Tehran. We are talking action against Jaysh al-Mahdi and others who are engaged in sectarian battles. We have a new plan of going in, holding, and clearing, the conventional and now-proven theory of dealing with insurgencies. You cannot just go in and wipe out people who are causing chaos and killing their political enemies. You have to stay there and maintain peace, security. That is what we are supporting the Iraqi forces doing. The Iraqi forces are there. They are the ones who are going to have to take over. The training of the Iraqi forces is the critical element for us to assure stability in the region.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on mine embraced the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. For example, the distinguished majority whip on December 8 on CNN said:

We ought to follow the Iraqi Study Group.

This new plan the President and General Petraeus have put forward is, by and large, the Iraq Study Group's plan. After receiving the report, when you look at the recommendations, they track with what we are doing now, from sending reinforcements to Baghdad to increasing the number of embedded American advisers, to holding the Iraqi Government responsible for specific security and political milestones. The differences between what we are doing now in Iraq and the Iraq Study Group recommendations are insignificant. Sending reinforcements to Baghdad, the principal tenet of the new plan General Petraeus has put forth, is referenced in general by the Iraq Study Group, which said it could support a short-term redeployment or surge of American combat forces to stabilize Baghdad, recognizing the level of violence in and around Baghdad has crippled the ability of both the al-Maliki Government and the U.S. military to restore basic services and establish a modicum of law and order. I quote:

The ISG recognized, as does the U.S. military, that Baghdad is central to success or failure in Iraq. It is not surprising that more troops were added—the total number of which is still below 2005 levels.

There is one other very important point that is of concern to everybody in this body and all Americans. The Iraq Study Group said:

The United States should not make an open-ended commitment to keep large numbers of American troops deployed in Iraq.

President Bush said of his plan and its implementation:

I've made it clear to the Prime Minister and Iraq's other leaders that America's commitment is not open-ended. If the Iraqi government does not follow through on its promises, it will lose the support of the American people.

It is clear we have a new way forward. The language in the underlying legislation before us says we ought to set a timetable, a political timetable. We ought to determine in this body exactly the dates when we start removing troops from Baghdad, from Iraq, changing our policy.

I have a novel idea: Wars cannot be run from these hallowed and comfortable and sanctified chambers 10,000 miles away from the war zone. How about allowing the officers, the men, and the commanders in the field—who are engaged daily, risking their lives to bring peace and security to Iraq—to determine when and how we can best turn over to the Iraqi security forces the critical job—the critical job—of assuring security and a relatively peaceful country? Nobody is saying it is going to be a Jeffersonian democracy. What we are seeking is peace and security.

We had an open hearing with the leaders of the intelligence community in January before the Senate Intelligence Committee. The top leaders of that intelligence community said, unanimously, it would be very unwise to establish a short-term political timetable for withdrawal prior to the

time the Iraqi security forces take over.

If this body, in its “wisdom”—an oxymoron in this case—says pull out on such-and-such date, and the Iraqi security forces are not ready to take over, what would happen? Three things—all of them bad.

No. 1, the killing, sectarian violence between Shia and Sunnis would escalate. You would see many more thousands killed, as we would no longer be there to serve as a buffer and as adviser to prevent that from happening.

No. 2, the goal of al-Qaida, as expressed by Osama bin Laden and his No. 2 man, Ayman al-Zawahiri, to achieve the headquarters of the caliphate in the “land of the two rivers,” i.e., Baghdad, would be achieved. They would have a safe haven. They would have a safe haven from which they could train, recruit, perhaps even get back to turning on the dual-use facilities Saddam Hussein set up for turning out chemical or biological weapons.

Now, the third thing that would happen, which is a true disaster, would be the neighboring countries would have to come in to back up their co-religionists. If the Sunnis are being oppressed by the Shia, then the Sunni states will be ready, and they will come in. If they come in, Iran and its Shia partners are all ready to come in.

What happens then? We have a conflagration in the Middle East bringing in many countries in a region-wide war that will draw, unfortunately, perhaps hundreds of thousands of American troops to prevent the disaster from spreading, to support our friends in Israel.

