EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003—Continued

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). I agree with everything he said. All I disagree with is we should not adopt his amendment for a lot of reasons.

A letter from the President’s National Security Adviser has been referred to several times. A copy of that letter is as follows:


Hon. BILL YOUNG, Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for supporting the President’s request for aid to Turkey in the Emergency Supplemental legislation. Despite recent difficulties, the President is devoting his efforts to maintaining the strategic partnership that has existed between the United States and Turkey for almost 60 years.

Secretary Powell addressed important military, political, and economic issues when he met this week with President Sezer, Prime Minister Erodogan, Foreign Minister Gul, and General Staff Chief Ozkok. Both sides agreed to an unimpeded flow of humanitarian aid to Northern Iraq and access by American forces to supplies sent through Turkey. Turkey continues to grant overflight rights and has committed to enhanced cooperation on terrorist threats and possible refugee flows in the region, without moving additional Turkish military forces into Iraq. These are very positive steps.

American and Turkish soldiers stood side by side during the Cold War and on battlefields from Korea to Afghanistan. The President’s supplemental request recognizes and reflects that past and his desire to strengthen the relationship further. This assistance, coupled with Turkey’s continued adherence to sound economic policies supported by international financial institutions, could play a significant role in bolstering the U.S.-Turkey partnership. I ask your assistance in advancing these goals on the floor and in conference.

Sincerely, CONDOLEEZZA RICE, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

I would like also for the Members to know on page 27 of the bill there is a long list of requirements that have to be met before the President can release this money. The Congress is playing its role in controlling spending and getting accountability. So look at that page and you will see that it is not just a grant of money to anybody.

Now, let me say quickly that the face of the world is changing. Alliances are changing. Friendships are coming. Friendships are going. The President of the United States needs the flexibility to deal with those extremely important changes. And as far as who asked for the money, the Turkish delegation visited the President to discuss a program of $6 billion. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and I had the privilege of meeting with that delegation. They certainly asked for the help.

Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, Turkey has been our friend and I assume still desires to be an ally of the United States. I have visited Turkey. It is a beautiful country and they have fought side by side with many of our soldiers. Yes, they supported our efforts with Operation Northern Watch. Yes, we support their emerging democracy, but it is important for them to understand that there are consequences to their actions.

Mr. Chairman, when we as Members of Congress cast a vote there are consequences. Earlier this year we asked for their help and they voted “no.” Well not they want our help and I’m voting “no”. I think we spend too much money in foreign aid, money that could be used for tax relief, building a strong defense, and paying down the debt.

This week, Turkey agreed to help with re-supply and humanitarian aid and assumes that...
Uncle Sam is going to pull out his checkbook and write another billion-dollar check without batting an eye.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when our veterans have to wait months to see a doctor and our servicemen in Iraq are risking their lives and chemical attack for the preservation of liberty, isn't it time for Uncle Sam to stop sending blank checks to fair-weather allies?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). The amendment was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE
Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 110, noes 315, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

AYES—110

Abernathy 43  \hspace{1cm} Arkin 4  \hspace{1cm} Atkins 13  \hspace{1cm} Baca 4  \hspace{1cm} Baldwin 29  \hspace{1cm} Barbour 3  \hspace{1cm} Bartlett (MD) 3  \hspace{1cm} Blunt 3  \\
Boucher 2  \hspace{1cm} Boebel 1  \hspace{1cm} Boehner 1  \\
Abercrombie 4  \hspace{1cm} Ackerman 4  \hspace{1cm} Aderholt 4  \hspace{1cm} Alexander 4  \hspace{1cm} Allen 4  \hspace{1cm} Baca 4  \hspace{1cm} Baird 4  \\
Baliles 4  \hspace{1cm} Barret (SC) 4  \hspace{1cm} Bartlett (MD) 4  \\
Barton (TX) 4  \\
Boehner 4  \\

