the office. I hope that, in our conduct, we can prove ourselves good and responsible stewards of this public trust.

It is my sincere hope that now that the correction has been filed and the slander abated, this will be the last time any Member has the unpleasant duty of rising in this House to defend his or her reputation and the traditions of this institution. I hope that this single aberration will be remembered as just that: a single aberration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial published this morning in the daily newspaper in Norfolk, Virginia, the Virginian Pilot, on this issue.

[From the Virginia Pilot, May 5, 2005]

A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF

The mood in certain precincts of Congress has become so poisonous that people aren't speaking our common language unless they're accusing political opponents of unspeakable crimes.

The ''Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act'' would make it a federal offense to take a minor across a state line to get an abortion without the consent of her parents, for a physician to perform such abortions, and allows parents to sue anybody who does.

Democrats on the Judiciary Committee offered several amendments that would have limited the law's scope. U.S. Rep. Bobby Scott, for example, sought to insert this line: ''The prohibitions of this section do not apply with respect to conduct by taxicab drivers, bus drivers or others in the business of professional transport.''

Pretty straightforward, right?

Should the U.S. government prosecute a bus driver because a girl in one of its seats is traveling to end a pregnancy? No matter your answer to that question, the congressman's wording is pretty clear, unless you're a member of the Judiciary Committee's staff, which managed Scott's amendment into this:

''Mr. Scott offered an amendment that would have exempted sexual predators from prosecution if they're taxicab drivers, bus drivers or others in the business of professional transport.''

In other words, the staff of a committee on which Scott serves accused him of trying to protect sexual predators, arguably a crime in itself.

It is the kind of libel—repeated against two other Democratic members of the committee—that only nameless, faceless bureaucrat would dare make. But, significantly, it's also the kind of power-made mischief that the Republican leadership felt deserved defense.

The Congress Tuesday evening spent an hour debating a resolution to require Republicans to change the descriptions, which are supposed to be, and ordinarily are, written in dry, neutral language.

That debate was itself illustrative of how deep the divisions in Congress have become. While the Democrats—including Scott and Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi—talked about how Republicans abused the truth to score political points, the majority changed the subject entirely and re-argued the merits of the abortion bill, which passed the week before.

''The issue is whether we can trust each other to deal with each other fairly,'' said Wisconsin Democrat Rep. David Obey, who had voted for the abortion bill.

In the end, Tuesday's debate was a rancorous parry and feint, lasted an eternity and came to absolutely nothing. The resolution to change the descriptions, of course, failed on a party-line vote.

Still, for 60 minutes, the rudeness that now rules the hall of the Capitol was on sharp display for all America to see.

''The rewrite says more about the person who wrote it, and those who defend it, than it does about the amendment itself,'' Scott said Tuesday.

Scott's right. What is says is nothing kind, and not to be forgotten.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, not seeing the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for filing the corrected report, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1215

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to accompany the bill, H.R. 1268, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1268, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF ACT, 2005

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 258, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1268) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, to establish and rapidly implement regulations for State driver's license and identification document security standards, to prevent terrorists from abusing the asylum laws of the United States, to unify terrorism-related grounds for inadmissibility and removal, to ensure expeditious construction of the San Diego border fence, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 258, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 3, 2005 at page H2813.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to bring to the House for its consideration the conference report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror and Tsunami Relief.

The conference agreement includes a total of $82 billion. The vast majority of these funds are to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. For that reason, it is critical that we move this package quickly. It also provides needed assistance to the victims of the tsunami.

During our conference with the Senate, Chairman COCHRAN and I agreed that the final agreement should come in at or below the President's request and relatively free of extraneous items. The conference report before you has met both of these very critical parameters. We did our very best to keep the package clean, and by and large, we were successful with that. We have funded our foreign policy priorities while still preserving congressional prerogatives where appropriate.

With that said, the conference report provides a total of $75.9 billion for defense-related expenditures, roughly $921 million over the President's request. The additions over the request are for force protection, and increasing the survivability of troops in the field. In addition to the defense-related spending, the conference report provides a reduction of $1.5 billion in foreign assistance from the President's request. The conference agreement also includes $635 million for increased border security enforcement. This includes 500 additional border patrol agents and increased detention space.

We have also included $656 million for tsunami disaster relief. Finally, the bill includes much of the REAL ID Act of 2005, which was included in the House-passed version of the bill. The provisions on asylum, border infrastructure, and driver's license standards are included. Each of these provisions will greatly enhance the security of our borders. All of these provisions reflect agreements negotiated by relevant authorizing committees. I especially want to thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Chairman DAVIS and their staffs for getting this measure before the Congress in a timely fashion.

I urge my colleagues to support this much needed support for our troops.

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND TSUNAMI RELIEF, 2005					
TITLE I - DEFENSE-RELATED APPROPRIATIONS					
Military Personnel					
Military Personnel, Army (emergency)	11,756,842	11,779,642	12,067,208	12,067,108	+310,266
Basic Allowance for Housing, Army (emergency)	1,542,100	1,542,100	1,542,100	1,542,100	---
Military Personnel, Navy (emergency)	524,980	534,080	535,108	535,108	+10,128
Military Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)	1,246,126	1,251,726	1,358,053	1,358,053	+111,927
Military Personnel, Air Force (emergency)	1,316,572	1,473,472	1,684,943	1,599,943	+283,371
Reserve Personnel, Army (emergency)	39,627	40,327	39,627	39,627	---
Reserve Personnel, Navy (emergency)	9,411	11,111	9,411	9,411	---
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps (emergency)	4,015	4,115	4,015	4,015	---
Reserve Personnel, Air Force (emergency)	130	130	130	130	---
National Guard Personnel, Army (emergency)	429,200	430,300	291,100	291,100	-138,100
National Guard Personnel, Air Force (emergency)	91	91	91	91	---
Subtotal, Military personnel	16,869,094	17,067,094	17,531,786	17,446,686	+577,592
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation and Maintenance, Army (emergency)	17,201,004	17,366,004	16,701,004	16,914,004	-287,000
Transfer from Afghan Security Forces (emergency)	---	---	(290,000)	(290,000)	(+290,000)
Transfer from Iraq Security Forces (emergency)	---	---	(210,000)	(210,000)	(+210,000)
Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization, Army (emergency)	66,300	66,300	66,300	66,300	---
Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency)	3,423,501	3,030,801	3,430,801	3,030,574	-392,927
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)	970,464	982,464	970,464	982,464	+12,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)	5,601,510	5,769,450	5,528,574	5,627,053	+25,543
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)	3,521,327	3,061,300	3,308,392	3,042,265	-479,062
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (emergency)	8,154	8,154	21,354	26,354	+18,200
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (emergency)	75,164	75,164	75,164	75,164	---
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (emergency)	24,920	24,920	24,920	24,920	---
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (emergency)	188,779	188,779	326,879	326,850	+138,071
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (emergency)	10,000	10,000	---	---	-10,000
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (emergency)	1,285,000	1,285,000	1,285,000	1,285,000	---
Transfer, Afghan. Security Forces Fund (emergency)	---	---	(-290,000)	(-290,000)	(-290,000)
Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency)	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	---
Transfer, Iraq Security Forces Fund (emergency)	---	---	(-210,000)	(-210,000)	(-210,000)
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	38,076,123	37,568,336	37,438,852	37,100,948	-975,175
Procurement					
Aircraft Procurement, Army (emergency)	458,677	458,677	458,677	458,677	---
Missile Procurement, Army (emergency)	294,036	340,536	280,250	310,250	+16,214
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (emergency)	2,425,207	2,678,747	2,406,447	2,551,187	+125,980
Procurement of Ammunition, Army (emergency)	475,000	532,800	475,000	532,800	+57,800
Other Procurement, Army (emergency)	5,316,405	6,549,905	5,322,905	6,250,505	+934,100
(By transfer emergency)	---	(85,000)	---	---	---
Other procurement, Army (incl transfer)	(5,316,405)	(6,634,905)	(5,322,905)	(6,250,505)	(+934,100)
Aircraft Procurement, Navy (emergency)	200,295	200,295	200,295	200,295	---
Weapons Procurement, Navy (emergency)	71,600	71,600	66,000	66,000	-5,600
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)	133,635	141,735	133,635	139,635	+6,000
Other Procurement, Navy (emergency)	85,672	78,372	78,397	78,397	-7,275
Procurement, Marine Corps (emergency)	2,974,045	3,588,495	2,929,045	3,283,042	+308,997
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (emergency)	269,241	279,241	269,309	277,309	+8,068
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (emergency)	6,998	6,998	6,998	6,998	---
Other Procurement, Air Force (emergency)	2,834,328	2,658,527	2,653,760	2,577,560	-256,768
Procurement, Defense-Wide (emergency)	591,327	646,327	591,327	645,939	+54,612
Subtotal, Procurement	16,136,466	18,232,255	15,872,045	17,378,594	+1,242,128
(By transfer emergency)	---	(85,000)	---	---	---
Total funds available	(16,136,466)	(18,317,255)	(15,872,045)	(17,378,594)	(+1,242,128)
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army (emergency)	25,170	25,170	37,170	37,170	+12,000

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy (emergency)	179,051	202,051	179,051	204,051	+25,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (emergency)	102,540	121,500	132,540	142,500	+39,960
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (emergency)	153,561	159,600	203,561	203,561	+50,000
Subtotal, RDT&E	460,322	508,321	552,322	587,282	+126,960
Revolving And Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (emergency)	1,311,300	1,411,300	1,311,300	1,511,300	+200,000
National Defense Sealift Fund (emergency)	32,400	32,400	32,400	32,400	---
Subtotal, Revolving and management funds	1,343,700	1,443,700	1,343,700	1,543,700	+200,000
Related Agencies					
Intelligence Community Management Account (emergency)	250,300	250,300	250,300	250,300	---
Other Department of Defense Programs					
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense (emergency)	257,000	257,000	227,000	242,000	-15,000
Office of the Inspector General (emergency)	148	148	148	148	---
Defense Health Program (emergency)	175,550	175,550	225,550	210,550	+35,000
Subtotal, Other DoD programs	432,698	432,698	452,698	452,698	+20,000
Military Construction					
Military Construction, Army (emergency)	990,100	930,100	897,191	847,191	-142,909
Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps (emergency)	107,380	92,720	107,380	139,880	+32,500
Military Construction, Air Force (emergency)	301,520	301,386	140,983	140,983	-160,537
General Provisions					
Additional transfer authority (emergency)	(2,500,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,185,000)	(2,685,000)	(+185,000)
New transfer authority (emergency)	(5,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
Defense Cooperation Account (emergency)	12,000	12,000	---	---	-12,000
Up-armored humvees	---	---	213,000	---	---
Sec. 1118 Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy (by transfer emergency)	---	---	---	---	---
Iraq Freedom Fund (rescission) (emergency)	---	---	---	-50,000	-50,000
Section 1035 (emergency)	---	---	---	50,000	+50,000
Total, Title I	74,979,703	76,838,910	74,800,257	75,888,262	+908,559
(By transfer emergency)	---	(85,000)	---	---	---
(Transfer authority emergency)	(7,500,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,185,000)	(5,685,000)	(-1,815,000)

TITLE II - INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND THE WAR ON TERROR

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign Agricultural Service

Public Law 480 Title II Grants (emergency)	150,000	150,000	470,000	240,000	+90,000

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

Diplomatic and Consular Programs (emergency)	767,200	748,500	357,700	734,000	-33,200
Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance (emergency)	658,000	592,000	592,000	592,000	-66,000

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
International Organizations					
Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (emergency)	780,000	580,000	533,049	680,000	-100,000
(By transfer)	---	---	---	(-50,000)	(-50,000)
RELATED AGENCY					
Broadcasting Board Of Governors					
International Broadcasting Operations (emergency)	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	---
Broadcasting Capital Improvements (emergency)	2,500	---	2,500	2,500	---
STATE AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
United States Agency For International Development					
International Disaster and Famine Assistance (emergency)	44,000	94,000	44,000	90,000	+46,000
Transition Initiatives (emergency)	63,000	---	63,000	---	-63,000
Operating Expenses of the USAID (emergency)	24,400	---	24,400	24,400	---
Operating Expenses of the USAID	---	24,400	---	---	---
Operating Expenses of the USAID Office of Inspector General (emergency)	2,500	---	2,500	2,500	---
Operating Expenses of the USAID Office of Inspector General	---	2,500	---	---	---
Subtotal, USAID	133,900	120,900	133,900	116,900	-17,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic Support Fund (emergency)	1,631,300	376,500	1,636,300	1,433,600	-197,700
Economic Support Fund	---	681,700	---	---	---
(Transfer out emergency)	---	---	(-10,000)	(-10,000)	(-10,000)
(By transfer emergency)	---	---	(46,000)	---	---
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (by transfer emergency)	---	---	(10,000)	(10,000)	(+10,000)
Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (emergency)	60,000	---	70,000	70,000	+10,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union	---	33,700	---	---	---
Global War On Terror Partners Fund (emergency)	200,000	---	25,500	---	-200,000
Subtotal, Other bilateral assistance	1,891,300	1,091,900	1,731,800	1,503,600	-387,700
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (emergency)	660,000	594,000	660,000	620,000	-40,000
(Transfer out emergency)	---	---	(-46,000)	---	---
Migration and Refugee Assistance (emergency)	53,400	103,400	108,400	120,400	+67,000
Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs (emergency)	32,100	17,100	32,100	24,600	-7,500
Subtotal, Department of State	745,500	714,500	800,500	765,000	+19,500
MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Foreign Military Financing Program (emergency)	250,000	---	250,000	250,000	---
Foreign Military Financing Program	---	250,000	---	---	---
Peacekeeping Operations (emergency)	210,000	10,000	210,000	240,000	+30,000
(Transfer out emergency)	---	---	---	(-30,000)	(-30,000)
(By transfer emergency)	---	---	---	(50,000)	(+50,000)
Subtotal, Military assistance	460,000	260,000	460,000	490,000	+30,000
General Provisions					
Sec. 2102- Rescission of unexpended balances (rescission)	---	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Sec. 2111 - Provide Additional Assistance to Sudan: Contributions for International Peacekeeping (transfer out emergency)	---	---	(-91,000)	---	---

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
Peacekeeping Operations (by transfer)	---	---	(50,000)	---	---
Intnatl. Disaster and Famine Assist (by transfer)	---	---	(41,000)	---	---
Total, Chapter 2	5,443,200	3,112,600	3,616,249	3,888,800	-1,554,400
Appropriations	---	992,300	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	5,443,200	3,120,300	4,616,249	4,888,800	-554,400
Rescissions	---	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Total, Title II	5,593,200	3,262,600	4,086,249	4,128,800	-1,464,400
Appropriations	---	992,300	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations	5,593,200	3,270,300	5,086,249	5,128,800	-464,400
Rescissions	---	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
By transfer	---	---	(91,000)	(-50,000)	(-50,000)
Transfer out (emergency)	---	---	(-147,000)	(-40,000)	(-40,000)
By transfer (emergency)	---	---	(56,000)	(60,000)	(+60,000)
TITLE III - DOMESTIC APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE WAR ON TERROR					
CHAPTER 1					
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
National Nuclear Security Administration					
Weapons activities (emergency)	---	---	26,000	---	---
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (emergency)	110,000	110,000	84,000	84,000	-26,000
Total, Chapter 1	110,000	110,000	110,000	84,000	-26,000
CHAPTER 2					
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
Customs and Border Protection					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	105,451	49,075	+49,075
Salaries and expenses	---	---	---	75,350	+75,350
Construction (emergency)	---	---	41,500	51,875	+51,875
Immigration and Customs Enforcement					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	276,000	349,050	+349,050
Salaries and expenses	---	---	389,613	105,200	+105,200
United States Coast Guard					
Operating Expenses (emergency)	111,950	111,950	111,950	111,950	---
Acquisition, Construction and Improvements (emergency)	49,200	49,200	49,200	49,200	---
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
Salaries and expenses	---	---	---	2,568	+2,568
Construction	---	---	---	1,882	+1,882
Total, Chapter 2	161,150	161,150	973,714	796,150	+635,000
CHAPTER 3					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Office of Inspector General (emergency)	---	---	2,500	---	---
Detention trustee (emergency)	---	---	---	184,000	+184,000
Legal Activities					
Asset Forfeiture Fund (rescission)	---	---	---	-40,000	-40,000

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
United States Marshals Service					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	11,935	11,935	+11,935
Federal Bureau Of Investigation					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	80,000	78,970	66,512	73,991	-6,009
Drug Enforcement Administration					
Salaries and Expenses (emergency)	7,648	7,648	7,648	7,648	---
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	5,100	4,000	+4,000
Total, Chapter 3	87,648	86,618	93,695	241,574	+153,926
CHAPTER 4					
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
House of Representatives					
Payment to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress	---	---	---	162	+162
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	---	39,000	+39,000
Subtotal, House of Representatives	---	---	---	39,162	+39,162
Capitol Police					
Salaries	36,483	---	---	---	-36,483
(Emergency)	---	---	10,000	---	---
General expenses	23,044	---	---	---	-23,044
(Emergency)	---	---	13,300	11,000	+11,000
Subtotal, Capitol Police	59,527	---	23,300	11,000	-48,527
Architect of the Capitol					
Capitol grounds (emergency)	---	---	---	8,200	+8,200
Capitol Police buildings and grounds (emergency)	---	---	23,000	4,100	+4,100
Subtotal, Architect of the Capitol	---	---	23,000	12,300	+12,300
Total, Chapter 4	59,527	---	46,300	62,462	+2,935
Total, Title III	418,325	357,768	1,223,709	1,184,186	+765,861
TITLE IV - INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI RELIEF					
CHAPTER 1					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Other Bilateral Assistance					
Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund (emergency)	701,000	659,000	656,000	656,000	-45,000
(Transfer out emergency)	(-43,000)	(-30,500)	(-36,000)	(-48,500)	(-5,500)
CHAPTER 2					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE					
Operation And Maintenance					
Operation and Maintenance, Navy (emergency)	124,100	124,100	124,100	124,100	---
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency)	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	---
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (emergency)	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	---
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (emergency)	29,150	29,150	29,150	29,150	---

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (emergency)	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	---
Defense Health Program (emergency)	3,600	3,600	---	3,600	---
Defense Health Program (emergency)	---	---	3,600	---	---
Total, Chapter 2	225,650	225,650	225,650	225,650	---
CHAPTER 3					
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
United States Coast Guard					
Operating Expenses (emergency)	350	350	350	350	---
CHAPTER 4					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
United States Geological Survey					
Surveys, Investigations, and Research (emergency)	8,100	8,100	8,100	8,100	---
CHAPTER 5					
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, Research, and Facilities (emergency)	4,830	4,830	7,070	7,070	+2,240
Procurement, Acquisition and Construction (emergency)	9,670	9,670	10,170	10,170	+500
Total, Chapter 5	14,500	14,500	17,240	17,240	+2,740
Total, Title IV	949,600	907,600	907,340	907,340	-42,260
TITLE V - OTHER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS					
CHAPTER 1					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service					
Research and education activities (emergency)	---	---	3,000	---	---
Natural Resources Conservation Service					
Emergency watershed protection program (emergency)	---	---	103,000	104,500	+104,500
General Provision					
Sec. 5102 Watershed protection program (emergency)	---	---	15,000	---	---
Subtotal, Natural Resource conservation Service	---	---	118,000	104,500	+104,500
Total, Chapter 1	---	---	121,000	104,500	+104,500
CHAPTER 2					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Departmental Mangement					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	---	---	3,000	3,000	+3,000
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
National forest service (emergency)	---	---	2,410	---	---
Capital improvement and maintenance (emergency)	---	---	31,980	24,390	+24,390
Subtotal, Forest Service	---	---	34,390	24,390	+24,390
Total, Chapter 2	---	---	37,390	27,390	+27,390