General Petraeus has promised, in his confirmation hearings, that he will tell us if the new plan, the new rules of engagement—putting the Iraqi security forces out front, with American advisers continuing to supply American troops to go after the high-value targets, the radical Salafist jihadists of al-Qaida and other entities—we will continue to hunt them down so they do not overwhelm the Iraqi security forces.

General Petraeus will tell us. He should know by this summer if it fails. If it fails, he said he will tell us, and I would trust he would begin making such changes as are necessary, without tipping off the enemy what they are planning to do. The important thing is not telling the enemy what our timetable is.

I think it is perhaps illustrative to share with you some comments from an e-mail I received from a marine who has been in Iraq and who is going back. He was commenting on a timetable. He said: I haven't polled all of them. I don't speak for all of them, but I can tell you, a lion's share think a timetable is a disastrous idea. I don't know what possible benefit you can assess that would come from a timetable. Where is the help toward mission accomplishment?

He said: Iraqis understand that progress is being made. I think the

Iraqi forces are getting ready to take over and with our help should be able to do it sometime in 2007. But if we tell everyone exactly when that is going to be, it gets a lot easier for the merry mujahedin to claim victory, lay low, and then wreak havoc when the coalition packs up shop.

This particular marine said: I'm not wild about going back to Iraq, but I would sure as heck rather do that than essentially invalidate everything we've done to date by leaving too early and inviting chaos.

That is the choice. Does a political timetable give Members cover back here? Maybe. But I have even heard that ridiculed. I have heard that ridiculed. I ask this body to strike the language, let General Petraeus run the war, let him pursue every avenue to assure Iraq is stable and secure. He and the President have said, if it does not work, we will change policy. But let's give it a chance to work.

Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues and yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' HEALTH, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY ACT, 2007

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1591, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1591) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Cochran amendment No. 643 (to amendment No. 641), to strike language that would tie the hands of the Commander-in-Chief by imposing an arbitrary timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq, thereby undermining the position of American Armed Forces and jeopardizing the successful conclusion of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, before my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, leaves the floor, I wonder if I might just engage him in a colloquy for just a moment.

Mr. BOND. Sure.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to speak about agriculture disaster provisions in the emergency supplemental bill. We had some people on the Senate floor yesterday questioning whether they are valid, whether they are necessary provisions to help family farmers. I noted the Senator from Missouri was a cosponsor of mine, as we worked together to put the agriculture disaster program in the emergency supplemental bill.

Let me make a point and then ask a question of my colleague from Missouri.

First of all, I appreciate very much his help. I know Missouri has been hit with a devastating drought and other weather-related disasters for family farmers. It has been the case in other parts of the country as well. We have been working for some long while just to reach out a helping hand to those farmers out there struggling who got hit with weather-related disasters to say: You are not alone. As is the tradition in this country when you get hit with a weather-related disaster and lose everything, this country wants to help you some. We help everyone around the world. It is time to take care of things at home. That is what this provision is about.

I ask the Senator from Missouri about his motivation for being a part of those of us who worked together to get this put in the emergency supplemental bill. I know he strongly supports it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from the Dakotas. Before he arrived on the floor, I made the case for it. The Senator asked about the situation in Missouri. I told them about the devastating ice storms. We have had a historic drought. What we need is a comprehensive national policy to deal with the problems and not just for the Dakotas or Missouri but for Colorado, Texas, Nebraska, Kansas, California—throughout this country—where people have been devastated by extreme weather conditions.

We have livestock producers who were hit the hardest. There is no safety net in place for livestock producers. They are not protected by crop insurance, the farm bill, or disaster protection under the USDA since the standard is crop loss and there were no crops to be lost in the middle of the winter in an ice storm. But the devastation is there.

This body and this Government came to the rescue of people who were absolutely wiped out by Hurricane Katrina and other natural disasters. Well, the impact in the farm area is very severe. No, it is not the same as a hurricane, but the weather disasters have caused tremendous hardships and threaten to put many farmers under and destroy rural communities.

That is why I am very pleased to join with my colleague in urging this body to keep the agricultural disaster program, the relief we have not had for 3 years, in this bill.

I thank my colleague.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for his leadership on this issue as well.

Let me say that the Congress did help farmers in the gulf region who lost their crops. I understand we helped cities that were devastated and lost buildings and lives and so on. We also helped farmers who lost their crops.

My point is—and I think the point of the Senator from Missouri is—there is