NOES—315

Abercrombie 4  \hspace{1cm} Ackerman 4  \hspace{1cm} Aderholt 4  \hspace{1cm} Alexander 4  \hspace{1cm} Allen 4  \hspace{1cm} Baca 4  \hspace{1cm} Baird 4  \\
Baliles 4  \hspace{1cm} Barret (SC) 4  \hspace{1cm} Bartlett (MD) 4  \\
Barton (TX) 4  \\
Boehner 4  \\

Mr. PETRI, Ms. LEE, and Messrs. GORDON, DAVIS of Tennessee, GOOD-LATTE and HOLT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, today the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with our courageous military forces in Iraq and their brave families at home, especially those families who have lost a loved one or await the return of the missing and our prisoners of war.

Today, we all celebrate the wonderful and courageous rescue of Jessica Lynch. We all celebrate her rescue and the courage that she demonstrated, as well as those who brought her home safely.

As Members of Congress charged in the preamble to the Constitution with providing for the common defense, we have pledged to give our Armed Forces the support they need in these difficult and dangerous days, both to win this war and to win the peace. This supplemental abides by that commitment.

Sadly, this supplemental does not fulfill America’s commitment to our men and women in uniform at home and abroad, our local firefighters, police and emergency medical personnel who serve on the front lines against the greatest threat facing our Nation, the clear and present danger of terrorism.

Time and time again, the President and the Republican majority in Congress have said that defending the homeland is “the single most important priority, our most important challenge and our biggest responsibility.”

But time and time again, the rhetoric has failed to match the reality of their proposals.

The reality is that the Republicans have failed to spend $2.5 billion in desperately needed homeland security funds appropriated by Congress last year. The Republicans have repeatedly told that they will do whatever it takes to defend our homeland, but the reality is that the Members from both parties and mayors from across the country are speaking to the administration and the Republicans in Congress to give firefighters, police, and health care workers the funding, training, and equipment they need to protect our communities and to respond to a terrorist attack.

The President said that “I am going to commit the resources necessary to defend our freedom,” but the reality is that this supplemental has a message that the President and the Republicans have not been committing the resources necessary to fully defend our homeland.

Perhaps nowhere is this credibility gap on homeland security greater than when it comes to protecting our vulnerable ports.

In speaking to the Coast Guard at the port of Philadelphia last week, the President said that protecting our Nation’s ports is essential to our economic security and to our national security.

But the reality is that the
President vetoed $39 million to inspect the millions of container ships that dock in U.S. ports every year. The reality is that the administration and the Republicans have no funding for this program in the fiscal 2004 budget or in any other supplemental. With our Nation at the second-highest level of terrorist alert, the Republicans are shortchanging homeland security. The American people deserve better. We must do everything we can every day to protect the homes that people live in, the places where they work, the bridges and roads they use to get there, and the communities where they live.

I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, for his outstanding leadership on this issue and for his efforts to give our States and communities the resources they need to protect themselves.

America needs to know that Democrats voted this week to boost homeland security by $2.5 billion, including an additional $1 billion for rent-funded firefighters, police and medical personnel. The Oney amendment, had it been allowed to be brought to the floor, would have gone even further than that, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Americans need to know that the Republicans voted no. The President and the Republicans owe the American people an explanation. Why are they shortchanging our men and women on the front lines in our homeland who protect our communities, while they are giving massive tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest in our country, those who need it least? This would be unwise at any time. In this time of war, with our Nation on high alert, it is particularly reckless.

Democrats support this supplemental because it funds our men and women in uniform in Iraq as well as other critical needs. At the same time, it does not do enough for our men and women in uniform domestically who are trying to keep our communities safe. Democrats will continue fighting to give them the funding, the training, and the equipment they need to protect America. We owe these men and women and the Americans they protect nothing less.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

As I review the number of amendments pending, I see 39 remaining amendments on the Democratic side of the aisle and 6 on the Republican side of the aisle. As I calculate the clock, that this weekend of all of those amendments are only debated for 5 minutes per side, without counting the time for roll calls, that we would be here until midnight. If we then have actual votes on those amendments, I calculate that that would take us till at least 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. If we have an additional 5 minutes per side or debate on half of those amendments, that would take us until about 5 o'clock in the morning.