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
CHAPTER 3					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Health Resources and Services Administration					
Health resources and services (rescission)	---	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (rescission)	---	---	---	-58,000	-58,000
Office of the Secretary					
Office of the Inspector General (rescission)	---	---	-700	-700	-700
Public Health and Social Services Emergency fund (emergency)	---	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000
Public Health and Social Services Emergency fund	---	---	---	58,000	+58,000
Assistant Secretary for Health (rescission)	---	---	-7,300	-7,300	-7,300
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary	---	---	2,000	2,000	+2,000
Total, Department of Health and Human Services	---	---	---	---	---
RELATED AGENCY					
Institute of Musem and Library Services (emergency)	---	---	10,000	---	---
Total, Chapter 3	---	---	10,000	---	---
CHAPTER 4					
THE JUDICIARY					
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses	101,800	---	---	---	-101,800
(Emergency)	---	---	65,000	---	---
Subtotal, Courts of Appeals, district Courts, and Other Judicial Services	101,800	---	65,000	---	-101,800
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Housing Programs					
Housing For Persons With Disabilities	---	---	238,080	238,000	+238,000
Rescission	---	---	-238,080	-238,000	-238,000
Subtotal, Housing programs	---	---	---	---	---
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight					
Salaries and expenses	---	---	5,000	5,000	+5,000
Offsetting collections	---	---	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000
General Provision					
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Sec. 5401 Emergency assistance (emergency)	---	---	10,000	---	---
Total, Chapter 4	101,800	---	75,000	---	-101,800
Total, Title V	101,800	---	243,390	131,890	+30,090
Appropriations	101,800	---	243,080	301,000	+199,200
Emergency appropriations	---	---	253,390	141,890	+141,890
Rescissions	---	---	-248,080	-306,000	-306,000
Offsetting collections	---	---	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000

Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense - the Global War on Terror - and Tsunami Relief - 2005 (H.R. 1268)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. Request
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS					
General Provisions Sec. 5002 (By transfer)	---	---	---	---	---
Weapons activities (transfer out)	---	---	(-10,000)	---	---
Sec. 6019 Office of the Administrator (by transfer)	---	---	(10,000)	---	---
Defense site acceleration completion (transter out)	---	---	(-30,000)	---	---
Sec. 6030 Defense environmental services (by transfer)	---	---	(30,000)	---	---
Fossil energy research development (CCPI loan)	---	---	---	---	---
Sec. 6030 State and private forestry (by transfer)	---	---	(1,500)	---	---
Capital improvement and maintenance (transfer out)	---	---	(-1,500)	---	---
Sec. 6027- Department of Homeland Security:					
Office of the Secretary and Executive Management (rescission)	---	---	---	-500	-500
Office of the Under Secretary for Management (rescission)	---	---	---	-3,300	-3,300
Customs and Border Protection salaries and expenses (rescission)	---	---	---	-76,000	-76,000
Immigration and Customs Enforcement salaries and expenses (rescission)	---	---	---	-85,200	-85,200
Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund (rescission)	---	---	---	-20,000	-20,000
Sec. 6035- Surface mining fees	---	---	-41,000	-41,000	-41,000
Sec. 6050- U.S. Senate (emergency)	---	---	---	35,000	+35,000
Sec. 6074- Home Equity Conversion Mortgage	---	---	---	-8,000	-8,000
Total, Title VI	---	---	-41,000	-199,000	-199,000
Grand total	82,042,628	81,366,878	81,219,945	82,041,478	-1,150
Appropriations	161,327	992,300	632,693	486,000	+324,673
Emergency appropriations	81,881,301	81,374,578	81,881,332	83,190,478	+1,309,177
Rescissions	---	-1,000,000	-1,248,080	-1,531,000	-1,531,000
Offsetting collections	---	---	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000
(Transfer authority)	(7,500,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,185,000)	(5,685,000)	(-1,815,000)
(By transfer)	---	---	(132,500)	(-50,000)	(-50,000)
(By transfer emergency)	---	(85,000)	(56,000)	(60,000)	(+60,000)
(Transfer out)	---	---	(-41,500)	---	---
(Transfer out emergency)	(-43,000)	(-30,500)	(-183,000)	(-88,500)	(-45,500)

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us today makes clear that we have now spent $284 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan since the war began. The money that has been spent in Afghanistan is certainly legitimate and justified. After all, that country harbored the people who attacked us on 9/11. The problem is, however, that $165 billion has now been spent to deal with a country that did not attack us. We have spent some $240 billion on this entire endeavor since the President first landed in his jumpsuit on that carrier and addressed the country under the banner ''Mission Accomplished.'' There has been quite a bit of that mission left since it supposedly was over. We have now been involved in Iraq longer than we were involved in World War I, and respectable and responsible experts have told me that they expect that we will be involved for at least another 5 years.

This whole operation has been brought to us by the same people who erroneously told us that we had to go to war because Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and it was implied that they had, or were close to having, nuclear capability. That was all demonstrated not to be true. This has been brought to us by the same people who believed the assertions that our troops would be welcomed with open arms. It has been brought to us by the same people who thought they were so smart that they knew more than General Shinseki when the good general warned us that we would need substantially more troops and boots on the ground than we were scheduled to have if the postwar occupation was to go well.

And it has been brought to us by the same people who provided to our troops insufficient armor for Humvees, insufficient body armor and insufficient jammers to prevent our troops from having their faces and their legs and their arms blown off by remotely detonated bombs and mines.

I want to make quite clear I will support this bill because I feel that I have no choice but to participate in cleaning up the mess which somebody else left. But I do not relish it. I believe that the entire operation in Iraq has been accompanied by incredibly naive romanticism on the part of the White House and on the part of the civilian leadership in the Pentagon, and that has left the people fighting the war to bear the brunt of the miscalculations that have been made by the civilian leadership of our government. We have lost the lives of 1,500 American service men and women. We have seen more than 11,000 be injured. And this bill understates, in my view, the amount of money that will be needed eventually to restore the readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces and to minimize their casualties.

The second thing this bill does is to demonstrate once again how we, on both sides of the aisle, have had to work doubly hard to overcome the resistance of the White House in adequately funding homeland security operations. They have been especially resistant to providing the adequate funding along the borders, especially the Canadian border. And it has taken a bipartisan effort on the part of a wide variety of people in this Congress in order to overcome that resistance. This bill falls far short of the funding that is necessary to provide a secure set of borders for the United States. The new bill that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will help fill that gap, but that is forced to play catch-up because we have met a steady resistance effort on the part of the White House.

Lastly, I simply want to say that while I am certainly no expert on the subject, I note that there is being attached to this bill a provision which many experts in the field feel has the potential to construct a nationwide database that could be very harmful in terms of people's efforts to engage in identity theft. I hope that proves not to be the case.

I would simply make the point that certainly no one on our committee on either side of the aisle has the expertise that you would hope would be found in the authorization committees, and I wish that that provision had been dealt with on a separate bill rather than solving an internal problem within the Republican Caucus by having it attached to an unrelated bill, and I want to make one point about that.

We are being lectured almost daily by the majority that we should not add ungermane riders to appropriation bills. I want to serve notice that if the majority feels free to add unrelated authorization bills such as this to a must-pass bill, that then I feel fully within my rights in offering whatever authorization legislation we feel appropriate on this side of the aisle and asking that it be attached to appropriation bills. If sauce is going to be okay for the goose, then it ought to be good for the gander.

So we will see in the coming months what the attitude of the majority is when we seek to add what we feel are legitimate efforts to strengthen appropriation bills by adding various pieces of so-called legislation to appropriation bills.

□ 1230

So since the majority has chosen to proceed down that path, I hope they raise no objection when we seek to follow it. With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I repeat I intend to vote for this bill with all of my misgivings.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), my colleague on the committee.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the chairman of the full committee on this, his maiden effort, to bring a major supplemental appropriation to the floor as chairman, and I congratulate him for the leadership that he has shown in bringing this so swiftly to this floor.

I do rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 1268. Before I address the funding that is the responsibility of my subcommittee, I want to briefly acknowledge a critically important part of this bill, border security funding. The securing of our Nation's borders to prevent the hemorrhaging flow of illegal immigration through my State of Arizona has got to be a top priority for the Federal Government. The people I represent living on the border are frustrated with the illegal immigration system, and we must address gaps in border security now. Arizona and other border States can no longer serve as the back door for this country's broken immigration system. By adding the funding that we do in this bill, we are taking a step in the right direction to ensure our northern and southern borders are protected.

Regarding the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Subcommittee chapter of this legislation, the conference report includes $2.53 billion in funding for programs under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Subcommittee, which I chair. While this overall level is $1.4 billion less than requested, let me say once again I strongly support the objectives of the President that he seeks to achieve with this request for Afghanistan, the Middle East, and the tsunami-devastated areas of Asia. I believe that this conference agreement provides the financial support necessary to help the United States achieve these objectives.

The major elements of the conference agreement that differ from the House-passed levels are additional funds for Afghanistan reconstruction, the Solidarity Initiative, and support for Ukraine. The $739 million proposed by the House for Afghanistan reconstruction represented the highest priority projects that could be implemented and executed during 2005. The Senate provided $1.3 billion, the administration's request. And the conference level is $1.086 billion, or $347 million over what the House had recommended. This increase over the House level supports some 2006 requirements, which is, I believe, a cost-effective approach to the 2006 budget process.

The House provided no funding for the administration's $400 million Solidarity Initiative. The Senate provide a total of $225.5 million, $200 million in the Solidarity Fund and $25.5 million in the Global War on Terror Partners Fund. The conference agreement provides a total of $230 million, merging the two funds into one appropriation, and places these funds within Peacekeeping Operations appropriations. This arrangement provides for regular order congressional review of the Department's plans for these funds.

The conference agreement provides $60 million for Ukraine, and these funds will support the government of Ukraine's highest priorities for political and economic reform, including anti-corruption initiatives and support for the upcoming parliamentary elections.

I think my colleagues recognize that we are faced with unique opportunities in the Middle East and Afghanistan. This agreement will provide the financial resources necessary to promote democracy and provide the State Department with programs and projects to support these positive influences.

Let me say that the funds we are providing in the foreign assistance chapter must be considered an investment in security both in the region and on American soil. However, Congress has the responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and transparently, and we take that responsibility seriously with reporting requirements, and we will continue vigorous oversight of these programs.

The greatest weight all of us must bear is the knowledge that these decisions we make directly put the lives of Americans at risk. I firmly believe the bill before us today will help build stability and freedom in Afghanistan, the Middle East, and parts of Asia. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the fiscal year 2005 emergency supplemental conference report on H.R. 1268.

I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 1268, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005.

Before I address the funding in my subcommittee, I wanted to briefly acknowledge a critically important part of this bill—border security funding. The securing of our nation's borders to prevent the hemorrhaging flow of illegal immigration through my state of Arizona must be a top priority for the federal government. The people I represent living on the border are frustrated with the illegal immigration system, and we must address gaps in border security now. Arizona and other border states can no longer serve as the backdoor for this country's broken immigration system. By adding this funding we are taking a step in the right direction to ensure our northern and southern borders are protected.

I am pleased that my colleagues on the conference committee agreed to provide $635 million for Border Security to hire an additional 500 Border Patrol Agents, 50 additional criminal investigators, 168 Immigration Enforcement Agents and Deportation Officers, and to fund 1,950 additional detention beds.

The bill also includes my amendment to strengthen the REAL ID Act to address the technology, equipment, and personnel needs improving security within the U.S., requiring Department of Homeland Security to carry out an improved ground surveillance program, and requiring DHS to improve interagency communication.

Regarding the Foreign Operations Subcommittee chapter, the conference agreement includes $2.532 billion, in funding for programs under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations subcommittee of which I am Chairman. This amount is $685 million over the House level, $251 million less than the Senate level, and $1.4 billion less than the Administration's request.

While this overall level is $1.4 billion less than requested, let me say once again that I strongly support the objectives the President seeks to achieve with this request for Afghanistan, the Middle East, and the tsunami devastated areas of Asia. I believe that, with the understanding that we need to reduce our federal deficit, this conference agreement provides the financial support necessary to help the United States achieve these objectives.

The major elements of the conference agreement that differ from the House passed-level are: additional funds for Afghanistan reconstruction, the Solidarity Initiative, and support for Ukraine.

The $739 million proposed by the House for Afghanistan reconstruction, represented the highest priority projects that could be implemented and executed during 2005. The Senate provided $1.3 billion, the Administration's request. The conference level is $1.086 billion, $347 million over the House recommendation. The increase over the House level supports some 2006 requirements—a cost effective approach to the 2006 budget process—such as $101.4 million for two additional power plants, $8.4 million for a water pipeline, $72 million for additional roads and infrastructure, and $43 million for economic governance.

The House provided no funding for the Administration's $400 million ''Solidarity Initiative.'' The Solidarity Initiative request of $400 million for two $200 million Funds to be used by the Secretary of State, as she determines, was to offset the costs of those countries that have dedicated troops to the Global War on Terror as well as economic support to other nations that have provided support. The Senate provided a total of $225.5 million—$200 million in the Solidarity Fund and $25.5 million in the Global War on Terror Partners Fund. The conference agreement provides a total of $230 million, merging the two Funds into one appropriation and places these funds within the Peacekeeping Operations appropriations. This arrangement provides for regular order Congressional review of the Department's plans for these funds. This will provide sufficient oversight of a substantial amount of money for the Global War on Terror.

The House provided $33.7 million for support to Ukraine. The Senate provided the Administration's request of $60 million. The conference agreement provides $60 million for Ukraine. These funds will support the government of Ukraine's highest priorities for political and economic reform, including anti-corruption initiatives and support for the upcoming parliamentary elections.

I think my colleagues recognize that we are faced with unique opportunities in the Middle East and Afghanistan. U.S. leadership can have positive, democratic influence in the West Bank, Gaza, Lebanon, Belarus, and Ukraine. This agreement will provide the financial resources necessary to promote democracy and provide State Department with programs and projects to support these positive influences.

Finally, the conference agreement provides $656 million for assistance to the victims of the tsunami and earthquakes of last December and March.

Let me say that the funds we are providing in the foreign assistance chapter must be considered an investment in security both in the region and on American soil. However, Congress has a responsibility to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used efficiently and transparently, and I know my colleagues take that responsibility seriously. We have included financial reporting requirements for all funds in the Foreign Operations chapter. For Afghanistan counternarcotics and West Bank Gaza programs, we have included additional auditing requirements. As Chairman, I pledge to continue vigorous oversight of these programs.

The greatest weight all of us must bear is the knowledge that decisions we make as Members of Congress directly puts the lives of Americans at risk. Already, men and women from probably every district represented today have made the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq and Afghanistan. I firmly believe the bill before us today will help to build stability and freedom in Afghanistan, the Middle East and parts of Asia.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on passage of the fiscal year 2005 emergency supplemental conference report on H.R. 1268.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman who has long been trying to extend debate in this Chamber.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, in regards to what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just said, I am surprised at the new chairman. He is so lenient about getting time out of him. Usually our bill moves much faster than this. I thought he learned.

Let me say the defense part of this and maybe the rest of it is probably the most bipartisan bill one could ever find. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), and I have been traveling to these various bases. We found shortages every place we went, all kinds of problems that they brought to our attention that needed to be rectified. We found problems so severe that many of the units that were on their way to Iraq were C–4. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), my good friend, the hero from Vietnam, knows what I am talking about when I say C–4. I am talking about they are not ready to go to combat because the equipment is so bad.

As a matter of fact, the equipment was so bad at one base, and I think it was Fort Stewart where the troops did not have radios to train with, did not have small arms ammunition, did not have mortar ammunition to train with, and that means that when they get there, they are not at the cutting edge of where they should be. Now they get equipment when they get there, and that overcomes the C–4.

So the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and I, what we did was put $2.3 billion into the budget. We first checked, the staff checked, with the Army to make sure that that is where it ought to be put. The Army came back and supported us. Usually, they beat around the bush. The gentleman from California (Chairman

LEWIS) knows what I mean. We talk to them, and because of other people over there, they do not want to admit that they need the money. This time they were very emphatic that they needed every cent and they needed it as soon as they could get it. So we added money for the types of things that they need.

Having said that, what I have said to the services because we are having such a problem, we see the recruiting problem, we are looking into that right now. The subcommittee I serve on, we realize and we have said for a long time, they are going to have a recruiting problem as this war gets unpopular; and we were trying to figure out how do we overcome that.

Most times I disagree with those bonuses because I feel so strongly that people ought to join the Armed Forces for the good of the country, but we have to give bonuses to send them over there. We put money in for those kinds of things. We increased the amount of money somebody gets when they are killed in action. We expanded it so that when they are killed in action, they are taken care of retroactively as well as prospectively. We take care of somebody who is wounded. We added money to it. Some veterans group called me and said they were not happy with the way we added that money. They felt like there ought to be more study, and I cannot disagree with that.

But when the four of us sat down, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and Senator INOUYE and Senator STEVENS, we came to the conclusion that we just did not think we could wait. So we put money in to take care of people who were injured so severely as well as the ones that were killed. And I got so many letters from the people at home, and I have had 12 killed in my district, how pleased they were about what we are doing because it helped them get through a very difficult time.

What we have tried to do over the years is make sure that the people that were in the Armed Forces had what they needed, that the people in Iraq have what they need. Our subcommittee brought to the attention of the country that they were without a lot of equipment in Iraq. We are working right now. New trucks, we are trying to figure out how to put new trucks in that are encapsulated because we have taken care of the Humvees, but we need to take care of the trucks now. So we got some commercial trucks which were recommended which were $100,000 less, but it was so late, we could not get it in the bill. We are going to ask for reprogramming for that amount of money.

So this bill is taking care of equipment shortages, not all of them, but it is taking care of as many as we could possibly squeeze in. It is taking care of Reset. We forced the military to ask for Reset. The minute that this war is over and the money starts to dry up, Reset will be the first thing they do not do; so we have to do it now. And I have said to many of the industrial leaders in this country, the minute the war is over, there will not be any supplementals, there will be a lot less money to be spent, and we have got to spend this money now in the supplementals to make sure that that gets done. Armor modularity, there is some argument about that; but we think it ought to be done, and we have pushed this.

Many of the programs that the Army has today have come about because of the Defense Subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and chaired by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). Many of the things that have happened have happened because we see it out in the field. We go out in the field, talk to the people, make sure that we are doing the right thing, and then we try to send defense in the right direction.

So I urge the Members to vote for this. The troops need it, and it helps dramatically for the amount of money that is needed by the Armed Forces.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for one of the most illuminating, but also one of the longest, statements I have ever heard him make on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the greatest subcommittee in the appropriations process.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding me this time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member on our Defense Subcommittee, has explained the bill quite thoroughly as it relates to the war fighters. The biggest part of this supplemental is for war fighters, and the bill that we have put together goes just to that issue.

