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.