And if we have no time agreements on these amendments, we will be here at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. That is the reality of the clock that faces us.

So I want Members to understand why it is that we are going to be seeking time agreements if we do not, and the leadership has said we were not going to be here tomorrow, which means we may not start a session tomorrow but we are certainly going to be here tomorrow approaching noon unless we get time agreements on these amendments. So I just wanted to put the House on notice that the gentleman and I are trying to reach an understanding on time limits and we need those time limits to be as tight as is reasonably possible.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida for whatever comments he may wish to make.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I double-checked his math and he is exactly right about the time it would take us to conclude these amendments.

I noticed where there are three or four, sometimes six amendments with the exact same title. I am not sure what that is, but that could be a big time delay. But here is where we are. We have to finish this bill today, whether this legislative day runs over until tomorrow or Saturday or whatever. The reason is very simple. We have to have the weekend to prepare for a conference with the other body early next week.

Now, if we do not have that conference with the other body early next week, we do not get a conference report back to the House before the end of next Friday. And if Members recall, the following week is scheduled to be a district work period. So if we extend this bill beyond today, in effect, we cannot get to the conference until next week sometime, and we cannot have a conference report by the end of the next week.

So what I would hope is that we could look at some of these amendments, and if there are redundancies and duplications, why bother with them? Why do we not just do one on a subject rather than three or four? I am trying to help tonight to let us prepare the conference over the weekend, give the membership a conference report next week, and then do what it is that everyone plans to do back in their districts during the district work period. So the gentleman is exactly right.

And if we spend a lot of time hassling over the time limits, that actually eats into the clock as well. So we really want to try to expedite this. We need to get this bill out of here. This is a wartime bill, and our troops are on the field. And I appreciate the gentleman calling this to our attention, because he is absolutely right.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and I would just ask Members to be understanding of the time problem that we face and to recognize that we have to ask them to agree to tight time limits that are going to be here until the cows come home.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that I am against this war. All my actions have pointed toward my opposition to the utilization of war as an option. But I believe it is important to again restate the support that we have for the troops, and to acknowledge that some have been characteristically avowed and that those of us who support the troops are actually undermining them. As we proceed through this debate, I think it is important to respect Members who have different perspectives and, as well, to allow their amendments to be presented that will characterize the diversity in this Congress.

There was a different vote on the Turkey issue. My vote was to vote not to penalize a sovereign Nation, a democracy which we disagree with. I believe in restoring diplomatic relations with Germany and France and others who have been our friends in the past.

I also believe that, as my leadership believes, that we should do more for homeland defense and homeland security. I also believe that there is not enough in this supplemental that deals with creating the peace, beginning peace discussions and stopping to discuss peace. And I will look forward to debating an amendment that deals with beginning peace talks as we speak, for it is important to note that we do have a difference of opinion but we do want our troops home and we want them to be safe.

I think if we proceed under these auspices, or this umbrella, then this will truly be a democracy reflective of all of us that we can stand proudly in support of our flag and our Nation, because many of us agree that there are other options, and certainly peace should be one.

So I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to supporting efforts to restore the diplomacy that we have had with other nations, to ensure that we look to rebuild Iraq, to be sure we begin the discussion of peace and, as well, that we support our troops.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 1559 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 172 no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:
Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate; amendments numbered 2, 7, 8 and 9 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. If the chair will suspend, the request being offered by the chairman must be made in the whole House. It cannot be acted upon in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Davis of Virginia) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1559), making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations and continuing certain operations and expenses for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) had been disposed of, and the bill was open from page 3 line 3 through page 9 line 11.