The increases that we have added in this bill go to the urgently needed items such as ammunition, weapons, up-armored Humvees, transport vehicles, Jammers, night vision equipment, radios, add-on armor kits; and the list goes on and on. And I include a list of those items that are for the war fighter and force protection, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and I and many of our colleagues have visited our hospitals to visit with our soldiers and Marines at Walter Reed and at Bethesda Naval Hospital and also at Landstuhl, where many of our servicemen come first before they get transported back to the United States, and we have located a number of areas where the government just does not take care of these soldiers and the Marines. And this bill goes a long way towards taking care of that.

It has been pretty generally known that we have in this bill increased the death benefit for those who make the total sacrifice and lose their lives in working and supporting the Nation's security. We have also increased the service group life insurance programs substantially so that those who prefer to take part in that program can have additional benefits, and many of these benefits are really needed. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) referred to this, but I want to take just a minute and explain. We added, basically, a new program, and that is for a traumatic injury insurance benefit for members of the service. We provide up to $100,000 to compensate for injuries such as loss of sight, losing a hand or a foot, or other debilitating injuries. And these benefits would be retroactive to October of 2001, when the war started.

There are many soldiers and Marines today who have been wounded so seriously that in previous wars would have died on the battlefield but who are living today in this war because of improved and increased medical benefits and better training and better medicines and the ability to transport from the battlefield to a medical facility. So these soldiers and Marines are hurt really bad, and we have an obligation to take care of them, and this bill goes a long way toward beginning that process, to take care of things for our heroes and our fallen heroes who have not been taken care of by the government properly.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

Conference Agreement for Additional Equipment

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	*Recommendation*
Missile Procurement, Army:	
ITAS/TOW Mods	30,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army:	
Bradley Reactive Armor Tiles	20,000
Stryker	69,540
Small Arms Modifications	55,200
Procurement of Ammunition, Army:	
Ammunition Industrial Base	57,800
Other Procurement, Army:	
Up-Armored IDMWVs (M1114)	150,000
Other HMMWVs (M1151)	80,000
FMTV	225,000
FHTV	114,000
Add-On Armor Kits	48,000
SINCGARS Family	30,000
Improved HF Radios (including PRC–150 and PRC–148)	17,000
Jammers (Warlock including Low Cost Jammer)	60,000
Night Vision Devices	59,000
Counter Rocket Artillery and Mortar System (CRAM)	75,000
Force XXI Battle Command Brigade and Below (FBCB2)	66,100
Handheld Stand-off Mine Detection System (HSTAMIDS)	10,000
Army Total:	1,166,640
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps:	
Small Arms Ammunition	6,000
Procurement, Marine Corps:	
Light Armored Vehicle (LAV)	175,000
Night Vision Equipment	54,000
Radio Systems (including EPLRS, PRC–117 and HF Communications Vehicle)	55,000

Program	Recommendation
HMMWVs	30,000
Marine Corps Total:	320,000
Grand Total:	1,486,640

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am of course going to vote for this emergency supplemental appropriation because I believe it is absolutely imperative to support our brave men and women in harm's way in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I know that even today, 2 years after the onset of Operation Iraqi Freedom, there continues to be strong disagreement across the Nation on the decision to remove the brutal Hussein regime as well as the planning and prosecution of our military effort in Iraq.

□ 1245

However, on this point, I believe there is unanimity.

We, the elected representatives of the American people, have a legislative duty as well as a moral responsibility, to do everything in our power to ensure that our troops have everything they need to defeat the vicious insurgency in Iraq, to assist the Iraqi people in establishing democracy, and continuing our efforts in Afghanistan.

In my view, however, we are not doing enough. Just last week, The New York Times reported the experience of Marine Company E, an experience that, ''was punctuated not only by a lack of armor, but also by a shortage of men and planning that further hampered their efforts in the battle.''

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this bill includes $1.4 billion more than the administration requested for bolstering force protection needs such as add-on armor and night vision goggles, and, in addition, for outfitting troops rotating into Iraq and Afghanistan.

Over the last 4 years, this administration, however, has refused to ask the American people, particularly the wealthiest American people, to make even minimal sacrifices, while we ask our men and women in Afghanistan and Iraq for some to make the ultimate sacrifice. The very least, in my opinion, that we can do is give them the resources they need to achieve victory and to return home safely.

I also support, Mr. Speaker, the important funding in this bill for tsunami relief, foreign assistance, and domestic homeland security as well as the $200 million in assistance for the Palestinian Authority for infrastructure and economic development projects. Those are all worthwhile, necessary, and important projects. The political reforms taking place in the territories must be accompanied by an end to the poverty and lack of opportunity facing the Palestinian people. That is ultimately how we will defeat terrorism.

Finally, however, let me raise, Mr. Speaker, one objection, among others, to the funding bill: the $592 million for a new embassy compound in Baghdad. That is not an emergency. This funding, Mr. Speaker, is not only inappropriate in this emergency supplemental appropriation, but it also, in my opinion, is substantially excessive in its expenditures; not to keep the people safe, we can do that, but to create an embassy in a relatively small country that, hopefully, in the years ahead, will be more peaceful than we have found it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are at a critical juncture in Iraq. Victory is imperative, although it is not certain. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the other conferees for giving us a whole new effort, a major effort to try to control the borders and to deal with the massive illegal immigration problem that the country is facing. We have 11 million estimated illegal aliens in the country, and 800,000 or so of them are people who have been ordered deported and yet have absconded. Eighty thousand of those have criminal records.

This bill, when combined with the homeland security appropriations bills for 2006 that we marked up yesterday in the subcommittee, those two bills combined will give us a new, massive effort to deal with the problem. These two bills will give us 1,500 new Border Patrol agents, 568 new Immigration and Customs enforcement officers throughout the country, and some 3,900 new jail bed space to try to deal with this massive, overwhelming problem.

I want to commend the chairman for having the foresight, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the other members of the conference, for giving us the new capability to tackle a problem that is proving to be very elusive.

So I compliment the chairman, and I urge everyone to support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference committee report. But, Mr. Speaker, the American people whose sons and daughters are fighting this war and the senior military officers who are directing this war deserve to know what the White House will consider to be success in Iraq.

Now, this conference committee report includes language that would require the administration to fully evaluate the situation in Iraq and provide the Congress with measurable, achievable criteria, including the following: an assessment of the number of troops it will take to secure the peace and how those troops would be rotated; key measures of political stability, such as ratification of a national Constitution and permanent national elections now scheduled for next year; the estimated strength of the Iraqi insurgency and the extent to which it is composed of nonIraqi fighters; the operational readiness of Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are capable of conducting counterinsurgency operations independently; and the readiness of Iraqi police forces to perform all duties now being undertaken by coalition forces; as well as the viability of economic sectors that are crucial to Iraq's economic recovery, as measured by unemployment levels, utility availability, and oil production rates.

The fact is that our long-term presence in Iraq will only give our enemies in the region a greater ability to recruit terrorists and build public support for violence. That is the opposite of our objective there. I do think it is past time to lay out for the American people what is our strategy for success. This language that is included in the report will require the Secretary to report no later than 60 days after the enactment of the supplemental and every 90 days thereafter. That is progress.

We support our troops. We have to complete this mission, but we also need to work together. The fact is, the American people whose sons and daughters are fighting this war do not have the ability to require this of the administration, nor do the senior military officers. It is our responsibility, and I am glad that this Congress is committed to performing that responsibility. On balance, it is a good bill, and I support it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to our majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise, of course, in support of this supplemental.

I also want to rise to really express my appreciation to the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the tremendous job he has done in limiting the scope of this supplemental and getting this work done in a quick way, and moving forward on the rest of our appropriations process at the same time. These measures can often become reasons not to move forward with the normal work of the House, and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and his committee and their staff have really accepted double responsibility and double duty by doing these things at the same time.

This bill does include, as my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) mentioned, the embassy compound in Baghdad. He

and I visited the current embassy together in December, and I think we disagree on the need to go ahead and get this project started now. The project is 10 percent below the amount of money that the administration asked for. It is a substantial amount of money. It is a difficult environment, but bidding and starting these projects simply cannot happen if we have a little piece of that money to start with; you have to have the money available so that this embassy can be built and that our people representing us there in the embassy can be secure. We had two people killed in the current embassy compound in recent weeks from a missile that was fired there, and we need to move forward.

In addition to providing vital funding for our troops in fighting the war, this bill also addresses some of the border vulnerabilities identified by the 9/11 Commission. This legislation does not create a national ID card or a national database, but it does move forward in securing our borders and making our asylum process work better to protect Americans, both young and old. This legislation tightens the asylum system because of that.

Finally, this legislation provides $635 million for increased border security and enforcement. That includes $176 million to hire, train, equip, and support 500 border patrol agents and relieve current facility overcrowding. It includes almost half a billion dollars for Immigration and Customs enforcement, which includes $97.5 million to hire and train additional criminal investigators and immigration enforcement agents.

This bill works to protect our fighting forces abroad, to help secure our borders at home, to move us forward in the war against terror. I appreciate the committee's work on it, and I encourage its approval today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, why is Congress approving yet another multibillion dollar spending bill when the previous 3 multibillion dollar spending bills have been misused, improperly managed, and, in some cases, downright stolen?

A report by the Special Inspector General for Iraq's reconstruction has stated that nearly $100 million for reconstruction projects in southern Iraq is missing and cannot be accounted for. These funds must be accounted for before allotting one more dollar for the war in Iraq.

And where is the congressional investigation into the $9 billion that mysteriously disappeared from the books at the Coalition Provisional Authority? Why are we voting on writing another check for a mission that has been so badly botched? Who is being held responsible for the misinformation that led us into the war in the first place? Who is being held responsible for the troops not being equipped and armed with the billions of dollars that we have allocated to Iraq? Where is our exit strategy?

This bill is nothing short of highway robbery, and the victims are the troops and the American people. No more blank checks, Mr. Speaker. No more wars without reason. I will vote against the supplemental.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to fund urgent supplemental requirements for the military.

For the State Department, we have included just over $2 billion, a reduction of $199 million from the President's request.

The bill includes the necessary funds to maintain our diplomatic presence in Iraq and Afghanistan, and for allowing our personnel to carry out their duties in the safest and most secure manner.

Iraq and Afghanistan are the front lines of our foreign policy. This conference report provides the necessary resources for operations, logistics, and security in those dangerous, but critically important, parts of the world.

There is also $592 million to allow State to move quickly to build a secure compound in Baghdad and, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) said, these facilities are not secure now, and they are needed. This money will result in the completion of a secure living and working compound facility within 24 months.

The $680 million, $100 million below the President's request, pays for the U.S. share of ongoing peacekeeping missions, including a new mission for Sudan, where it is absolutely critical, now that there is a north-south peace. And, by sending this mission there, hopefully, it will bring peace to Darfur.

The conference report also includes $241.6 million for domestic appropriations to support the war on terror, including FBI counterterrorism efforts and, for DEA, a counternarcotics program in Afghanistan.

Finally, it includes $17.2 million to jump-start the improvement of the United States tsunami warning capabilities on both coasts.

The conference report before us provides funding for important security measures for our diplomatic personnel, for our ongoing State Department and Justice Department commitments, and I strongly urge support of the conference report.

□ 1300

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, while I have problems with the concept of this supplemental and supplementals, and the misplaced budget priorities of the Republican Party, this bill, I believe, is needed for our men and women who are fighting the war on terrorism.

This bill includes much needed higher death benefits for our military. And while it will never return these patriots such as Christian Engeldrum in my district to his family, what we can do as Americans is ensure that his wife and children have financial security for his personal sacrifice to his country.

This bill finally provides funding for body armor for our troops, something that this administration has refused to do for over 2 years now. So hopefully less families can claim the new death benefits for their loved ones fighting overseas.

This bill provides much needed aid for the victims of the December tsunami. I led a delegation to Sri Lanka in January, and I saw first hand the resources needed in that country, multiplied by the effects on other countries; and this money will go to good use.

This funding, along with the sheer generosity of the American people, is a true testament of our country in comparison to the tepid actions by the White House in the immediate days after the crisis.

While this money is important, I would be remiss if I did not express my disappointment at no funding being included for the U.N. Population Fund for children and maternal health care in the tsunami region. I offered an amendment to fix this, but yet again this administration has played politics and refuses to fund the UNFPA.

This bill provides $50 million in important aid to the State of Israel as they embark on the critical disengagement plan and withdraw from the Gaza Strip. We have the support, the courage of the Israeli people; and this is the right thing to do at this time.

And, finally, this bill includes important language to create the 9/11 Heroes Medal of Valor, for which I am deeply indebted to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for including this provision in this bill.

On behalf of my cousin, John Moran, who was killed on 9/11, a battalion chief of the Fire Department of New York, and the over 400 families in New York City that are affected by this legislation, I want to say thank you for this honor that is going to be bestowed by the President in September of this year.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a great member of our committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been flying wing on the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for about 14 years, and he has always got me home safely.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and his wife are out at Bethesda in the hospitals every single day

taking care of our troops. There is no better team than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) to make sure that our men and women are safe.

I have another great friend in the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). And if we were back in the times of Troy, I would be Achilles, and he would be Hector, and we would cross swords, but we would respect each other. And there is one area, Mr. OBEY, when you mentioned homeland security we can seat those swords. The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) is working on the abuses of the homeland security money. That is being taken on.

I think we can work in a very bipartisan way to make sure that that happens. I would like to thank the chairman for the border issues, that we have been able to secure our borders with this bill and provide for border patrol.

Many of us have been working on this for years. And the Speaker has granted us that at the first must-pass bill we can bring this forward.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield for purposes of a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER.)

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since President Bush stood aboard the USS *Lincoln* aircraft carrier and declared, "Mission Accomplished" in Iraq. And in those two years it has become increasingly clear that the war in Iraq is far from over, and that the American people are paying the price.

Let's just take a look at the facts:

There are currently 150,000 American troops now serving in Iraq, including 8,000 Reserve and National Guard troops.

Tragically, 1,582 American service members have been killed in the Iraq war.

At least 12,243 U.S. troops have been wounded in action, many with grievous injuries that will require a lifetime of medical assistance and other types of support.

More than one in five Iraqi war veterans have some type of mental disorder caused by their wartime service.

In addition to the cost of life and quality of life for the brave American men and women who are fighting in Iraq, the dollar cost of the war is also taking its toll on the American people.

To date, $217 billion in American taxpayer dollars have gone to fund the war in Iraq. We were told our allies would share the cost of the war; we were told Iraqi oil would pay for the cost of the war. Now it is clear, there was no plan: the American taxpayer is paying for the cost of this war to the tune of $5 billion a month.

In fact, today's $82 billion supplemental is the fifth such supplemental Congress has passed at the request of the Bush Administration to fund the war on terror. That's billions of dollars not spent on pressing problems right here at home.

Problems, such as:

The price of gas at the pump. Gas prices remain at record levels at $2.24 per gallon nationwide, with some states topping $2.60. That means gas prices have risen 33 cents in just the last two months and are 42 cents a gallon higher than a year ago. The Energy Department predicts that gas prices will climb to a record $2.35 by Memorial Day—averaging $2.28 this summer.

The high cost of health insurance. Health care costs for families have skyrocketed almost 50 percent over the past five years.

A lagging economy. The economy grew at just 3.1 percent in the first quarter—the slowest pace in 2 years and down from a 3.8-percent pace logged in the final quarter of 2004.

Declining wages and benefits. Workers' salaries and benefits have suffered the largest 3-year decline since 1948 (as a portion of our economy) even as corporate profits continue to rise.

Fewer jobs. 446,000 private-sector jobs and 2.8 million manufacturing jobs have been lost.

Record budget deficits. This year's deficit is on track to reach a record $427 billion.

Veteran's benefits. Over the next 5 years, the budget for veterans programs, primarily health care, is $14.2 billion below the amount needed to maintain services at current levels.

And, record trade deficits. The U.S. trade deficit surged to an all-time high of $61.04 billion in February.

Two years after President Bush declared mission accomplished in Iraq, there is still no end in sight. Instead of just signing another multi-billion dollar check to the Administration, isn't it time to develop a real plan to stabilize Iraq so we can bring American troops home and concentrate on our problems here at home?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) as I express my deep appreciation for his cooperation in this project.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him for his hard work on this conference report. As many in this Chamber know, this conference report contains the provisions of the Real ID Act, which I offered, and the House overwhelmingly approved earlier this year.

The sensible reforms contained in this legislation are long overdue and will make America safer. These provisions will hamper the ability of terrorists and criminal aliens to move freely through our society by requiring that all States' prior proof of lawful presence in the U.S. for their driver's licenses be accepted as identification for Federal purposes, such as boarding a commercial airplane, entering a Federal building or a nuclear power plant.

This legislation will also require a temporary driver's license issued to a foreign visitor to expire when their visa expires, with the maximum term of 1 year. The legislation will also prevent the ability of potentially dangerous aliens to show up under false pretenses on our shores and be granted safe haven, while simultaneously protecting those who are legitimately fleeing persecution.

Finally, the legislation will also ensure that the security and integrity of our border is not imperiled by endless and frivolous litigation. I would also note that there are several immigration-related provisions included in the report by the other body that enjoy broad support from this House.

One will provide that aliens who have received H–2B visas issued to work in temporary or seasonal jobs in any of the last 3 years shall not be counted toward the 2005 or 2006 quotes when applying for an H–2B visa during the next 2 years.

Another amendment expands immigrant visas available for aliens who serve as nurses or physical therapists. I wish to thank the House leadership, the White House, and many Members of both Chambers who rightly recognized the importance of the Real ID Act and supported its inclusion in this conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both the chairman and the ranking member for this bill, especially for its Iraqi dollars, because this bill analyzes microscopically the kinds of equipment that is needed there now, and then surgically targets those dollars in a vastly efficient manner for our troops.

The bill also deals with healing the wounds of both mind and body of those soldiers who are returning. The bill also deals with small businesses being able, through the H–2B process, to hire legal workers. And the bill also deals with enhanced technology for the tsunami situation that we saw so much, months ago.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for the legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the $17 million included in the Supplemental that we are considering today, which will support the expansion of the U.S. Tsunami Warning Network. These funds will help NOAA to procure and deploy tsunami detection buoys in a system designed to provide continuous tsunami warning capability for both the Pacific and Atlantic coasts of the United States. Detection is a critical part of a warning system which I hope will ultimately include a comprehensive approach to educating communities about, and preparing them for, tsunamis.

Comprising 70 percent of the Earth's surface area, our oceans support a growing source of protein for many developing countries, promising sources of medicines, and efficient transport of goods between continents and among nations. They also strongly influence our climate and weather and provide economic and unmeasurable quality of life

benefits. For proof of this, one only needs to know that the U.S. coasts support over 50 percent of the U.S. population and comprise only 17 percent of our land base.

When South Asia was struck by tsunami waves on December 26, the world's interest in tsunami detection and warning systems was heightened. The impact of these waves was felt around the world, and the tragedy of its immediate effect on Indian Ocean coastlines has painfully exposed our lack of ability to provide early warning and coastal community education and support. Many lifelong residents of Indian Ocean coastal towns fear the sea—the primary source of their livelihoods for generations. It is critical that individuals in high-risk areas are educated about and prepared for tsunamis before they strike. Coastal communities need assurance that technology exists and will be applied to increase warnings for such events and to prepare them for evacuation to avoid catastrophic loss of human life.