Pursuant to the previous order of the House, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate; amendments numbered 2, 7, 8, and 9 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and amendments specified in the list placed at the desk. Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole; any point of order against such an amendment shall be considered as reserved pending completion of debate thereon; and any such amendment may be withdrawn by its proponent after debate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will read the list.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. McGovern regarding reducing funding for counter-drug activities; Mr. Obey regarding cuts for Colombia money transferred to port security; Mr. DeFazio regarding limiting funding for Turkey and increasing for National Guard; Mr. DeFazio regarding limitation on military activity not authorized by Congress; Mr. Sherman regarding non-proliferation; Mr. Sherman regarding economic support fund; Mr. Reyes regarding money to joint task force for borders; Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas regarding $50 million for SEVIS; Mr. Nadler regarding port security; Mr. Wu and Mr. Scott regarding airline bailout; Mr. Flake regarding airline bailout; Mr. Millender-McDonald regarding transit security; Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas regarding Office for Domestic Preparedness; Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas regarding Office for Domestic Preparedness; Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Substance Abuse/ Medical Health; Mr. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Department of Health and Human Services; Mr. Allen regarding IDEA and No Child Left Behind Act, no offset; Mr. Crowley regarding $100 million for Iraq limit; Mr. Crowley regarding Hero bill; Mr. DeFazio regarding unemployment compensation for airline workers; Mr. Edwards regarding airline-line discontinuation of service near bases; Mr. Israel regarding Commercial Airline Protection for Surface to Air Missiles; Mr. Kucinich regarding Limitation Amendment that require all contracts acquired for the reconstruction of Iraq to be subject to competitive bidding, as stated in the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the USAID Acquisition Regulation; Mr. Kucinich regarding limitation amendment that restricts funds in Title I, Chapter 3 “Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund,” Mr. Rangel regarding $450 million for Iraq to school improvement; Mr. Rodriguez regarding adding $70 million for veterans health care; Mr. Turner regarding homeland security report; Ms. Waters regarding conflict of interest; Ms. Waters regarding HUD community development; Mr. Hoefel regarding strike $80 million from Colombia. Transfer peacekeeping mission in Iraq; Mr. Stupak regarding health care for Iraq; Mr. Wu regarding airline bailout; Mr. Rothman regarding supplemental appropriation; Mr. Hoeffeller regarding limitation on use of Iraq funds; Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota regarding limitation on the use of Iraq funds; and Mr. Hoeftstra regarding AmeriCorps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. Obey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the Clerk read two or three amendments to be potentially offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. Waters)?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 172 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1559.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. Thornberry in the chair.

The Clerk reads the title of the bill.

In the Committee of the Whole...
For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Navy”, $3,940,300,000, of which $1,000,000,000 shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, $1,383,700,000, of which $786,000,000 shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, $3,688,200,000, of which $800,000,000 shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, $901,900,000.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, $58,400,000.

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, $3,301,700,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement (Transfer of Funds)”, $3,301,700,000.

For an additional amount for “Air Force Procurement”, $4,100,000.

For an additional amount for “Army Procurement”, $4,100,000.

For an additional amount for “Army Procurement”, $53,300,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $447,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, $241,800,000.

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Air Force”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (Transfer of Funds)”, $11,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, $11,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $90,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense Operations, and Support Reconstitution Costs (Transfer of Funds)”, $11,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army”, $3,301,700,000.

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $447,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, $241,800,000.

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Air Force”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, $11,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide”, $90,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps”, $1,383,700,000, of which $786,000,000 shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, $3,688,200,000, of which $800,000,000 shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide”, $901,900,000.

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard”, $58,400,000.

For an additional amount for “Defense Health Program”, $3,301,700,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement (Transfer of Funds)”, $3,301,700,000.

For an additional amount for “Air Force Procurement”, $4,100,000.

For an additional amount for “Army Procurement”, $4,100,000.

For an additional amount for “Army Procurement”, $53,300,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement of Ammunition, Army”, $447,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Army”, $241,800,000.

For an additional amount for “Other Procurement, Air Force”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Defense-Wide”, $451,000,000.

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (Transfer of Funds)”, $11,500,000.

For an additional amount for “Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army”, $11,500,000.
to quickly move in terms of long-term security presence to peacekeepers from our allies in Europe, from other partners, from organizations of international stature, such as the United Nations, or more likely perhaps NATO; and we need to understand the need to move toward that. We need to establish the rule of law in Iraq as part of peacekeeping, and we will need an international team of legal experts and judges and prosecutors to form a transitional justice team and a civilian police. The United Nations have made that organization probably incapable of the kind of robust peacekeeping that we are going to need.

I would suggest to the House that we look at NATO. That is the kind of organization that can lift a great part of the burden from American taxpayers and yet deliver robust and effective peacekeeping in Iraq after our victory. It is time now to understand the need to internationalize our burdens, not to try to do this all ourselves, to plan ahead and to make sure we call upon international agencies like NATO to help us in the tasks to come after our military victory.

For a variety of reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw this amendment. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) and the ranking member (Mr. Obey) of the Committee on Appropriations for their cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. ZOFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. McGovern:

In chapter 3 of title I, in the item relating to "DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "reduced by $34,000,000".

In chapter 4 of title I, in the item relating to "ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "reduced by $27,000,000".

In chapter 5 of title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS", after the first and second dollar amounts, insert the following: "increased by $34,000,000".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida for a time request.

MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG OF FLORIDA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) and any amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself as the points of order, and any other amendments that may be offered.

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, as I said earlier, we have over 40 amendments left to go. I understand this is an important amendment. We just had an hour on an amendment from the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo) that was considered important. If we provide 40 minutes' time for this amendment, I do not want the expectation to be that we will do that for every other amendment. I would hope that we understand that this is the last amendment we would ask significant time for, and Members can expect us to ask unanimous consent in order to hold each future amendment to considerably less time than this.

Mr. YOUNG OF FLORIDA. Mr. Chairman, if under his reservation the gentleman would continue to yield, I will do my best to make that work on my side.

If the gentleman would continue to yield, as to our Members so they can make some plans for the evening, while we will still continue and intend to complete this bill sometime tonight, I would ask the Chair that we not have any votes prior to 8 p.m., rolls votes until 8, so Members can have time for dinner or whatever.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) is recognized.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. Delaurie) to add $34 million to the Office of Domestic Preparedness for assistance to State and local first responders. I would have preferred to increase those funds by $61 million, but the Committee on Rules last night would not allow even that modest sum to go to our first responders.

This amendment is very simple. It adds $34 million for our first responders, and it strikes $61 million in military funds for Colombia. My amendment does not touch additional funds for hostage search and rescue missions in Colombia. This amendment does not touch funds to strengthen security for President Uribe, and it does not touch at least $25 million in other military assistance in this bill, funds which could be used for bomb detection, for extending the Colombian Government's control over zones of conflict, or for other purposes.

This amendment is a very modest increase for the men and women who are on the front lines of security right here at home, and a very modest reduction in military funds for Colombia.

Most of my colleagues know that I have grave concerns about our policy in Colombia. I am even more deeply concerned that we never seem to get an opportunity to debate that policy except when money is being slipped in through the back door in supplemental appropriation bills that are focused on other critical issues like the war in Iraq.

Members may disagree with me on our policy in Colombia, but they cannot disagree that these funds are needed more at home right now than they are needed in Colombia.

I just returned from 1 week in Colombia, and I saw first hand what the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights in Bogota just reported to the Human Rights Commission in Geneva. Violence and human rights crimes by the paramilitary guerillas are on the increase. Human rights
I know that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is concerned that terrorist groups like al Qaeda rely in part on drug money to finance their operations. Every Member of this House is concerned about that. But al Qaeda's drug money comes from South Asian poppy fields, not Colombia. In Colombia, drug money permeates all sectors of society. It helps finance Colombia's 40-year-old civil war. And let me suggest that one of the best ways to deal with the drug problem in America is by making certain that we have enough law enforcement officers on our own city streets. So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment, support our police, our firefighters and our public safety officers at home, to pass this amendment for their own hometown.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOELBE).