In contrast, developed nations use increasing technological sophistication to acquire from the sea its bounty—with little thought for the long-term sustainability of this activity. In time, without increased understanding of our ocean ecosystems and the impact of our harvest and extraction of its resources, developed nations may also come to fear the sea. The antidote to the disease of fear is understanding. New technologies have already led to enormous advances in our understanding of the coastal and marine environment. However, advanced sensors have been deployed only on relatively small scales, and the systems that are deployed have not been coordinated into an integrated system that will optimize our understanding of the oceans.

Since the U.S. hosted the Earth Observation Summit in July 2003, we have been working with our partner nations to adopt a comprehensive, coordinated and sustained Earth Observation System to collect and disseminate data, information and models for more effective and responsible use of our resources as well as to inform decision-makers about impending disasters. Most recently, the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy made an integrated ocean observing system a top recommendation in its report, An Ocean Blueprint for the 21st Century.

Our space exploration and our weather programs show that when our scientists and the Nation support a program and devote time, money and, most importantly, the human mind into these types of endeavors we are highly successful. The ocean, however, is often referred to as the last frontier, a place where we continue to find new organisms and species and where we still struggle to understand the profound implications for climate changes and more direct impacts of the oceans on our human habitats.

There is perhaps no more motivating event, no louder a voice for attention and understanding than having the ocean engulf human habitats. Our failure to fully develop and utilize our technology to understand our oceans has many more implications, including the potential for permanent damage to fragile and complex ecosystems that have generously provided us with food, medicines, recreation, and other benefits. We are now awake to the power of the ocean, and it is my hope that we will use this opportunity to move more quickly toward integrated data collection and dissemination systems, as well as intensive education of coastal communities, to ensure that we and future generations can look to the sea for inspiration, sustenance, and life-giving support.

I strongly support the inclusion of these funds to increase global monitoring capacity and public awareness about tsunamis and other disasters, particularly if they add to capacity of ocean monitoring as part of the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. And I would like to take a few minutes to express my support with some provisions included in the foreign operations chapter of this supplemental bill.

First and foremost, I am pleased that we have finally appropriated funding to address the earthquake and tsunami that devastated Asia. The images of destruction, parents separated from their children, whole villages flattened and emptied, livelihoods washed away, touched the American people deeply and brought out the most generous and humanitarian impulses in us all.

I am disappointed, however, that it has taken Congress so long to respond officially on behalf of the United States, but I am happy that we finally have a robust package of aid to offer affected nations.

I want to thank Chairman KOLBE, Senators MCCONNELL and LEAHY for responding to my request to ensure that the needs of women and children around the world are addressed in this supplemental. Of the $656 million included in the bill for tsunami-related assistance, over 200 million will be dedicated to directly meet the needs of women and children, and much of the remainder of those funds will be of indirect benefit through the restoration of infrastructure needed, such as new schools and roads.

The bill also makes a strong statement about U.S. support for a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It provides 200 million to help the Palestinian people improve their economic situation.

I also want to thank Chairman KOLBE and my colleagues in the Senate for agreeing to provide most of the $100 million added by the House for emergency needs in Africa outside of Sudan. Unfortunately, the horrible tragedy in Sudan has meant the diversion of funds needed to address ongoing problems in the democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Ethiopia, and Uganda. This 100 million, along with additional funds for Public Law 480 food aid, will go a long way toward easing the pain and hunger expressed by many women and children throughout Africa.

While I have deep concerns about other provisions included in other sections of this supplemental, I am pleased with the shape of the foreign operations section. I believe it goes a long way toward fulfilling our many commitments around the world.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for this time. I rise in strong support of this conference report as the people's House at long last takes care of some unfinished business. In the closing days of the 108th Congress, some in the other body objected to commonsense provisions that deal with our national security and our border security, to wit, the notion that when you apply for a driver's license or another legal document, you should be who you say you are, and you should enjoy legal status in this country.

This supplemental conference report includes the REAL ID Act, and at long last the Congress of the United States gets real and understands that border security and national security are one and the same. Pass this to help protect our borders and help protect our national security.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman LEWIS for including in the supplemental the provision which is our wounded warrior bill.

As our enemies adapt their war-fighting strategies, they change not just to kill our men and women overseas, but to maim and wound. Roadside incendiary devices, rocket grenades, car bombs mean the loss of several arms and legs and eyes, blindness and paralysis.

Our men and woman coming home at Walter Reed Army Hospital and their families coming up to be with them so they can heal faster are incurring great debt. Never mind that they try to transition back into society, those great wage earners, trying to find self-worth in the work.

This bill includes the wounded warrior project. It says to our troops, we are going to provide you with supplemental disability insurance to help you transition back to being American citizens and thank you for your patriotism.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this supplemental. Do not allow these traumatic injuries to be the economic death sentence after our troops have survived the death bed overseas. Vote for our wounded warriors.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the chairman on this bill. It is important that we take care of business with our military.

Mr. Speaker, having been to Iraq this year, I saw our troops, our young men and women from all branches of the service doing the finest job ever representing the concept of freedom and representing the United States; and they certainly need the supplemental.

However, I am concerned about some of the baggage that seems to have been added to the supplemental. And I think maybe in the future we should be careful about adding things that are not really important emergencies, such as in this supplemental conferring eligibility for rural housing assistance grants in the village of New Miami, Ohio; allowing some farm service accounts for the Alaska dairy farmers; increasing the cost of the Fort Peck Fish Hatchery Project in Minnesota; and adding to the National Center for Manufacturing Services in Michigan; along with $500,000 for the oral history of negotiated settlement projects at the University of Nevada.

I think these belong in some other bill. They may be great projects, but they certainly are not emergency projects. But I do urge all Members of the House to support this legislation.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

□ 1315

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conference report includes the REAL ID Act, which I cosponsored. And of course the goal of this bill is straightforward. It seeks to prevent another terrorist attack on U.S. soil by disrupting terrorist travel. These provisions were called for by the 9/11 Commission. And this legislation uses existing States driver's license systems to ensure we know who is in our country, that people are who they say they are, and that the name on a driver's license is the holder's real name, not an alias.

All but one of the 9/11 hijackers used U.S. driver's licenses to board the planes that day because these documents allowed them to circumvent their expired visas. It allowed them to not raise suspicion or concern.

Mohammed Atta received a 6-month visa to stay in the U.S. He received a Florida driver's license good for 6 years. The REAL ID Act will end this by establishing a rule for all States, that temporary driver's licenses for foreign visitors expire when their visa terms expire and establishes tough rules for confirming identity before driver's licenses are issued.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to explain the motion to recommit that I will offer at the end of this debate. Here is what it does:

The Senate bill contains funding for a total of 150,000 border patrol agents, 250 immigration investigators, and 168 immigration enforcement agents, and detention officers and their associated training and support cast.

This conference agreement falls short of the Senate bill in 3 areas. It only contains funds for 500 border patrol agents, not the 150,000 called for in the Senate bill. It only contains funding for 50 immigration investigators, not the 250 called for in the Senate bill.

Last, it also contains no funding for unmanned border aerial vehicles.

The motion to recommit is simple. It would take us to the levels contained in the Senate bill for border patrol agents by adding funding for 550 additional border patrol agents and for 200 immigration investigators.

It would also fund unmanned border aerial vehicles that have been used successfully in a test in Arizona to assist in surveillance. Former DHS Deputy Secretary Lloyd testified that the vehicles provided ''invaluable'' service.

Since border patrol agents are trained at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Artesia, New Mexico, funding is included like the Senate bill to purchase and operate modular classrooms for these additional agents.

This motion, in short, would provide an additional $284.4 million to immigration and customs enforcement to do this as was in the Senate bill. Need I remind anyone that the Intelligence Reform Bill, which became law last December, called for 2,000 additional border patrol agents a year and 800 additional immigration investigators? The President requested no funding for that supplemental request.

I would note that on March 30 the administration announced it would add more than 500 agents in Arizona, but those are not new agents. 135 of them or so will come from other southwest and southern border patrol locations, and the remainder are simply new trainees who will replace agents retiring or leaving the border patrol across the country.

So I would simply urge House Members to vote for this motion. It ought not be at all controversial. It is practical if you want to put your money where your press releases have been with respect to border patrol.

Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, although I am disgusted with the anti-immigration provisions in it, particularly the things with the driver's licenses.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this supplemental appropriations bill, but not without very serious misgivings. I will vote for this legislation because it contains support for our troops in the field and important tsunami relief. With American soldiers in harm's way, I am very reluctant to vote against funding of military operations. And, having personally seen the devastation in the wake of the Tsunami in Indonesia, I feel that aid to the victims is critical.

Nevertheless, I am disgusted by the process by which this legislation came to the floor and by the immigration-related provisions in the bill. This is an appropriations bill. It is not the place to write new immigration law or to include seriously flawed driver's license provisions. The Republicans are clamoring in the Senate about the lack of up or down votes on judges and, today, they denied the House not only an up or down vote on the so-called "Real ID" Act, but even a real debate on this issue.

The immigration sections are seriously flawed. They impose onerous restrictions on foreign nationals in the U.S., not to mention upon American citizens, and slap a massive unfunded mandate upon the states. Shortly after this legislation takes effect, I can only imagine that, instead of more licensed drivers on the roads, there will be less. Instead of safer roads, we will have more reckless drivers operating completely outside of our laws.

America is a nation of immigrants and our strength is in our diversity. We are founded upon the people who have come from all corners of the globe and are continually enriched by the unique strengths that they add to our national mosaic. We must not undermine the careful balance our nation has struck. I, therefore, strongly oppose these ID and immigration-related sections and pledge to fight hard in the future to remove the offensive provisions from the law.

in the end, as a legislator, I must vote on the bill in front of me, and in this instance I must vote for the vital funding contained in this bill. But, Mr. Speaker, please know that I will work hard in the day ahead to strike the dangerously flawed sections from the code.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise sadly to oppose the emergency supplemental because of the horrific and ill-advised immigration provisions and the lack of oversight that has been given to the provisions in this section. I hope we will have an opportunity to address this in a comprehensive manner.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today very conflicted over a piece of vital legislation for which this entire body should really be in solidarity. The Conference Report on H.R. 1268 provides for emergency FY2005 funds for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, tsunami relief efforts, foreign assistance programs and domestic homeland security priorities. However, this legislation also includes an insidious section with provisions of H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act, which has nothing to do with what should be the real intent of this Emergency Supplemental. Instead of being united on issues of national security and international relations, we are put in a divisive situation with the provisions of the REAL ID Act.

The issues of importance addressed by this Emergency Supplemental do not give rise to a need to include provisions from H.R. 418, the REAL ID Act—legislation for which Congress

has not held a legislative hearing, markup, nor full debate in the House. Just last year, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle attempted to force these provisions in the context of the 9/11 Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, H.R. 10.

The sponsor of the REAL ID Act's driver's license provisions would have gone far beyond the scope of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. The 9/11 Commission did not suggest that the standards should be federally mandated without state participation, that a database should be created to share personal identification information, that undocumented immigrants should be prevented from getting licenses or that non-citizens should get an identifiably different driver's license.

Finally, none of the REAL ID Act sponsor's provisions have been reviewed by the Congress or the Commission. There have been no hearings or debates on these significant changes to existing law. The immigration provisions that have been forced into this supplemental include numerous provisions restricting the grant of asylum " protection, imposing onerous new driver's license requirements on the States, making it easier to deport legal immigrants, waiving all Federal laws concerning the construction of fences and barriers anywhere within the United States, and denying immigrants long-standing habeas corpus rights.

The USA PATRIOT Act, for which we in the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security of the Judiciary are only now holding hearings in piecemeal form, already barred terrorists from receiving asylum protection in the United States. None of the people associated with recent attacks, or plans for terrorist attacks in the U.S., were here under grants of asylum. Instead, these changes will make it harder for people legitimately fleeing persecution to prove their asylum claims and gain protection here. Bona fide refugees who cannot meet the higher standards will be returned to countries where they were persecuted, possibly to face terror, torture and death.

The forced provisions will set a dangerous legal precedent by requiring the government to waive all federal, state and local laws to build barriers and fences to deter illegal entry into the United States. This waiver would require violating laws that protect sacred Native American burial sites, important environmental regions, and the wages of laborers. Yet this policy is unnecessary. In the 9–11 Act, we passed language to develop and implement a comprehensive plan for the systematic surveillance of the Southwest border by remotely piloted aircraft and other electronic means. We can preserve our legal rights and regimes and still secure our Nation.

The great majority of this Emergency Supplemental, a sum of $75.9 billion goes towards U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. In this Conference Report's military spending total of $75.9 billion includes $37.1 billion for military operations and maintenance spending, $17.4 billion for personnel, and $17.4 billion for new weapons procurement. I am very pleased to say that this Conference Report increases the military death gratuity to $100,000, from $12,420, and increases subsidized life insurance benefits to $400,000, from $250,000, for families of soldiers who died or were killed while on active duty beginning from Oct. 7, 2001. I can not describe how fundamental it is that we take care of our armed forces and their loved ones. This Conference Report addresses some of the concerns that Democrats have had about the fact that the families of soldiers who were killed while on active duty were not being given the necessary funds to provide for themselves. In addition, this Conference Report provides $308 million more than requested for add-on vehicle armor kits; large increases for new trucks; added funds for night-vision equipment; and $60 million in unrequested funds for radio jammers to disrupt attempts by Iraqi insurgents to explode remote-control bombs and mines. As with the increase in death benefits, Democrats in this body have been advocating for increased funds to provide the necessary armor and equipment to protect our troops. While I am supportive of our troops and their families, I am disappointed that this war continues with no end in sight. How long will it be before our brave men and women of the Armed Forces can come home and embrace their families? This is the question Democrats have been asking for months and we still don't have a real answer. Again, while I support funding our soldiers and their families to ensure that their safety and financial needs are met, I am deeply disappointed that we still do not have a proper exit strategy in Iraq.

As I stated there are many provisions of this Emergency Supplemental in which this body can be united in agreement. One such issue is the tsunami relief provided in this Emergency Supplemental. The Conference Report before us today appropriates $907 million in direct assistance for tsunami disaster relief for countries affected by the Dec. 26, 2004, earthquake and tsunami. In addition, this measure also provides $226 million to reimburse the U.S. military for expenses incurred in providing emergency relief to the tsunami victims, and $25 million to build and deploy 35 new tsunami-detection buoys in the Pacific, Atlantic, the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico to provide warning to communities of approaching tsunamis. I had the opportunity to see the damage caused by the tsunami when I visited Sri Lanka with my colleagues led by Mr. CROWLEY shortly after the tsunami disaster. I had the opportunity to visit with USAID personnel who were there trying to aid the Sri Lankan people in rebuilding their Nation. I have to say the attitude of our American personel and the smiles they brought to the face of the Sri Lankan people would make every member of this Congress very proud. We talk about public diplomacy with the international world and I firmly believe that the funds appropriated here along with the work of our personnel on the ground help make a great case for the goodness of our Nation.

I am also similarly pleased that about $400 million in this Conference Report will go towards humanitarian assistance in Darfur, Sudan. I recently had the opportunity to visit refugee camps in neighboring Chad where thousands of Sudanese in Darfur have fled to escape the conflict. Needless to say, I was able to confirm from eyewitness accounts that the conflict in Darfur is indeed even more shocking and deeply disturbing in its viciousness than has been reported to us. We as a Nation must stand against such brutality and the funds in this Emergency Supplemental will help to ease the suffering of those involved in this conflict. In addition, this Conference Report includes $920 million for all peacekeeping programs, many of which are in Sudan. However, while I have always been a strong advocate for peacekeeping operations, I am disappointed that the total money appropriated is $70 million less than the president's request. We must continue to support such operations because the alternative can only be to the detriment of the international community, including our own Nation.

Again, I am in general support of the goals proposed by H.R. 1268, but I am troubled by the implications of the Supplemental Appropriations measure that this body is poised to pass that relate to immigration policy. The underlying legislation proposes to fund important needs that pertain to Operation Iraqi Freedom; Operation Enduring Freedom, in Afghanistan; Army and Marine Corps restructuring; recapitalization and replacement of equipment; and replenishment of cash balances in certain working capital funds. In truth, this Emergency Supplemental funds many needed priorities, but it is the one issue of the REAL ID Act, which is not a priority, that poisons this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our distinguished ranking member, the lead Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations for his leadership for his very important motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into talking about the bill, I want to commend both the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and our distinguished ranking members on the Committee on Appropriations and Subcommittee on Defense. Over the years, they have worked very hard and provided great leadership for our men and women in uniform and for the security of our country.

There is much about this bill that I support. I have some concerns which I will express but none of that diminishes the regard and appreciation I have for the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time since the President ordered the invasion of Iraq 2 years ago, Congress has been asked to provide funds for the war outside the regular budget. With nearly 140,000 troops in dire need of equipment and supplies, this legislation will be overwhelmingly approved and I will support it.

A willingness to provide our troops the support they need, however, should not be mistaken for support for the repeated failures in judgment that first put our troops in harm's way and that keeps them there today.

Two years ago this week on May 1, 2003, President Bush stood on an aircraft carrier under a banner that proclaimed ''Mission Accomplished.'' Considering the events that followed and what has been disclosed since then, if the President were to stand under a

banner today it would have to read ''Credibility Demolished.''

We are in the war's third year. Daily headlines are grim reminders of how far we are from a stable and secure Iraq, and the President has yet to provide a plan to get us to that place. We are fast approaching sadly 1,600 U.S. military deaths and thousands of more have suffered grievous and lasting wounds.

I have had the privilege to pay my respects to troops in theater and in hospitals in Europe and in the United States. Whatever our disagreement about the policy which brought us into the war, whatever our disagreement on the lack of planning to end it, it never diminishes the regard that we have for our men and women in uniform. We respect them and we appreciate their courage, their patriotism and the sacrifice they are willing to make for our country. And on any opportunity that many of us have, we express that to them personally.

The President's rationale for the invasion was discredited long ago. Iraq remains unsafe. I talked about credibility in terms of the lack of planning. There is also a lack of credibility in budgeting. Although appropriations for Iraq approaches $200 billion, the President's budget requests no money for the war on the grounds that the cost is unknowable. Instead, the President chooses to include a figure for the war's cost, zero, that everyone knows to be wrong.

Here we are today on Thursday talking about a supplemental with a set amount in it of emergency funding for our troops, and we passed the budget last Thursday. It was not one week ago we did not know what the cost would be and now we do this week.

This is simply not an honest way to do our budgeting.

Our troops need relief and their equipment needs repair and replacement. The risk assessment released by the Joint Chiefs of Staff this week shows the strain on our military is real and unsustainable. And it is clear that the figure in the supplemental is really not enough to meet to meet the measure that the chairman mentioned.

Providing money alone as this bill will do is not enough. A way out must be provided as well. We must focus on quality rather than quantity when training Iraqi security forces, accelerate Iraq's reconstruction in ways that give Iraqis a major stake in rebuilding their country, and step up regional diplomatic efforts to heal the strife on which the insurgency thrives.

I was pleased to be part of the bipartisan delegation that visited Iraq during Holy Week, and I can tell you that firsthand that we have a long way to go to reaching those goals.

Our experience in Iraq strongly suggest that if we do not take these steps and soon, about training the security forces, accelerating Iraq's reconstruction, and stepping up regional diplomacy or as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) would say, Iraqatize, internationalize and energize, if we do not do this and soon, Americans may wonder for years to come if the end will ever be in sight.

The funds provided for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, for the relief of those devastated by the tsunami, to aid those suffering in Darfur and elsewhere, and to promote Middle East peace are necessary and important.