Mr. KOELBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to talk about this amendment which does affect both the defense chapters as well as the foreign assistance chapter. The supplemental bill before the House today has the same level as the President's request for funding for Colombia in the Foreign Assistance Chapter. It includes $37 million foreign military financing and $34 million from the Andean Counterdrug Initiative. The McGovern amendment would cut $27 million from the Andean Counterdrug Initiative and $94 million from the funds in the Department of Defense Chapter. It leaves in the foreign military financing assistance and $7 million of the Andean Counterdrug Initiative.

Let me begin by saying about my opposition to the amendment that the funding in supplemental legislation for Colombia is subject to all of the restrictions and conditions that exist under current law. These funds are not exempt from those conditions. The funds are subject to human rights certification. They are subject to Colombia's spraying condition, conditions on the use of U.S. helicopters, the rules of engagement, and there is more. In fact, let me emphasize to my colleagues that there is no provision in the foreign assistance legislation that is subject to more conditions than these funds, with the possible exception of those funds provided for the West Bank and Gaza.

I apparently do not need to remind the House that Colombia is South America's oldest democracy, but it is a country that is torn by decades of civil strife. It has endemic violence, corruption, deep socioeconomic inequalities, weak institutions, and a serious economic recession, all exacerbated by the illegal production and trafficking. Drug profits play the motivating factor in inciting the terrorism that is killing 3,500 Colombian citizens every year. It is in the national interest of the United States to promote better stability in Colombia by helping it address these longstanding problems and confronting the socially corrosive drug industry.

But for the first time since becoming chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, I have some good news to share with my colleagues. Our eradication efforts with President Uribe's administration and with his assistance are making a difference in Colombia.

The last half of 2002 and the first half of 2003 marks a turning point in the struggle by the United States and Colombia against narcotrafficking and terrorism. We have made significant progress; but as a result, the narcoterrorist groups have become desperate.

President Uribe and his senior administration officials, in office only since August of 2002, have demonstrated the will and the ability to fight narcotrafficking and terrorism at their roots. Therefore, the terrorists are now targeting him and other officials for assassination. Funding in this supplemental will provide much-needed security upgrades for official facilities and training for Colombian security personnel to reduce the threat of assassinations.

I would urge my colleagues to recognize the situation in Colombia, to recognize that U.S. national interest in a stable Colombia is important, to recognize that we are making a difference. Reducing U.S. support at this time would send the wrong message to the FARC and to the paramilitaries.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the McGovern amendment. (Mrs. LOWEY was given permission to include a statement at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The additional funding requested for Colombia has no place in this bill. More importantly, it adds funding in support of a policy that is essentially flawed. President Uribe's election gave us some initial hope that he would engage all the disparate elements of the conflict with new ideas and a real commitment to bring lasting peace.

Unfortunately, what we have seen is an escalation of activity from guerrilla organizations, increasing influence and control by paramilitary organizations, no reduction in coca cultivation, and a slippage in the commitment to prosecute human rights abuses.

I have no illusion about the complexity of the problems of Colombia, but I do not think we should be adding funds to expand our commitment there at this point. Make no mistake: we are headed toward the direct involvement of U.S. troops in that conflict. I regret the fact that there are U.S. hostages in FARC camps, and I support all efforts to rescue them, but this funding goes beyond that and expands the involvement of U.S. personnel on the ground.

If the policy were balanced and we had a real commitment on the part of the Colombian government to deal with all aspects of the problem—including the rapidly expanding drug trafficking by paramilitary organizations—it might be different. Unfortunately we don't, and the influence of these organizations and their cooperation with the Colombian military increases daily. The Colombian military has succeeded in decreasing the control that rebel groups have enjoyed in certain parts of the country. But these successful military operations have been followed up by paramilitary units moving in to these same areas and taking control. This has occurred in the Buena Ventura port area on the Pacific Coast of Colombia, which is a primary drug transshipment port near the town of Cali. And we also have seen no action by the Colombians to arrest indicted members of the Paramilitaries.