Were conferees able to focus solely on these issues, their final product would have been much stronger. However, since this bill is must-pass legislation, House Republicans demanded the inclusion of controversial immigration provisions. These provisions would be much better considered as part of a comprehensive immigration reform effort. These provisions will make asylum harder to obtain for those seeking a haven from persecution and place a huge unfunded responsibility on the States to verify information used to support a driver's license application.

This is an unfunded mandate. This is an unfunded mandate and it is not part of the Contract With America, no unfunded mandates.

Since this is a conference report, we cannot have a ruling from the Chair that will allow us to discuss some specifics about the unfunded mandate, the driver's license application that is in the bill. It sounds like a good idea. But if you are at the desk at the Department of Motor Vehicles and you have now become an immigration officer because you have to prove the citizenship, or at least the legality of somebody being in the country, it is a big burden, it is costly, and it is unfunded.

We have given a mandate without the money and really without the consideration that this provision should have been given.

In addition, we unwisely vest in the Secretary of Homeland Security the power to weigh Federal and State environmental and labor laws. This in the name of securing our borders. Securing our borders should be a national priority, which makes it all the more inexplicable that the President did not request in his budget the extra border patrol agents and detention beds authorized by Congress last year in response to the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

Bipartisan efforts in the Senate do more for border security in this bill and were rebuffed by House Republicans in favor of provisions that trample on the rights of individuals and States, and may result in the diminishment of the safety of the American people.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for offering his motion to recommit to fund border security at the Senate levels. He also had this as a motion to instruct when the conferees were named, to add $1 billion so that we could have the border security that was recommended by the 9/11 Commission. But that was rejected.

So we talk a great deal about securing the border, but we are not putting the resources there to do the job. Thank heavens Senator BYRD prevailed with part of the money in the Senate. We can do more. We should have done more. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has been a champion on this issue year in and year out as far as this discussion has been going.

Again, border security, border security, border security, and then we can talk about a comprehensive immigration policy.

I hope that all of our colleagues will give an overwhelming support of this body to the Obey motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, for many reasons, this is not an easy bill to support. The legitimate emergency needs to which it responds, particularly the needs of our men and women in uniform overseas, are real and must be addressed.

□ 1330

A much better job, though, must be done to create conditions to allow large numbers of them to come home and to come home soon.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support the gentleman from Wisconsin's motion to recommit.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that while I very strongly oppose my colleague from Wisconsin's motion to recommit, the gentleman was kind enough to share the recommittal motion with us before the fact, and I am very much appreciative of that.

The greatest difficulty I have with the motion is that at this moment our forces are on gas fumes, rather than real gasoline. It is very, very critical that we get this bill moving towards the President's desk and to the troops as quickly as possible.

I would like to speak for a moment about some of those things that the bill does that may be of great interest to the Members who are concerned especially about border security.

Within this package there are some 500 border patrol agents, added as a result of this measure as it goes to the President's desk. There are 218 immigration enforcement agents and criminal investigators. There are some 1,950 detention beds. The bill is designed to take every step that we possibly can on short order to secure our border.

At the same time, just yesterday the Subcommittee on Homeland Security marked up their 2006 bill to move further down this same pathway. We are moving very quickly to strengthen and secure our borders by way of this legislation, as well as regular order.

From there, Mr. Speaker, let me express my deepest appreciation to Members on both sides of the aisle who have worked very hard, their staffs, as well as the Members themselves, to make sure that this supplemental would arrive on time and ahead of schedule. Virtually nobody thought we would be here at this moment. The reason we are is because the Members recognize

how critical it is that we get this support to our troops immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleagues' patience as we work quickly on this bill. It is a very good bill. I urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, during times of war, the United States Congress has an obligation to act. With this bill, we do just that.

I want to commend Chairman JERRY LEWIS and the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on this legislation. This is the first appropriations bill completed under the leadership of the gentleman from California. He and our conferees did a tremendous job of crafting this war supplemental promptly and responsibly.

H.R. 1268 provides the funds needed to pay, equip and protect our military during a time of overseas conflict. It supports the war on terrorism at home and abroad.

It also is important to note that tomorrow is Military Spouses Appreciation Day, and this bill provides for spouses and families who might tragically lose a loved one at war. The bill increases the maximum Servicemember Group Life Insurance benefit from $250,000 to $400,000. The onetime death gratuity for combat families will rise from $12,000 to $100,000. There are also new insurance benefits for soldiers who suffer traumatic injuries, such as loss of a limb or sight.

Funds are included to assist our coalition partners, support international peacekeeping efforts and continue reconstruction programs in Afghanistan. As you know, opium production is undermining Afghanistan's efforts to rebuild and in too many cases, funding terrorists. Money included in this bill will train Afghan police and help farmers produce alternative crops.

We pledged to include in this bill critical provisions to protect our border and curtail illegal immigration. We have delivered on that promise, and I thank Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER of the Judiciary Committee and Chairman TOM DAVIS of the Government Reform Committee for their leadership on these provisions.

The bill includes $176.3 million to hire, train and equip 500 new Border Patrol Agents. New immigration enforcement agents and other criminal investigators are also funded in the bill. Last year, Border Patrol agents arrested nearly 1.2 million illegal aliens; nearly 12 percent of them were captured near the San Diego Sector. In an important step, this bill eliminates the barriers to completing construction of the San Diego border fence, closing a critical border security breach.

Finally, the bill supports recovery efforts for the hundreds of thousands of people impacted by the Indian Ocean tsunami by providing $656 million in tsunami-related disaster relief.

Mr. Speaker, this bill goes a long way towards meeting our global commitments and maintaining America's status as a world leader. More importantly, it declares to the brave men and women serving in our armed forces that the United States Congress will continue to stand beside them in the war on terror. I urge the House to adopt this legislation.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I recently presented a joint statement with Senator SNOWE regarding small business contracting and would like to submit it for the RECORD.

Section 6022 of H.R. 1268, as adopted in the Conference Report, H. Rep. 109–72, contains certain provisions concerning small business contracting at the Department of Energy. These provisions were inserted as a substitute for Section 6023 of the Senate version of H.R. 1268. Section 6023, among other things sought to amend the Small Business Act to authorize counting of small business subcontracts at the Department of Energy's large prime contractors for purposes of reporting small business prime contracting results. Because the substitute language was not adopted by Congress through regular legislative proceedings in the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the House Committee on Small Business but was adopted anew during the House-Senate conference, the committees of jurisdiction take this opportunity to provide guidance generally provided through their reports to Senators and Representatives prior to their vote on the Conference Report, and to affected Federal agencies prior to their implementation of the Conference Report if adopted.

In subsections 6022 (a) and (b), the language chosen to replace Section 6023 in the Conference Report directs the Department of Energy and the Small Business Administration to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding for reporting small business prime contracts and subcontracts at the Department of Energy. This replacement language does not change the Small Business Act's clear distinction between prime contracts and subcontracts, does not amend the statutory small business prime contracting goal requirements which are binding on the Department of Energy, and does not obviate Congressional and regulatory policies against contract bundling. This language does not repeal the President's Executive Order 13360 directing the Department of Energy to comply with its separate statutory prime contracting and subcontracting goals for awards to small businesses owned by service-disabled veterans. Any interpretation to the contrary would be unreasonable and contrary to Congressional intent.

In subsection 6022(c), the replacement language mandates a study of changes to management prime contracts at the Department of Energy to encourage small business prime contracting opportunities. The object of the study is to examine the feasibility of establishing a procurement agency relationship between the management prime contractors and the Department of Energy in accordance with the requirements of Federal procurement laws, Federal procurement regulations, the ''Federal norm'' of government contracting as recognized by the Comptroller General, and applicable judicial precedent such as U.S. West Communications, Inc. v. United States, 940 F.2d 622 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Finally, in subsection 6022(d), the replacement language imposes certain requirements upon the Department of Energy concerning break-outs of services from large prime contracts for awards to small businesses. First, the Secretary of Energy is required to consider whether services performed have been previously provided by a small business concern. This requirement is for acquisition planning purposes only, and shall not be construed as imposing a restriction of any kind on the ability of the Department of Energy to break out its large prime contracts for award to small businesses. Congress recognizes that most of work currently contracted by the Department of Energy to its large prime contractors has never been historically performed by small businesses. However, this does not waive the application of the Small Business Act, the President's Executive Order 13360, or the President's initiative against contract bundling to the Department of Energy. Second, the Secretary of Energy is required to consider whether small business concerns are capable of performing under the contracts which are broken out for award. This requirement is simply a restatement of current statutory and regulatory requirements on contractor responsibility. Subsection (d)(2) direct the Secretary of Energy is required to—impose certain subcontracting requirements. As the text plainly indicates, this provision applies solely to small, business prime contracts which were formerly small business subcontracts for services.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 1268 was first considered on the floor in March, I reluctantly supported its passage. Now that the conference report has been returned to the House for this chamber's approval, I still find myself torn because I do not see how additional funding for the Iraq War effort will ultimately produce a positive outcome for the United States or for the people in Iraq. I want a successful exit strategy—not a permanent occupation in Iraq.

Despite my misgivings for the direction of our Iraq policy, or lack thereof, I do not believe our troops, who are fighting so bravely, should be penalized for the mistakes in judgment of our civilian military leadership at the White House and the Pentagon. As we speak, our ground forces scrounge for scrap metal to make the unarmored vehicles more safe against insurgent attack. The funds provided in this bill will enable our soldiers and Marines on the ground to uparmor their vehicles. There should be more outrage from the American public that they were deployed without adequate equipment from the beginning. But they are there. It is vital that our troops receive the equipment they need to defend themselves against attack.

I have been critical of our war planning from the outset. I voted against the authority that allowed the President to take action in Iraq. I continue to be frustrated that our war plan still contains no game plan on when we can begin to bring our troops home. I am pleased that the bill does contain provisions that require the administration to develop a set of performance indicators and measures for determining the stability and security in Iraq and report its findings to Congress. This requirement falls well short of the exit strategy we need to determine how long our commitment in Iraq will last.

The bill also funds tsunami relief, which is well overdue. The agreement appropriates $656 million in direct assistance to tsunami disaster relief for countries affected by last December's tragedy. The total includes $5 million to support environmental recovery activities; $10 million to create new economic opportunities for women; and $12.5 million to support initiatives that focus on the immediate and long-term needs of children.

The bill provides $400 million for humanitarian assistance in the Darfur region of Sudan and elsewhere in Africa, including funds for the temporary resettlement of refugees. It also funds $240 million for international humanitarian food assistance through the Food for Peace Program, much of which will go to the Darfur region. This assistance will provide some relief to those who are being victimized by the ethnic cleansing that is being waged against the black Muslim population by the Arab Muslim-dominated Sudanese government.

In a period when the President and this Congress proposes reductions in programs that support the development of local communities and neighborhoods, the bill provides

$592 million for a gold-plated embassy compound in Iraq. I find it very difficult to defend such spending when the budget priorities of this administration propose disinvesting in our cities, towns and our American workforce. Money for this project goes beyond providing office and working space for U.S. foreign service personnel. What we are proposing to build is not an embassy, but a compound, with stores and other amenities which will further distance our American embassy personnel from the Iraqi civilian and political population. We are constructing a fortress, not an embassy. I want a successful exit strategy—not a permanent occupation in Iraq.

Another key element of this agreement with which I take issue is the mandate imposed on states that requires certain identification standards on driver's licenses for federal identification purposes. The measure mandates that states meet certain requirements for determining the validity of persons applying for drivers' licenses. Although the bill provides authority for states to receive federal grants to comply, it is insufficient and amounts to an unfunded federal mandate.

The money contained in this bill will go a long way to saving lives, saving the lives of our land forces in Iraq and Afghanistan and reconstructing the lives of those who experienced the devastation of last year's tsunami. After weighing the alternatives, I reluctantly support the passage of this bill. I am not happy with the choices we are making today. I feel backed into a corner without much wiggle room, but the lives of our troops matter to me and they deserve the protection this bill is designed to deliver to them.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 1268, the War Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005, which will provide funding for military operations and reconstruction activities in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as important funds for tsunami relief and recovery.

I say ''reluctant support'' because the Republican leadership has made a very poor and political decision to include controversial legislative provisions in this emergency spending bill that otherwise enjoys almost universal support because it provides needed assistance for our servicemen and women overseas.

It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that our servicemen and women deserve to have the equipment and support they need to help keep them safe as they fulfill their missions abroad. Towards that end, the Appropriations Committee increased funding by 69 percent above the President's request for add-on vehicle armor kits, new trucks, and radio jammers to disrupt attempts by Iraqi insurgents to explode remote controlled bombs and mines.

The bill also includes important provisions to increase the military death gratuity and to provide subsidized life insurance benefits for families of soldiers who die or are killed on active duty. No amount can compensate for the tragic death of a loved one, but an increase in these benefits can help a family cope with the financial impact of a combat death.

I am also pleased that additional funds have been provided for humanitarian relief and disaster assistance, including $400 million for Sudan, $907 million for Indian Ocean tsunami relief, and $240 million in P.L. 480 grants for emergency food assistance.

But I am extremely upset and disappointed that the Republican leadership is using this critical bill as a vehicle to pass unrelated and controversial policies, that will allow the Department of Homeland Security to preempt state and federal laws to build border fences, require uniform national standards for issuing driver's licenses, and change the asylum standards for immigrants seeking to flee to the United States to avoid persecution. In particular, the bill includes an assault against the matricula consular cards issued by Mexican and other Latin American consulates, and consequently makes it an assault on our immigrant families who rely upon this form of identification in their daily lives for transactions involving banking, housing, education and even proving, when necessary, that they are the parents of their own children. These provisions were not openly debated or negotiated with the minority, but once again decided behind closed doors by the Republican leadership. I am outraged that this Republican leadership essentially has chosen to pit support for our troops against support for hard-working immigrants, many of whom have their own sons and daughters fighting to protect our country abroad.

Why does the Republican leadership continue to abuse its power and shut out the American public? Because the Republican leadership knows that if these controversial provisions were openly debated in the House and Senate they would not pass. Only by attaching these provisions to a must-pass bill like the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for our troops in Iraq could they hope to be successful.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more example of abuse of power by a Republican leadership that continues to act irresponsibly on issues of importance to our American society.

Nevertheless, in spite of my concerns, given the choice before us, I believe it is my responsibility to provide our servicemen and women the resources necessary for them to fulfill their mission and come home safely. Protecting our troops, who are sacrificing so much on our behalf, and providing for their families, will always be one of my highest priorities, and that is why, once again, I will support this necessary and important conference report today.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to question the omission of an amendment sponsored by Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CROWLEY and myself, which was agreed to by the Chairman of Appropriations.

The amendment took $3 million from the ''Economic Support Fund'' and put it toward the ''Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction Fund,'' for the express purpose of the providing the United Nations Population Fund, UNFPA with these funds.

This past January, I toured the region that was overwhelmed by the tsunami. The extent of the destruction was massive, and I was glad to see the world contributing to relief efforts. However, I was concerned that the special needs of women were not being adequately addressed.

I visited the remains of a three-story maternity hospital. There were 300 women and infants in that hospital when the first wave hit. The tsunami toppled a cement wall, flattened utility polls, and shattered all of the glass windows in the front of the building. Of the 300 women and their babies, all but one, a newborn, were saved from the crashing waves. I met a doctor who finished a C-Section in absolute darkness, after the generators were underwater, as the rest of the building was evacuated. The hospital was practically destroyed. The beds were pushed and piled against each other by the flooding, and shards of glass crunched under our feet. The sheets were strewn about like wet rags, and saturated packages of medicine were thrown in useless piles.

It is conditions like these that the UNFPA addresses. The organization has experience working with women in disaster areas; they have participated in emergency projects in more than 50 countries and territories. They already have offices in tsunami-affected countries, and they understand the distinctive ways that disasters affect women and children.

When I visited in January, there were an estimated 150,000 pregnant women in the tsunami-affected areas. The UNFPA has worked to supply safe-birthing kits and emergency obstetric equipment.

Women who are in refugee camps need personal hygiene kits, soap, sterile cotton cloth, antibiotics, and drugs for treating sexually transmitted infections. Although relief efforts often overlook these supplies, and the UNFPA has done its best to fulfill these needs.

UNFPA's priorities are reproductive health, including safe childbirth, prevention of violence against women and girls, and counseling for those affected by the 26 December tsunami. For many of these women, they must now become the head of the household. They have become widows overnight, and must deal with the emotional and economic issues involved with being the sole breadwinner in an area with no jobs.

In early January, UNFPA asked for $28 million to support its tsunami-related work. Our amendment would have given them $3 million, which is about 11 percent of what they requested.

By late February, over 70 percent of the requested funding had been received or pledged. Germany gave $8 million. Japan gave $5.5 million. The Netherlands gave $1.5 million. Norway gave $1 million. New Zealand gave $700,000.

The United States has not given anything to this organization that is the most experienced and successful in addressing the distinctive needs of women during times of natural disaster.

But this is not unusual. We have not given the UNFPA the money they need for some time.

The Omnibus for 2005 earmarked $34 million for UNFPA, however, the UNFPA has not and will not receive it. The UNFPA also received no funds from the United States in 2002, 2003, and 2004. Unfortunately, the President will not release these funds to this organization, because of issues related to abortion.

The money would not have been used for abortion. The money would have helped women deliver their babies. It would have helped women who have been sexually assaulted. It would have given women some of the tools they need to take care of themselves and their children.

It is unconscionable that this Congress would not allocate this $3 million to UNFPA.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the wartime supplemental that includes urgent funding for our soldiers and sailors now prosecuting the global war on terror in Afghanistan

and Iraq. This bill also has important additional funding for border security, and language important to South Texas shrimpers that will make it easier for them to hire workers for the coming season.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I know our soldiers can do anything. Yet that truth does not mean that the Congress should skimp on our financial obligations to our fighting men and women. They run out of money altogether at the end of this month, so I am pleased we are finalizing this bill today.

As a border Congressman, I am grateful that the conferees included desperately needed funding for border security. I have been relentless in talking to so many of you about my concerns related to spending on border security matters. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, for his work in getting negotiators to include this spending. While this is a good start, it still comes up short of both what we need and what the Intelligence Reform bill mandated we do.

The Intelligence Reform bill passed by Congress last year mandated 2,000 Border Patrol agents a year for the next 5 years. The President came to the table with only 210 in his budget; today we are adding another 500. That's still over 1,000 short of what this government agrees is the very least we should do to protect our border and stem the tide of releasing OTMs—illegal immigrants that are ''other than Mexican''—into the U.S. general population.

Given our border security is entirely budget driven, this is a rare victory for those of us who have been talking about the need to put our money where our mouth is when it comes to protecting our nation from terrorists that may be trying to enter the country through the loopholes in our border security policy. We are sending our young soldiers to fight and die in Iraq and Afghanistan and we justify that by saying we are fighting the war there so we will not have to fight it here.

We may very well be fighting a war over there and letting terrorists in our back door. As so many South Texans and my colleagues know, I have been lifting my voice about how border security is profoundly lacking. Currently, the United States does not have room to hold the large number of OTMs, caught by border law enforcement. While I know that most of these immigrants are merely seeking a better life, it is the few—the handful—that may be entering our country to do us harm. That is whom we need to worry about. So we are releasing, on their own recognizance, into the population of the United States very large numbers of OTMs.

What happens is our border patrol agents routinely call detention facilities and discover there is no room to hold OTMs. So, they process these immigrants, many times without even getting fingerprints or running them through our national databases to see if they are on watch lists, and release them into the general population with a notice to appear at a deportation hearing a few weeks later. Law enforcement officers then take the released OTMs to the local bus station by the vanload, where they head elsewhere in the U.S. The number that never appear for deportation is over 90 percent of those released, a number now probably over 75,000.

Already the number of OTMs captured and released is more, so far this year, than for all of last year. It is little wonder that private citizens are taking the law into their own hands to try to stem the tide of OTMs coming into our country. But private militias, operating without the color of law, are not the answer. We must secure our borders so private citizens do not feel the need to do so.

As a former law enforcement officer I know if we don't have the border officers to stop the OTMs crossing the border, if we don't have the room to hold the ones we catch, if we don't put our money where our mouth is, we continue to send a dangerous signal to those who may wish to do us harm. Until we send a signal that those who cross our borders illegally, until we send a signal that when we catch you we will hold you until you are deported, until we honestly face the amount of money it will take to deal with these things, OTMs will continue to flock to the U.S., quite possibly populating terror cells already operating in the United States.

Unfortunately, the Leadership decided to include many controversial provisions that members wouldn't otherwise support if they weren't linked to funding our troops. I do not agree with some of the so-called security provisions in this bill, mainly the stricter asylum laws and national standards for drivers' licenses. A country like ours that believes so greatly in freedom and the protection of the oppressed should be a safe haven for refugees that are being persecuted by their governments because of their race, religion or political beliefs, which is why we are fighting the war we fund in this bill.

I am also disappointed Congress has gone one step further in creating a national ID. Many would suggest that a drivers' license is the way terrorists are infiltrating our country. That is simply not the case. Standardizing a drivers' license would not have precluded the 9/11 terrorists from entering this country—immigration reform and better border security practices would have.

Today's bill is a start in putting our money where our mouth is, but it is still insufficient to the monumental border security task before us and I ask our appropriators to ensure the necessary funding is included in the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Democrat of the Committee on House Administration, I wish to comment briefly on key provisions of this supplemental appropriations bill that touch upon my committee's jurisdiction.

I commend the conferees for including $2.6 million for taking ''technical countermeasures'' to assure the electronic integrity of the Visitor Center now under construction here at the Capitol. Given the status of that construction project, this matter is time-sensitive, and while we have no reason to believe anyone involved with the construction may be seeking to install surreptitious listening devices within the building's walls and fittings, we know there are people in this world who might like to do so. It is prudent to take reasonable steps against it, and thus eliminate any chance of repeating what happened during construction of the U.S. embassy in Moscow some years ago.

I also commend the conferees for including $8.4 million to refresh the supply of ''quick masks'' deployed around the Capitol complex to protect persons against chemical or biological attack. The current masks have a limited shelf-life, and making these funds available now will expedite the process of replacement as they approach their expiration dates.

There is no question that the Congress needs a new off-site delivery center, to facilitate the secure, timely delivery of packages to the Capitol and congressional office buildings. I am pleased the conferees included funds for a temporary facility to replace the substandard site now used, and funds for design of a permanent facility. I trust that given the importance of deliveries to the Capitol, any difficulties between the two houses over the nature of the delivery system can be resolved quickly.

Finally, I wish to comment on something the conferees did not include in this bill, namely, any funding for up to 132 additional Capitol Police officers during fiscal 2005. These 132 officers, when added together with 122 more requested as part of the Police's fiscal 2006 request, would increase the sworn ranks by another 254 officers, an increase of roughly 16% within two years. Obviously, with less than five months remaining in fiscal 2005, the Police could not hire and fully train 132 more officers by September 30, so there is little reason to include funds in this bill, or even the funds for all 50 more officers included in the Senate bill. I am pleased that under these circumstances, the conferees chose to defer a decision about the need for 254 more officers until the House Administration Committee and the Senate Rules Committee, the authorizing committees for the Capitol Police, have had an opportunity to consider the optimum strength of the force going into the fiscal 2006 cycle.

I thank our friends on the Appropriations Committee for their difficult and prudent decisions on the Legislative-branch portion of this bill. I look forward to working with them, and with our colleagues on my own committee, as the work of the Legislative branch forges ahead.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations (HR 1268), on substance and process. I am strongly supportive of our fighting men and women, and mourn the loss of nearly 1,600 Americans who have died in Iraq, four of whom resided in my congressional district.

On substance, this bill fails to provide an exit strategy for our troops in Iraq. Since Iraq held democratic elections in January, the US should have been implementing an aggressive exit strategy that includes a timetable for the training of Iraqi security forces, so US troops can return home. Moreover, with nearly $10 billion already appropriated but not spent for critical reconstruction projects in Iraq, like rebuilding electrical grids and establishing telecommunications networks, US policy objectives for Iraqi independence are jeopardized. On process, many of the items in this bill should be funded under the regular order in the annual appropriations cycle.

Unfortunately, the Republican Leadership has used this bill as a vehicle for passage of immigration measures that are divisive and harmful for our country, and couldn't be passed as stand-alone bills. Provisions commonly known as the ''REAL ID Act'' regarding national driver's license standards, asylum law and completion of a southern border fence have been controversial from day one, but were added to appease a vocal minority of anti-immigrant advocates. I and many others in Congress would like to have a rational debate on immigration reform, but we are denied

the opportunity when the leadership attaches non-germane immigration measures to a funding bill.

To better demonstrate how the process has been hijacked by a minority of the majority, many of the same provisions that constitute the REAL ID provisions in the supplemental being considered today were stripped from the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (PL 108–458) in conference because of their extreme nature.

One of the most egregious provisions in the REAL ID section of the supplemental is the blanket authority given to the Secretary of Homeland Security to expedite construction of the remaining three miles of the southern border fence in San Diego. All Americans should be concerned that the DHS Secretary has carte blanche authority to waive any and all laws in the name of border security. This provision is a dangerous attack against the civil rights of all Americans, when any law can be waived under the guise of border security. Blanket authority to complete the three mile border fence is especially ''in your face'' politics when, under current law, the DHS Secretary already has a national security waiver for the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act. We must work harder to strike a balance between our national security and environmental protection, not simply ignore environmental laws.

Furthermore, the driver's license provisions of this bill touted in the name of national security are equally concerning. It is indeed ironic that these provisions would not have stopped the 9/11 hijackers from obtaining driver's licenses. The breach of our border security was a result of the hijackers having been issued legal visas to enter the US, which many of them used to apply for driver's licenses and identification cards. Even if the REAL ID provisions had been in place before the 9/11 attacks, the hijackers still would have been able to obtain a driver's license or state-issued ID. Again, a minority of the majority is playing on the fears of this nation to enact a flawed policy that does not actually address the problem it purports to fix.

For the record, I do not support illegal immigration, but I do support a regulated process for immigrants who enter the US legally, pay their taxes and play by the rules to earn US citizenship. No one can deny that comprehensive Immigration reform is a topic on the minds of our constituents—but such a critical policy debate should be conducted on its own merits.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the War Supplemental Appropriations Act but must voice my incredible misgivings for what the Republican majority has attached to legislation that should solely be about how we provide for our brave men and women in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan.

There is much in this bill to be proud of. Our military, despite the job of the civilian brass and this Congress, have been performing heroically. They have accomplished much more than we could have ever hoped for, and if any fault needs to be assigned it is to the policy makers, and not to those in uniform.

However, I am ashamed that this body has taken something as important as securing our troops, and attached a hastily considered immigration provision that will result in massive unfunded mandates being passed on to our states. I am ashamed that the conference committee removed language that would have created a Truman-style Commission to examine war profiteering, largely to ensure that this administration would not be embarrassed. Finally, I am ashamed that this Congress has turned its back on a promise made by our President to the Palestinian Authority to help improve the situation of the Palestinian people and further the cause of peace for all in the Middle East.

I am concerned that the immigration provisions will force our great nation to turn our back on the thousands of political and human rights asylum seekers who look toward America as their last and best hope. The Real ID Act will force the most vulnerable to have their torturers corroborate their tales of persecution.

I understand that we must protect our borders, and I understand that changes must be made to keep out those that seek to do us harm. But we should not hastily foreclose the dream and promise of America because of fear. We should not send back asylum seekers back to their torturers. Under these standards, Iraqis seeking to escape the rape rooms of Saddam Hussein would have been sent back to the Ba'athist prisons if they fled Iraq without the proper documentation.

I am also dismayed that rather than seeking to be responsible stewards of the public's trust, the Republican majority in charge of Congress once again decided to ignore its oversight responsibilities. It seems that rather than doing our oversight job as a separate and equal branch of government, the GOP leadership would rather save the Bush Administration and corporate CEOs some embarrassment.

I am old enough to remember the Truman Commission. I remember that Sen. Truman went against a Democratic administration, and saved our military and our tax payers billions of dollars in waste and fraud. I cannot understand why we do not do the same.

My friends on the other side of the aisle should be ashamed of the fact that Mr. Waxman and I have probably done more on this front from the minority, than has anyone with a gavel. Reconstructing Iraq and Afghanistan is too important not to get it right, but confronted yet again with evidence of massive fraud and egregious war profiteering, my Republican colleagues are again choosing to bury their heads in the sand, plug their ears, and turn out the lights on our duty.

Finally, this bill, by intention or not, has the potential of undoing all the progress that the Middle East Peace process has made since the death of Yasser Arafat. Mr. Speaker, the new president of the Palestinian Authority is in an almost untenable position. In order for Palestinian democracy to succeed over radical terrorism, President Abbas must be provided with the resources to open hospitals, create jobs, arm a police force, build jails, and take the fight to the terrorists.

President Bush recognized this. He made a statement asking for $200 million to support a nascent Middle Eastern democracy. Instead of allowing President Abbas to use American aid to build his security forces to take on terror, we instead set him up for failure. My friends, if you want to see Hamas win the upcoming municipal elections; if you want to see the peace process come to an abject halt; if you want to see more dead young Israelis and young Palestinians you should support this language.

It surprises me that the only thing that this Congress is capable of bucking and embarrassing this Administration on is the prospect of peace. I hope, for the sake of peace, we can correct this colossal error in judgment and that the President and the State Department speak out against Congress' ill-advised policy making on this most tragic conflict.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 2004, the national debt of the United States exceeded $7 trillion for the first time in our country's history. One year later, our national debt is $7.7 trillion. In the past year, our country has added $700 billion to our national debt.

The conference report for the FY06 budget resolution that is before us today would increase the statutory debt limit by $781 billion to a record $9 trillion. Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. The out-of-control rise in our national debt over the last year and the rise in our debt envisioned in this conference report are further signs of the terrible fiscal position in which we now find ourselves.

In 2001, we had ten-year projected surpluses of $5.6 trillion [2002–2011]. Now, over that same time period, we have likely ten-year deficits of $3.9 trillion. That's a $9.5 trillion reversal in our ten-year fiscal outlook.

Whether intentional or otherwise, our country's current fiscal policies are depriving the federal government of future revenue at a time when we ought to be preparing for an unprecedented demographic shift that will strain Social Security and Medicare. Our current fiscal irresponsibility will eventually land squarely on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren, who will be forced to pay back the debt we are accumulating today. The ''debt tax'' that we are imposing on our children and grandchildren cannot be repealed. It can only be reduced if we take responsible steps now to improve our situation.

Both parties need to work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring our budget back into balance so we can avoid the higher long-term interest rates and weakened dollar that are the inevitable consequences of rising deficits and a high national debt. We are witnessing on a daily basis the reaction of the global financial markets to our fiscal irresponsibility, and as we can see in this conference report, Congress has not yet gotten the message that deficits and debt matter.

For starters, Congress needs to reinstate PAYGO rules for the entire budget, including spending and revenue measures. Budget enforcement rules that apply to only certain parts of the budget will not have a significant impact on our rising deficits, as Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan mentioned in his recent testimony before the Budget Committee.

This fiscal year alone, interest on the national debt is expected to rise to $178 billion, and the administration projects that that figure will increase to $211 billion during the next fiscal year. To put that figure in perspective, projected interest on our national debt next year will be $75 billion more than projected spending on education, public health, health research, and veterans' benefits combined [$138 billion].

Further, the budget conference report before us today, which was filed only three hours before the House began to consider it, would require the House to cut Medicaid funding by as much as $15 billion over the next five years.

Just two days ago the House voted, by a vote of 348–72, to reject harmful cuts to the Medicaid program, and this conference report blatantly ignores the will of the House.

In addition to assuming an ever-larger share of our annual budgets, the interest on our debt, and the debt itself, are increasing our reliance on foreign borrowers, which will weaken our position in the world and increase the risk that another nation will be able to assert greater leverage over America. Over the last year, our country has borrowed nearly $400 billion [$389 billion] from foreign countries, and almost half [44%] of our publicly-held debt is held by foreign creditors [$1.96 trillion, out of $4.4 trillion of publicly held debt].

Finally, our deficits and debt threaten the Social Security and Medicare programs that have raised so many of our seniors out of poverty and helped sustain the strongest middle class in history. With a projected 75 year unfunded liability of $3.7 trillion, both parties in Congress need to work together to address Social Security's solvency problem, and this conference report does nothing to protect Social Security. In fact, it continues the practice of raiding the Social Security trust funds to pay for other expenses of the federal government.

It is time for Congress to stop playing games with our national debt, with Social Security, and with our kids and grandkids' futures and take a commonsense, bipartisan approach to solve our budget problems.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this supplemental appropriations bill for Iraq and Afghanistan.

At $82 billion, this is the second largest supplemental appropriations request passed by Congress. This is on top of an already bloated $400 billion defense budget. Instead of borrowing more from our children, Congress ought to instead stop wasteful spending on ineffective, redundant and unnecessary weapons programs.

A supplemental of this size wouldn't even be necessary if Congress dumped pie-in-the-sky missile defense programs, put a stop to the delayed and over budget F–22 and F–35, and ended the boondoggle Osprey that's unsafe for our troops.

There is, however, a larger, more fundamental issue here. The Bush Administration refuses to live up to the human costs of this ongoing war. Over 1,500 young Americans dead, over 12,000 young Americans maimed and wounded and countless Iraqi civilians killed in the continuing bloodshed.

The message of my vote against this bill today is clear. The immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq is necessary if the United States is serious about bringing peace and security to the Iraqi people.

The continued presence of an American occupying force only intensifies the resentment, anger and distrust that fuels the ongoing violence against our troops. It's time to bring our troops home.

This message is lost on the Bush Administration. They've sought to establish American dominance in the region and to pursue regime change at any cost. They'll stay the course whatever the tragic consequences for the wives, husbands and families of our soldiers.

These brave young Americans face down deadly conflict in the streets each and every day. We honor their courage and service. But, for their sake, everyone of us in this House must consider the burden they bear. Is it worth it for them and for all of us?

America is not safer today two years after the capricious preemptive invasion of Iraq. Terror networks continue to grow and recruit in response to the US' arrogant preeminence in the Middle East.

Terrorism has been brought to the front door of America: waged mercilessly against our troops in places like Baghdad and Tikrit. That terror won't stop until we get serious about involving the world in solving this conflict.

We must actively involve Arab states, the United Nations and our major world partners in taking a stand against these insurgents—and in taking our place. A large, multinational peacekeeping force is the soundest way forward to end the war and win the peace.

The Bush Administration can continue to throw billions at Halliburton without real accountability. They can continue to look the other way as profiteering trumps genuine reconstruction in Iraq. They can laud its new democracy as one of the key foundations necessary to sustain it—Iraq's economy—continues to flounder. The Bush Administration can do all these things, but the end of this war will not come any day sooner.

What America needs most is honest leadership and a clear strategy for Iraq. That's not reflected in this bill. Its just more money thrown at a crisis we cannot solve through force of will alone.

That is our problem here today. Congress won't force our President and his advisors to live up to their failure. We'll vote to give them another blank check without addressing the fundamental illusion of our Iraq policy: we can win the peace alone. That's a costly falsehood.

I urge my colleagues to take responsibility for the lives of our soldiers, Iraq's future, and the future security of the United States and the world. Vote down this bill. It is time to bring our troops home.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this appropriations bill contains much crucial funding, most importantly money to provide additional armor for our troops and vehicles in Iraq and electronic jammers to protect them from roadside bombs. While I strongly support this funding, I am disappointed that I must vote ''no'' on this bill.

We have a responsibility to the men and women who we send into harm's way as members of the United States Armed Forces. It is because of my desire to support our troops that I continue to insist that the administration develop a plan to win the peace in Iraq and, to the best of our capability, protect the troops as they go about their mission. I believe that Congress must hold the administration to the highest standards when the lives of our service personnel are at risk. A ''no'' vote is one of the few ways I have to protest the continued abdication of this responsibility by the highest levels of the Bush Administration.

One positive part of this legislation is an amendment that I offered during House consideration with Mr. MARKEY to prohibit funds for torture and for sending detainees to countries that practice torture, which was carried into this conference report. The use of torture and rendition is morally reprehensible, puts Americans at risk, is a poor way to obtain reliable information in our fight against terrorism, and sets back the cause of democracy. This is the very least that we can do as Congress continues to abdicate its responsibility to investigate this horrific aspect of administration policy.

Perhaps most disappointing, this legislation also continues to be burdened with all the flaws of H.R.418, the ''REAL ID Act,'' which, among other things, placed the entire 7,514 mile border completely outside all legal protections. This is perhaps the single most damaging precedent since I've been in Congress. Do we really want to be giving this responsibility to the Department of Homeland Security, which has not been a paragon of efficiency and sensitivity during its three years of existence? Some of the environmental laws waived by this provision include: the Noise Control Act, the Clean Water Act, the Farmland Protection Policy Act, and the Bald Eagle Act. This is not only bad public policy, it is unnecessary, as most of these laws have security exemptions already written into them. However, in addition to environmental laws, this provision would waive labor laws, safety standards, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Native American Graves Protection Act. If this provision were to become law, the Department of Homeland Security could build a road that has no safety standards, using l2-year-old laborers, through the site of a Native American burial ground, killing hundreds of bald eagles during construction, and polluting the drinking water of a nearby community. The proponents of this provision have given us no compelling reasons for why this broad exemption is necessary.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief. This essential legislation will support and defend America's values both at home and abroad.

Our troops serving in Iraq will have the necessary tools to continue their rebuilding efforts in Iraq and to continue the War on Terror. At home, the REAL ID provisions will strengthen our Nation's driver's license laws, providing each citizen with another layer of security.

Until now, terrorists could easily exploit weak driver licensing laws and obtain fake documents. With a license in hand, terrorists were better able to blend in, avoid detection, and harm our nation's citizens. This is exactly what several of the 9/11 terrorists did, using drivers' licenses to board airplanes and murder thousands of innocent Americans on September 11, 2001.

We in Congress have been working on ways to prevent our Nation from experiencing another terrorist attack by establishing stronger and more secure national programs. Stronger driver's license standards made possible by the REAL ID provisions will be another step towards American security.

The REAL ID provisions will close dangerous gaps that remain in our current licensing law and that allow terrorists to abuse our asylum and driver's license systems. The new law will protect innocent Americans by setting up national driver's license standards, networking State motor vehicle data bases, and linking visa and license expirations.

In 2003, the former Attorney General of Virginia, Jerry Kilgore, and I worked together on the Driver's License Integrity Act. That legislation required non-immigrant aliens to show

their visas when applying for State identification and tied the expiration date of the identification to that of the visa.