Until we have a balanced policy with a real commitment by the Colombian government to deal with all aspects of the problem, our funding for eradication and military training only serves to inflame, not to stop, the conflict. I urge my colleagues to move funding away from these purposes, and instead invest it in homeland security—where it can make a positive difference in the lives of the American people.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my friend and co-sponsor.

The previous speaker spoke about national interest. This amendment provides at least some critical assistance to national interest, and that is of dealing with all aspects of the problem, our funding for eradication today is about the war in Iraq. It is about the crucial ongoing operations in the region of Afghanistan, and it is about protecting the American people and future acts of terrorism. This war is expensive, and its aftermath will be more expensive still. And I must tell the Members, Mr. Chairman, I have deep concerns and I am troubled so very much about the aftermath after we have a victory in Iraq because that of course will be the proof in the pudding as to whether the young men and young women's sacrifices have been in vain.
Mr. Chairman, the Uribe administration has made more progress in 7 months than we have seen in many years. Vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I repeat, this amendment supports first responders. It does not touch $44 million of military aid in Colombia. A few weeks ago this Congress approved $500 million in military aid to Colombia, most of which is not even in the pipeline yet, and we can handle the rest of Colombia’s needs and have this debate through the regular appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), another cosponsor of this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer this amendment with my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton).

It would reduce military and security assistance to Colombia and send $60 million to the Office of Domestic Preparedness for assistance to State and local first responders.

Today our country is at war and the Nation’s threat level is high. I heard in my district a few weeks ago when I met with police, fire, and emergency medical personnel that there is a serious need in our cities and towns to provide funding for first responders in our fight against terrorism. Our localities have already spent in excess of $3 billion to meet their homeland security needs; and with this economy, with States in the single worst fiscal crisis since World War II, we cannot expect them to shoulder the full burden. Any bill to fund the war must also provide these towns and counties with the funds they need to safeguard their communities.

This bill includes provisions that have nothing to do with meeting our homeland and security needs or funding the war in Iraq. In particular, I am talking about the substantial military aid for Colombia. In fact, this bill contains more military and security assistance for Colombia, $105 million, than the amount that nearly every State will receive for first responders. And what is so urgent at this particular moment about our objectives in Colombia that could not be addressed in the annual appropriations process? Why is this funding in an emergency bill meant to address Iraq?

I am concerned that this funding for Colombia may signal an escalation of our military involvement there. If this is true, then we have an obligation to have a full debate here in the Congress and reconsider our objectives there rather than simply approve additional funding without any debate at all.

No matter how we feel about our involvement in Colombia, this bill is not the vehicle by which we should be making serious policy decisions regarding the escalation of our involvement.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) for his leadership.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Tom Davis).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I believe that this amendment would be a huge mistake for this House; so I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which proposes cutting vitally needed assistance to Colombia and the Andean region. Quite simply, now is not the time to turn our backs on the progress we are making against narcoterrorism in Colombia.

General James Hill, the commander of the U.S. Southern Command, said recently that the so-called narcoterrorists operating in Colombia and throughout Latin America fuel and fund worldwide terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah. Our counternarcotics and counterterror initiatives in Colombia are finally beginning to bear fruit. For example, last month John Walters, the director of the Office of National Drug Policy, announced promising new estimates of coca eradication in Colombia, and these estimates account for the intensified spraying that has occurred since President Uribe took office in 2002. It would be foolish for us to send this message to the Colombian Government now and for us to derail this program just as it is beginning to succeed.

The administration has requested the allocation of supplemental funding to support the Uribe administration’s commitment to stamp out terrorists, reduce the level of narcotics trafficking, and eventually eliminate his nation’s supply of drugs. President Uribe’s aggressive approach to counternarcotics and antiterrorist programs has seen significant results in a very short period of time.

Our 2003 funding was developed prior to President Uribe’s taking office, and it is not sufficient to appropriately and effectively fund the current pace of our counternarcotics operations. Supplemental funding would provide Colombia with several essential tools and resources such as equipment to detect threats against U.S. and Colombian officials and increase capabilities to enhance existing eradication efforts.