Due to Mr. Kilgore's leadership on this issue, the Commonwealth of Virginia was one of the first States to clamp down on terrorists' abuse of the trust that a driver's license conveys. Today, I am pleased to see Virginia's Driver's License Integrity Act provisions in this piece of legislation before us in the House of Representatives.

Since the beginning of the War on Terror, Congress has fought daily to ensure that our Nation never again suffers at the hands of terrorists. The provisions in this bill provide us with more weapons in our arsenal against terrorism.

I urge passage of this legislation.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1268, to authorize emergency supplemental appropriations for our military. The vast majority of this $82 billion bill will go directly to support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Congress has a responsibility to work with the President to protect the national security of our Nation. When our soldiers are sent in to war, it is the Congress' responsibility to make sure that all resources necessary are provided to carry out their missions.

I stand behind our brave men and women who have performed admirably in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have made tremendous sacrifices on behalf of their country and have served longer deployments than expected.

This bill provides important new benefits for our troops and their families. The legislation: increases the military death gratuity; increases subsidized life insurance benefits; creates a new insurance benefit for soldiers who have suffered traumatic injuries, such as the loss of a limb; extends the Basic Allowance for Housing for dependents of soldiers who die while on active duty; and provides additional funding for add-on vehicle armor kits, night-vision equipment, and radio jammers that disrupt remote-control bombs and mines.

The conference report also contains important measures to strengthen our domestic border security, by providing funds for new border patrol agents, immigration and customs investigators, enforcement agents, and detention officers. The bill also provides additional foreign assistance for: tsunami reconstruction; humanitarian and peacekeeping programs in Darfur; democracy assistance in Belarus; and political and economic reforms in Ukraine to strengthen their new democracy and legal system.

I regret that the Administration has consistently failed to properly budget for our ongoing military and reconstruction operations in Iraq. Congress should not repeatedly rely on emergency spending bills to provide the critical funding, resources, and equipment for our troops in battle by using emergency supplemental appropriations bills.

The United States is only belatedly seeking international support for our reconstruction efforts in Iraq, and we have failed to broadly engage the international community.

Because of these failures, Americans have paid a heavy price. It is primarily American troops stationed in Iraq that face continuing attacks, and have lost life and limb. It is our taxpayers that are being asked to almost exclusively pay the cost to rebuild Iraq, and these costs are mounting every day. Iraq is already facing a difficult transition in establishing a democracy that operates under the rule of law and protects minority rights. The U.S. must show enough flexibility in working with our allies to effectively help Iraq during this critical transition period, so that other countries will pledge both troops and funds to alleviate the burden on our American soldiers and taxpayers. Ultimately, the best way that we can support our troops is to reach out more aggressively to the international community, establish order and security in Iraq, and help the interim Iraqi government assume more responsibility for its own affairs as they establish a democratic state.

I am also disappointed that the Republican leadership decided to insert extraneous provisions into this legislation, which go beyond the scope of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. I voted against the "REAL ID Act" when it was considered by this House as a separate bill earlier this year. I am particularly concerned that this legislation repeals a number of provisions of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which enacted the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission. The 9/11 bill established a negotiated rulemaking framework—allowing for critical input from governors, State legislators, State officials, and other stakeholders—which would provide the opportunity to develop effective national standards for driver's licenses. I am concerned that this legislation does not give the States adequate flexibility to implement the 9/11 bill, and that this legislation may also create serious unfunded mandates and administrative burdens for the States.

As the ranking member of the Helsinki Commission (Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe), which promotes human rights and rule of law in Europe, I am also concerned about many of the asylum law changes contained in the REAL ID Act, which again go beyond the scope of the 9/11 Commission recommendations. These provisions may have a harmful effect on true asylum seekers, trafficking victims, women and children who are victims of domestic violence, and others seeking protection against persecution. This legislation may create higher burdens for legitimate asylum seekers, restrict judicial discretion to grant asylum, and take away some of the rights of appeal for certain refugees and asylum seekers.

Over the past week I have heard from a number of groups in Maryland that provide legal and social services to immigrants, asylum seekers, refugees, and survivors of torture and slavery. These groups have reported to me that it is already extremely difficult for legitimate asylum seekers to prevail in their case, as they have often left their home country on short notice, and do not have documentation of their persecution. It can take months or years for a case to work its way through our legal system. During this period, the asylum seeker often has neither legal representation nor work documentation.

I hope that in the near future Congress will have the opportunity, in a more thoughtful manner, to consider comprehensive immigration reform measures.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report to H.R. 1268, legislation providing $81.3 billion in emergency wartime supplemental appropriations to fund operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The conference report's immigration-related provisions are neither wise, nor consistent with our national values. I am equally disturbed that Congress declines to institute greater accountability for the Bush Administration's use of wartime appropriations. Accordingly, I cannot in good conscience support this conference report.

On March 16, 2005, I joined the vast majority of my colleagues in voting for H.R. 1268. The legislation included many laudable provisions, including funding for tsunami relief, humanitarian assistance in Darfur, and needed equipment for our Nation's soldiers. On the other hand, I was deeply troubled by the bill's inclusion of the REAL ID Act, which called for egregious, new restrictions on immigrants and put us on the path to creating a national identification card. I had hoped that the Senate would prevail and remove these indefensible provisions proposed in the House bill.

I am particularly concerned with provisions in the bill that affect asylum seekers. This conference report would require that asylum seekers establish first that they would be subject to persecution if returned to their home country, and second that race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion is at least one "central reason" for that persecution.

These changes will deny asylum to people who cannot prove the central motive of their persecutor, who cannot produce corroborating evidence of their account, or whose demeanor is inconsistent with an immigration judge's preconceived expectations. This measure could place insurmountable legal obligations on already vulnerable asylum seekers by requiring unrealistic and unfair burdens of proof. U.S. law already has safeguards to prevent immigration by known terrorists and criminals.

Another section of the conference agreement establishes minimum requirements for States issuing driver's licenses and identification cards, including acceptable documentation for issuance of identification cards. As a result, States will have the burden of determining the authenticity of a wide array of documents. Placing these types of requirements on State motor vehicle authorities is prohibitively costly and ultimately unworkable. Federal authorities will not recognize State identification cards that fail to meet these requirements.

With respect to the current military operations, I am also discouraged that Congress remains unwilling to hold the Bush Administration accountable for its many missteps in Iraq, and I am troubled that the President may interpret this emergency supplemental as another blank check. The Bush Administration cannot account for billions of Federal dollars targeted for Iraq, and allegations of inappropriate no-bid contracts to "well-connected" multi-national corporations have never been thoroughly investigated. Efforts on the House floor by Representatives JOHN TIERNEY and JIM LEACH to establish a bipartisan commission to investigate allegations of war profiteering were rejected by the Republican leadership, and no substantive accountability measures were included in the conference report.

I understand well the responsibility the Congress has to fully support our Nation's troops, and as former Peace Corps volunteer, I appreciate the value of humanitarian aid to regions ravaged by natural disasters and human conflict. I would proudly support a bill that meets these important priorities, but I cannot vote for a conference report that incorporates unnecessary and unjust provisions designed to hurt immigrants.

This conference report is an abuse of the legislative process and a threat to the fabric of this Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1268 making supplemental appropriations to ensure that our forces who are hard at work in Iraq and Afghanistan, and elsewhere, have the tools they need to do their job, and are well protected.

Mr. Speaker, this week we witnessed the establishment of Iraq's first democratically elected government in over half a century and their swearing in. This event is yet another historic milestone in Iraq's progress toward a representative and transparent government.

But even as we see important movement toward democracy, we are reminded that ''freedom is not free.'' As those of us who have seen war know, it is paid first by the sacrifices of those who serve.

Their courage is our inspiration. We wish them Godspeed, swift victory and safe return.

However, while it pales in comparison to the sacrifices of our brave men and women in the field, there is another part of the equation. And it is before us today.

With this legislation, Congress is acting decisively to ensure that our soldiers, sailors and airmen have the resources they need to keep Iraq on the road back to the community of civilized nations.

This bill contains over $76 billion to support military activities. This sum will: pay for the troop deployment; repair and replace damaged vehicles being chewed up in an extreme harshly operating environment; replenish stores of munitions and supplies; and provide additional armor for vehicles, improved communications gear and more night-vision equipment.

I would also add that this bill also provides over $60 million for additional electronic devices designed to protect our forces from the ''weapon of choice'' of the insurgents—IEDs.

Mr. Speaker, this ''wartime supplemental'' appropriations bill meets our military, humanitarian and foreign policy requirements.

We have every reason to be proud of young men and women at war. Every single word of praise uttered on this floor today is justified.

But while our young men and women in uniform appreciate our vocal support, they need this bill. It will provide them with the tools they need to get their job done as quickly as possible so they can return home to their families.

I commend Mr. LEWIS, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee—the gentleman from California—for his leadership.

And I urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment briefly on the $82 billion spending bill that will be approved today for the ongoing U.S. military campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I will support this bill. I am pleased it includes additional money for body armor and armored vehicles for our troops. It includes money to purchase bomb-jamming devices to protect our troops from roadside bombs. I also support the improved life insurance death benefits for military personnel and their families. And, I am hopeful that the additional funds that are in the bill to train and equip security forces in Iraq all Afghanistan will be expeditious and well spent. This money is critical if Afghan and Iraqi forces are to take over security duties from American troops, which will allow our men and women to finally come home. I have called for negotiating a timeline for the withdrawal of American troops with the new Iraqi government, hopefully to be completed within the year. But, for that to become a reality, well-equipped and competent security forces in Iraq and Afghanistan must be prepared to take our place. This bill will help achieve that goal.

I am also pleased that the final bill retained language inserted in the Senate directing the President to include future requests to fund the U.S. presence in Iraq in his regular budget. We have been in Iraq for more than two years and in Afghanistan for more than three years. The fact that we still have troops in Iraq should not come as a surprise to the budget writers at the White House and the Pentagon. It is not appropriate to continue funding these long-term, ongoing operations via supplemental appropriations bills, which are considered outside of the normal budget procedures and restrictions.

While I support the bill, I am outraged that, more than two years after the U. S. invaded Iraq, the Pentagon leadership has not gotten their act together to adequately protect our troops and to come up with a plan to get them home.

As columnist Mark Shields pointed out late last year, in the three years immediately after Pearl Harbor, the United States produced the following to win World War II: 296,429 aircraft, 102,3351 tanks, 87,620 warships, and 2,455,694 trucks. At the time, the U.S. population was 132 million and the size of our economy was less than $100 billion. Yet, approaching three years into the U.S. occupation of Iraq, the United States, with a population of almost 300 million and defense spending of $500 billion a year, under the failed leadership of the Pentagon, only 6,000 of the nearly 20,000 Humvees in Iraq are factory armored versions and more than 8,000 of the 9,128 medium and heavy trucks used in Iraq are without armor.

Despite repeated promises from the Pentagon leadership that the situation is getting better, a recent article in The New York Times showed that the emperor has no clothes. As the article details, one Marine Company has returned home to expose the reality of their tour in Iraq, ''one they say was punctuated not only by a lack of armor, but also by a shortage of men and planning that further hampered their efforts in battle, destroyed morale and ruined the careers of some of their most competent warriors.''

I have heard similar stories from the Oregon National Guard members I have talked to.

How did this happen?

Since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks against our country; Congress has provided the Pentagon with $1.6 trillion—$167 billion in supplemental appropriations bills for fiscal years 2001–2005; and $1.45 trillion in regular defense appropriations for fiscal years 2002–2005. Today's bill will add $75 billion or so to the Pentagon budget. Given that level of funding, it is hard to understand why our troops continue to suffer shortages of critical equipment.

It is hard to understand until you remember that Secretary Rumsfeld and the other civilian leaders at the Pentagon argued that our troops would be greeted in Iraq as liberators with flowers and candy, not the bullets and bombs that have led to more than 1,500 of our soldiers getting killed. Before, the invasion, the Pentagon planned to reduce our troop levels to 20,000–30,000 within a few weeks of overthrowing Saddam Hussein. The fact that 150,000 U.S. troops remain in Iraq more than a year and a half after the war began shows how badly the Pentagon leadership miscalculated the post-war situation.

Those miscalculations also led the Pentagon to vastly underestimate the equipment that our troops would need to survive and succeed in Iraq. First, the Pentagon leadership did not even order the necessary equipment like body armor, armored Humvees and bomb jamming devices. For example, under the Pentagon's original war plan, the Pentagon planned to have only 235 armored Humvees in Iraq for the 20,000 troops who would remain after overthrowing Saddam Hussein.

Then, when it became clear that this equipment was necessary, the Pentagon did not procure it with any sense of urgency. As The New York Times article I mentioned above noted, ''The Army's procurement system, which also supplies the Marines, has come under fierce criticism for underperforming in the war, and to this day it has only one small contractor in Ohio armoring new Humvees.''

The performance of Secretary Rumsfeld and his senior leadership at the Pentagon has been a disgrace. Unfortunately, it is our troops who have had to pay the price.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this conference report includes some items that I strongly support, and other things that I think should not have been included. On balance, I will vote for it because I think it would unrealistic and irresponsible to do otherwise.

FUNDING FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES

Most of the money appropriated by this legislation is for our ongoing military activities, especially in Iraq. Passage of this conference report will bring the total cost of operations in Iraq to well over $200 billion—and by now, two years after President Bush prematurely announced the end of major military activities in Iraq, I think even those who have been uncritical supporters of the Administration should be deeply concerned about the escalating costs, not just in money but in casualties.

The time has come—in fact, it is long since past—for the Administration to be candid about the costs not just of the war in Iraq but of the Administration's overall foreign policy. This should be the last time that the Administration or the Congress pays those costs through a supplemental appropriation bill instead of the regular budgetary and appropriation process. The American people deserve to know in advance what they will be asked to pay to support the Administration's policies.

Nonetheless, Congress must not fail to supply our troops. Funds in this conference report will pay for more resources, including body armor and military equipment, needed to safeguard their lives. The conference report also includes important provisions to raise the military death gratuity from $12,000 to $100,000 and to include a new insurance benefit of up to $100,000 for soldiers who have suffered traumatic injuries. The report also increases funding for body armor for the Army and Marines, add-on vehicle armor kits, night-vision equipment, and electronic roadside-bomb jammers—and includes funding for contract linguists for the Army.

Further, there is an imperative need for this funding. The Defense Department reports that

operating funds for the Army are nearing exhaustion and that it will be necessary to transfer more than $1 billion from other accounts to continue essential activities at home and abroad until these supplemental funds are available.

In short, the choice before us today is to vote for this supplemental or, by voting against it, to in effect require an immediate halt to military operations not just in Iraq but elsewhere.

And while I remain convinced it was an error to rush into war in Iraq, I am equally convinced it would be just as much an error to rush to withdraw.

We do need a strategy to get us out—which is why I'm pleased that the conferees included language directing the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with a report that identifies security, economic, and Iraqi security force training-performance standards and goals, accompanied by a timetable for achieving these goals.

But an immediate departure is neither good strategy nor would it mean peace for Iraq.

I recently returned from my second trip to Iraq—this time as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee. As a critic of the Bush administration's policy in Iraq, I did not go there to confirm my opposition to the war, but rather, to gain knowledge based on face-to-face conversations with our military leaders, the Iraqi leadership, an extraordinary group of Iraqi women, and most important for me, with our troops on the ground.

I am convinced that there can be no successful exit strategy without first doing what is needed to enable the new Iraqi government to take up the burden of providing security. That will take time and money, and in the meantime we must maintain our efforts. As the former head of American forces in northern Iraq, Brig. Gen. Carter Ham, said recently, ''We don't want a rush to failure.''

So, for me, the need to support the military funding in this conference report—however unpleasant—is clear.

OTHER FUNDS

The conference report also provides funding for tsunami disaster relief as well as for assistance in Darfur, food aid to Sudan and Liberia, and for peacekeeping programs, most of which are for Sudan. Importantly, the bill appropriates the president's request of $200 million for economic development in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS

Other parts of the conference report are problematical, particularly the inclusion of provisions like those in the ''REAL ID Act,'' legislation that I opposed when the House passed it in February. I believe these provisions will not strengthen national security, but will create undue difficulties for asylum seekers and excessively expand the powers of the Secretary of Homeland Security. This is a controversial issue that should have been addressed separately, not incorporated into this legislation.

An editorial in today's Rocky Mountain News says this part of the conference report ''has much more to do with immigration than security'' and is just ''one piece of a policy, poorly thought out and scarcely debated at all, and likely to have unintended consequences.'' I think that is an accurate description.

The Conference report also includes a provision that would revise the H–2B visa program, under which people can come into the country legally for seasonal non-agricultural work.

Several industries in Colorado are heavily dependent on the H–2B visa program to provide seasonal employees—some in the summer and some in the winter. While most of these companies try hard to find Americans to fill these jobs, they have not been fully successful. And the current limit on the numbers of visas has made it difficult for many of them to find the people they need. So, they have been asking Congress to revise the program.

However, while I am pleased that the report attempts to provide relief to companies struggling to find eligible employees, the specific provisions have some problems and may detrimentally affect some of the companies that have employed people entering under the H–2B program. This is particularly true for companies whose busy season is in the winter, such as the ski industry. They would actually be detrimentally affected by this provision because they do not rehire the same workers every year, and thus do not benefit from the provisions in the conference report that will exempt previously hired workers from the overall limit on the number of visas.

I wrote to conferees to urge a solution to the H–2B visa problem that would be equitable for both the winter and summer industries. Regrettably, the conference report does not fully meet that test. Still, it does make a good start to addressing the H–2B visa problem. I hope that we will be able to build on this foundation in the future so as to protect the interests of both summer and winter industries.

STATE REGULATION OF HUNTING AND FISHING

The conference report also includes, as Section 6063, provisions to reaffirm the authority of the States and Territories to regulate hunting and fishing.

This part of the conference report is identical to the text of H.R. 731, which I introduced in the House, and to S. 339, introduced in the Senate by Senator REID of Nevada. I applaud Senator REID's leadership in having this included when the Senate considered this supplemental appropriations bill and I am glad that it was accepted by the conferees. It will do two things—

(1) Declare as Congressional policy that it is in the public interest for each State to continue to regulate the taking of fish and wildlife within its boundaries, including by means of laws or regulations that differentiate between residents and non-residents; and

(2) Provide that courts should not use Congressional silence as a reason to impose any commerce-clause barrier to a State's or tribe's regulation of hunting or fishing.

Its purpose is to reaffirm the authority of States and Territories to regulate hunting and fishing by resolving questions that have arisen in the wake of a recent 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decision that held that some Arizona limits on non-resident hunting permits had constitutional defects.

Ideally, of course, legislation of this sort should be handled through the regular authorization process, and I had hoped that the Resources Committee would have taken it up by now. However, State fish and wildlife agencies will soon be considering regulations for coming seasons, and it is important that questions about their authority be resolved without unnecessary delay.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new about a State's having different rules for resident and nonresident hunters or anglers. Colorado draws that distinction in several ways, and many other States do so as well.

And while there have been challenges to the validity of such rules, until recently the Federal courts have upheld the right of the States to make such distinctions. For example, in 1987 the Federal district court for Colorado, in the case of *Terk* v. *Ruch* (reported at 655 F. Supp. 205), rejected a challenge to Colorado's regulations that allocated to Coloradans 90% of the available permits for hunting bighorn sheep and mountain goats. But a recent Court of Appeals decision marked a change—something that definitely is new.

In that case (*Conservation Force* v. *Manning,* 301 F.3rd 985; 9th Cir. 2002), the Federal appeals court for the 9th Circuit held that Arizona's 10% cap on nonresident hunting of bull elk throughout the State and of antlered deer north of the Colorado River had enough of an effect on interstate commerce that it could run afoul of what lawyers and judges call the ''dormant commerce clause'' of the Constitution.

Having reached that conclusion, the appeals court determined that the Arizona regulation discriminated against interstate commerce—meaning the ''dormant commerce clause'' did apply and that the regulation was subject to strict scrutiny, and could be upheld only if it served legitimate State purposes and the State could show that those interests could not be adequately served by reasonable non-discriminatory alternatives.

The appeals court went on to find that the regulations did further Arizona's legitimate interests in conserving its population of game and maintaining recreational opportunities for its citizens, but it remanded the case so a lower court could determine whether the State could meet the burden of showing that reasonable non-discriminatory alternatives would not be adequate.

Because of the decision's potential implications for their own laws and regulations, it was a source of concern to many States in addition to Arizona. In fact, 22 other States joined in supporting Arizona's request for the decision to be reviewed by the U.S. Supreme Court. Colorado was one of those States, and Senator KEN SALAZAR, who was then Colorado's Attorney General, joined in signing a brief in support of Arizona's petition for Supreme Court review.

Regrettably, the Supreme Court denied that petition. So, for now, the 9th Circuit's decision stands. Its immediate effect is on States whose Federal courts are within that circuit—namely those in Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington as well those of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. But it could have an effect on the thinking of Federal courts across the country.

The purpose of this part of the conference report is to forestall that outcome, and so far as possible to return to the state of affairs prevailing before the 9th circuit's decision. It is intended to speak directly to the ''dormant commerce clause'' basis for the 9th Circuit's decision in Conservation Force v. Manning.

I am not a lawyer, but my understanding is that lawyers and judges use that term to refer to the judicially established doctrine that the commerce clause is not only a ''positive'' grant of power to Congress, but also a ''negative'' constraint upon the States in the absence of any Congressional action—in other words, that it restricts the powers of the States to affect interstate commerce in a situation where Congress has been silent.

Section 6036(b)(1) would end the perceived silence of Congress by affirmatively stating that State regulation of fishing and hunting—including State regulation that treats residents and non-residents differently—is in the public interest. This is intended to preclude future application of the ''dormant commerce clause'' doctrine with regard to such regulations. And Section 6036(b)(2) would make it clear that even when Congress might have been silent about the subject, that silence is not to be construed as imposing a commerce-clause barrier to a State's regulation of hunting or fishing within its borders.

These provisions are neither a Federal mandate for State action nor a Congressional delegation of authority to any State. Instead, they are intended to reaffirm State authority and make clear that the ''dormant commerce clause''—that is, Congressional inaction—is not to be construed as an obstacle to a State's regulating hunting or fishing, even in ways that some might claim adversely affect interstate commerce by treating residents differently from nonresidents.

It's also important to note that this part of the conference report is not intended to affect any Federal law already on the books or to limit any authority of any Indian Tribe.

Section 6036(c) is intended to prevent any misunderstanding on these points.

Section 6036(c)(1) specifies that the bill will not ''limit the applicability or effect of any Federal law related to the protection or management of fish or wildlife or to the regulation of commerce.''

Thus, to take just a few examples for purposes of illustration, this part of the conference report will not affect implementation of the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Lacey Act, the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act, or the provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act dealing with subsistence.

Section 6036(c)(2) similarly provides that the bill is not to be read as limiting the authority of the Federal government to temporarily or permanently prohibit hunting or fishing on any portion of the Federal lands—as has been done with various National Park System units and in some other parts of the Federal lands for various reasons, including public safety as well as the protection of fish or wildlife.

And Section 6036(c)(3) explicitly provides that the bill will not alter any of the rights of any Indian Tribe.

These provisions are narrow in scope but of national importance because it addresses a matter of great concern to hunters, anglers, and wildlife managers in many States. I think they deserve broad support.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, while this conference report is far from perfect, I think it deserves to pass and I will vote for it.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, passage of this legislation demonstrates our commitment to our brave men and women in uniform and acknowledges that they need resources in order to accomplish their mission and return home safely. It also offers support for the families when a loved one pays the ultimate sacrifice in the cause of fighting for freedom.

All along, I've been concerned about the lack of progress reports coming from the Pentagon. This bill finally requires the Pentagon to use real performance indicators to report to Congress with our progress in terms of security, economic, and Iraqi security force training goals.

The money that will go directly to help our troops is of course the most important part of this bill. It increases the military death gratuity to $100,000 and increases life insurance benefits to $400,000 for families of soldiers killed while on active duty in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We've all been hearing reports about the lack of adequate personal and vehicle armor. Congress has funded these critical protections in the past and we're doing so once again in this bill. I hope that this money will quickly be turned around to provide the needed add-on vehicle armor kits, new trucks, more night-vision equipment, and essential radio jammers to defeat the roadside bombs that are injuring and killing our troops almost every day.

Our troops should not be compromised. Resolving the current instability in the region is in the long-term best interests of all Americans—failure in Iraq would lead to irreparable consequences. Thousands of American troops have been in Iraq for more than 2 years. We have to take care of them and ensure that they can come back home as soon as possible.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, when the House debated this legislation in March, it voted 420–2 to approve an amendment, which I authored, which reaffirms the U.S. commitment under the Convention Against Torture to not engage in torture, and to not render or transfer people to countries where they are likely to face torture. The U.S. signed this treaty under President Reagan, and the Senate ratified it in 1994.

Despite our commitments under this treaty and the recent statements made by the Bush Administration emphasizing that the U.S. is emphatically and unambiguously against the use of torture, there have been repeated reports in the press indicating that the U.S. has been sending detainees to countries where they are likely to face torture, including to countries who have become notorious for their human rights violations.

The practice of extraordinary rendition is shrouded in secrecy. An unmarked plane arrives in the middle of the night carrying men wearing plain clothes and black hoods, to take custody of the prisoners, cut off their clothes, drug them on the spot, shackle them, and fly off into the night. President Bush signed a secret directive reported to speed up the process by eliminating the case by case evaluation. And while unofficial estimates put the number of renditions since 9/11 to be between 100 and 150, the actual number of renditions remains a secret.

The Administration maintains that it is in full compliance with the Convention Against Torture. Compliance, they say, is guaranteed by the dubious practice of asking countries known to torture prisoners for ''promises'' that they will not torture our prisoners. These so-called ''diplomatic assurances'' then provide the cover for sending a suspect to that country to undergo interrogation.

The list of countries where the detainees have been rendered includes Syria, Uzbekistan, Saudi Arabia and Egypt.

So here is the sand on which the Administration stands—at the same time that we exhort the international community to isolate Syria for thumbing its nose at U.N. resolutions to get out of Lebanon, the United States has apparently been willing to accept Syrian promises that it will comply with the Convention Against Torture.

Here is what the State Department's annual human rights report says about Syria's methods of interrogation: ''administering electrical shocks, pulling out fingernails, forcing objects into the rectum, . . .'' And the list goes on.

How about Uzbekistan?—''suffocation, electric shock, rape, beatings, and boiling prisoners to death . . .'' And the list goes on.

The so-called ''diplomatic assurances'' that we have received from the torturers that they will not torture those we send them are not credible, and the Administration knows it. CIA Director Porter Goss basically acknowledged as much when he stated: ''But of course once they're out of our control, there's only so much we can do.'' Attorney General Alberto Gonzales confirmed this, when he said ''Once someone is rendered, we can't fully control what that country might do.''

Section 1031 of the conference report would prohibit the use of any funds included in this Supplemental appropriations bill to subject any person in custody or under the control of the United States to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment that is prohibited by the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. While the Conferees approved Senate language that is slightly different from that of the House-passed amendment, I am nevertheless supportive of this language. I support it because I read Section 1031 to clearly prohibit any appropriated funds from being spent to subject any person in U.S. custody or control to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment by transferring, extraditing, or rendering such persons to countries where they are likely to face torture.

This is because such actions clearly would be prohibited under Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture, a treaty signed and ratified by the United States. Article 3 of the Convention clearly states that:

> ''No State Party shall expel, return (''refouler'') or extradite a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture.''

Article 3 of the Convention further states that:

> ''For the purpose of determining whether there are such grounds, the competent authorities shall take into account all relevant considerations, including, where applicable, the existence in the State concerned of a consistent pattern of gross, flagrant, or mass violations of human rights.''

It would be my expectation that the funding limitation contained in Section 1031 would therefore prohibit funds from being used to transfer persons to any Nation where the person was likely to face torture, and that under Section 1031, funds could not be used for transfers or renditions in situations where the U.S. government had found there to be a consistent pattern of gross, flagrant, or mass violations of human rights. I would also note that in a September 2004 report to the United Nations General Assembly, the UN Special Rapporteur on torture expressed concern that reliance on diplomatic assurances is a ''practice that is increasingly undermining the principle of non-refoulement'' and observed that where torture is systematic, ''the principal of non-refoulement must be strictly observed and diplomatic assurances should not be resorted to.''

We take pride that even as our Nation fought for its survival against the Nazis and the Japanese Empire during World War II, that we did not ask our ''Greatest Generation'' to engage in torture or other war crimes. The legacy of the U.S. then, and now as we prosecute the War on Terror, is that we uphold our commitment to justice—even in the face of shadows of terror and war. The test of a Nation is found as much in how it wages war as in how it promotes the values of peace and democracy. That is what we must do today.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this supplemental appropriations bill and the anti-immigrant legislation it contains.

If we truly believe all the rhetoric we hear about the importance of freedom and liberty from the president and others, we will vote down this bill, which denies so much freedom and liberty to immigrants in our own country.

H.R. 1268 includes numerous provisions limiting the rights of refugees, imposing onerous new driver's license requirements on the states, making it easier to deport legal immigrants, waiving all federal laws concerning the construction of fences and barriers anywhere within the United States, and denying immigrants long standing habeas corpus rights.

If enacted into law, this legislation will close America's doors to religious minorities escaping religious persecution and women fleeing sex trafficking and rape.

We have been down this road of overreaction in the past. During the Civil War, General Grant sought to expel the Jews from the South. The aftermath of World War I brought about the notorious Red Scare and the anti-immigrant Palmer raids. World War II led to the unconscionable internment of Japanese Americans.

In the wake of the 9/11 tragedy, and even after the PATRIOT Act, this legislation would further target immigrants for crimes they have not committed, and sins they are not responsible for. At some point, we have to treat terrorism as a problem that requires an intelligence response, as opposed to an excuse to scapegoat immigrants.

It is for all these reasons that so many groups strongly oppose this bill, including groups concerned about immigrant rights, civil rights and liberties, privacy rights; Labor rights; the environment; Native-American rights; state rights, and international human rights.

I urge a ''no'' vote. We cannot and should not close ourselves off to the most vulnerable members of our society.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Agreement. I wish to commend the conferees for their work in bringing this important legislation to the House Floor. Not only does this bill provide critical support to our military and the war on terror, but it also funds international humanitarian reconstruction and economic assistance programs provided by the United States Agency for International Development.

As my colleagues know, I have believed for many years that the HIV/AIDS pandemic represents one of the greatest health and moral crises of our time, particularly in Africa. That is why I was especially pleased by the President's announcement of a visionary Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, and have supported grants and other programs funded by USAID that help to reverse the spread of this pandemic. It is thus my strongly held view that USAID should continue to fund existing programs, as well as invest in new programs, that support the President's HIV/AIDS initiative. In this regard, there are two programs, both directed toward South Africa, that I believe deserve the Agency's particular attention.

The first program is the new African Center for AIDS Management, which has, to date, trained over 800 graduates and is the largest program of its kind worldwide. I understand that USAID has provided only modest funding to support this initiative, while the bulk of the support has come from South African institutions. With substantial additional support from USAID during Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006, this program could double in size and provide training for executives and senior managers from government, the provinces, municipalities and educational institutions, as well as NGOs, corporations, and trade unions, in the management of an expanded capability to detect and treat HIV/AIDS in Africa.

The second program would be a new joint U.S.-South African program to provide telemedicine-equipped mobile clinics to serve the South African military involved in peacekeeping efforts throughout Africa. This program, which merits both USAID and DOD support, would be run through the South Africa Medical Research Council and provide medical services to remote areas to combat HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases. This mobile clinic system, employing some of the latest U.S. telemedicine technologies, would leverage U.S. military expertise across distances. As this system develops, so would it expand in both its capabilities and its services to the civilian population.

Both of these programs are examples of humanitarian initiatives requiring modest investments that USAID is both equipped and funded to support. I applaud the Agency's past work in this area, and encourage both the continuation of existing efforts and the expansion of the new efforts that I have outlined.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1268 and urge all my colleagues to support it.

In addition to necessary funding for our troops, tsunami disaster relief, and border security; this conference report also includes important provisions to bring long-overdue, common sense reform to drivers' licenses and state-issued identification cards, authored last year by the Government Reform Committee in response to a recommendation of the 9–11 Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank the Speaker and Majority Leader for making good on their promise to get this legislation to the floor signed into law quickly in the 109th Congress. I also want to thank my colleague from California, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for his strong support and for agreeing to include these provisions in H.R, 1268. Finally, I would like to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his tireless work and support on this issue, Last year following passage of the 9–11 Commission Recommendations Implementation Act, he and I made a commitment to work together to ensure that the most important provisions not addressed in the final bill would be addressed early in the 109th Congress. That commitment is being fulfilled today.

Judging by the basic nature of these requirements as well as the actions taken by some States, it is quite obvious that not enacting these reforms does not come from a lack of ability, but from a lack of will. The federal government cannot continue to allow our security responsibilities to be compromised by the inaction of a few.

Our approach is very straightforward. Building upon guidelines and best practices established and accepted by State Motor Vehicle Administrators, the federal government's longstanding work on identity security, and actions taken by individual States to shore up their licensing process following the terrorist attacks; our legislation sets forth minimum document and issuance standards for federal acceptance of driver's licenses and state-issued personal identification cards. The legislation provides three years for States to come into compliance with these standards in order for the federal government to recognize their documents as proof of an individual's identity.

Let me make one thing perfectly clear. States that want their drivers' licenses to be used for federal identification purposes will be required to meet these standards. All of them. If they do not, the citizens of that State will not be able to use their driver's license to identify themselves for many purposes that they use them for today, such as boarding an airplane. The bill and the report make clear that the Secretary must determine the uses, in addition to those set forth in the bill, for which drivers licenses only from complying states will be accepted. Importantly, the final bill makes clear that the Secretary of Homeland Security will be responsible for ensuring that the certifications represent full compliance. This requirement ensures that the national security interests of the United States will be protected through enforcement of the requirements of the bill.

States will also be required to confirm the applicant's proof of legal presence in the United States. Currently, only 11 states lack such a requirement, meaning a majority of states have already recognized the need for tighter standards, but unnecessary and dangerous gaps in the system still exist. Importantly, States are still permitted to issue drivers' licenses to individuals who are not lawfully present in the United States or who cannot provide satisfactory proof of identity. The ability of States to have such a system is currently under challenge in court, and this legislation will provide them with express authority. The bill further provides that these licenses or identification cards must be clearly visually differentiated from other licenses and contain specific language regarding their validity for federal identification and other official purposes.

In addition, the legislation will require identity documents to expire at the same time as the expiration of lawful entry status—this will prevent individuals who have illegally entered or are unlawfully present in the United States from having valid identification documents. This loophole was highlighted on September 11th, as Nawaf al Hazmi and Hani Hanjour, the pilots of Flight 77, both obtained licenses and identification cards after the expiration of their visa authorization. We must correct this dangerous problem before we again give individuals who have overstayed their visas the tools they need to integrate into society and carry out criminal and terrorist acts.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that these actions are consistent with actions taken

by individual states to date. For example, Nevada and New Mexico do not accept, as proof of identity, a state-issued driver license or identification card from states that do not meet their own standards. The federal government has been delinquent in dealing with this issue, but we are correcting that problem today.

Fraud in identity documents is no longer just a problem of theft. As we continue to strengthen our intelligence function to better identify and track terrorists, those individuals will be forced to find ways to conceal their identity in order to avoid detection. We must be able to establish, as close to certainty as we can, that people are who they say they are, and in order to do so the federal government must have documents that it can trust. In fact, we would not be fulfilling our security role for the American people if we did not.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these important provisions and the passage of this conference report.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental, especially the provision that would postpone reducing the number of Navy aircraft carriers from 12 to 11. Our nation is at war against global terrorism and reducing the number of aircraft carriers would be a huge blow to our nation's defense at this very critical time.

Since the end of the Cold War, carriers have been kept very busy and have proven their value in numerous operations. In this era of uncertain U.S. access to overseas air bases, the value of carriers as sovereign U.S. bases that can operate in international waters, free from political constraints, is particularly significant.

During the past half century, the carrier force has never dropped below 12 ships, illustrating the enduring need for a force of at least that many ships. After experimenting with an "11 + 1" carrier force in FY1995–FY2000, DOD returned to a force of 12 fully active carriers, suggesting that DOD was dissatisfied with a force of less than 12 fully active carriers.

This provision in the Supplemental would effectively delay the decommissioning of the USS *Kennedy* until 6 months after the Quadrennial Defense Review is released. The *Kennedy* is based at the Mayport Naval Station near Jacksonville, Florida. Aside from concerns of this move striking a blow to national security, the carrier's retirement would mean an estimated loss of $300 million a year to the local economy.

Furthermore, if the *Kennedy* were retired, all of the Atlantic Fleet's carriers would be, for some time at least, home ported in a single location. This, of course, would not be in the best interest of national security.

Decommissioning the *Kennedy* before the QDR is complete could prove to be a very costly and ill-timed decision. The QDR may conclude that a fleet of 12 aircraft carriers is essential to our nation, thus necessitating that the USS *Kennedy* be operational. In a time of war, it is unwise to retire an aircraft carrier without knowing whether or not it will be needed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of congress to carefully examine the effects that retiring the *Kennedy* and reducing the number of carriers would not only have on our nation, but the world at large. Please join me in supporting the Supplemental and the provision that keeps the number of carriers in the Navy's fleet contained therein.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in this form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 1268, to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to recede to the Senate and agree to the highest level of funding within the scope of conference for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for the electronic vote on the question of adopting the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 225, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—225

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley

Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (OH)
Capps
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Lantos
Larson (CT)

□ 1355

Mr. EHLERS and Mr. DELAY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, CONYERS, and RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 58, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—368

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—58

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Becerra
Blumenauer
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Coble
Conyers
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Duncan
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gordon
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jones (OH)
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Maloney
Markey
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Napolitano
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Rangel
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Matsui

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (OH)
Capps
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Lantos
Larson (CT)

□ 1404

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Thursday, May 5, 2005, to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 159, 160, and 161 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted: ''No'' on rollcall No. 159 ordering the previous question on H. Res. 258—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1268; ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 160 on the motion to recommit the Conference Report for H.R. 1268 to the conference committee with instructions; and, ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 161 on agreeing to the Conference Report for H.R. 1268—Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief Act, 2005.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present for the following rollcall votes and would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted as follows: Rollcall No. 159—''no''; rollcall No. 160—''yes''; rollcall No. 161—''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the vote on the Motion to Recommit the Conference Report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations Act. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for the vote on passage of the Conference Report on H.R. 1268, the Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations Act. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House to inquire of the majority whip the schedule for next week.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?