After a recent visit with President Uribe in Bogota, I can tell the Members of this Congress that the Colombian Government’s commitment is strong. President Uribe’s administration is working to enhance state presence in vast areas of the country that have lacked it for decades. They have the popular support of a vast majority of Colombians to beef up and spray eradication efforts, impose new taxes, to strengthen their police and military, and reform their beleaguered criminal justice system.

Of course, challenges remain. The FARC, ELN, and AUC continue to hold sway over large portions of the countryside where there is little, if any, state presence. The narcotics terrorists have also shown no respect for human rights and do not value human rights. They have murdered and kidnapped innocent men and women and children including American citizens. As we prepare to reaffirm our commitment to the demand side of the war on drugs by reauthorizing drug policy legislation in this Congress, it is imperative that we continue to closely monitor both progress and setbacks on the supply side in Colombia.

With military intervention in Iraq underway and concerns about homeland security here at an all-time high, it is important we do not overlook the battle against narcoterrorism going on in Colombia. It is part and parcel of our international antiterrorist efforts.

In the past, Colombia’s government and a Colombia club frequented by families and with police, fire, and emergency medical personnel that there is a serious need in our cities and towns to provide funding for first responders. And what is so urgent at this particular moment about our objectives in Colombia that could not be addressed in the annual appropriations process? Why is this funding in an emergency bill meant to address Iraq?

I am concerned that this funding for Colombia may signal an escalation of our military involvement there. If this is true, then we have an obligation to have a full debate here in the Congress and reconsider our objectives there rather than simply approve additional funding without any debate at all.

No matter how we feel about our involvement in Colombia, this bill is not the vehicle by which we should be making serious policy decisions regarding the escalation of our involvement.
I urge my colleagues, do right by their cities, their towns, police, fire, emergency medical personnel. Support this amendment. Give first responders the resources they need to keep their communities safe.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLenger).

Mr. BALLenger. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) that would cut $34 million in Colombian assistance provided by the Defense Department and $27 million earmarked for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative to be added to the Office of Domestic Preparedness.

Mr. Chairman, it really makes no sense at this time to direct additional funds to the Office of Domestic Preparedness when $331 million remains unspent from a previous allocation of $404 million.

President Uribe of Colombia is showing real leadership in the face of drug-financed terrorism. His life is always in danger. Our drug czar, John Walters, recently testified before my subcommittee about Colombia’s record progress in eliminating illegal drugs. The governor of a leading drug-producing area in Colombia, Putamayo, was in my office just this week telling me of additional successful efforts in his Putamayo district. In fact, drug production in Putamayo has already been reduced from 66 million hectares to 13 million hectares. That is a reduction of 80 percent over 2 years.

Cutting aid to Colombia would also remove search and rescue funding, even as we work to return three Americans who are being held by the FARC.

Mr. Chairman, the drug war continues. Our homeland security compels every effort to fight the drug scourge that continues to kill our children, up to 30,000 a year. Compare that to Iraq. We have an ally in Colombia who is fighting this war for us. Let us not reduce our efforts when we are finally winning.

I urge a “no” vote on the McGovern amendment.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Chairman, I need to repeat this, because I think we need to deal with facts here. Not one dime of search and rescue money is touched by my amendment. So we can disagree on policy, but we should stick to the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOretta Sanchez).

Ms. LOretta Sanchez of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my frustration and my disappointment that our first responders are being neglected in this effort to supplement the cost of the war. I am disappointed on behalf of the first responders in our district in Orange County, California. I am disappointed because the police in Anaheim, California, are being forced to spend an additional $20,640 a day to maintain their readiness under the orange threat level. Mr. Chairman, $20,640 per day. This is telling us these local officers at what level they must remain alert and yet adequate funding is not being provided. This mirrors what is going on all across our nation.

All of our first responders are responding every single day to the threat that still exists against this country. They are responding with additional officers, with additional sergeants, and with the additional overtime necessary to keep their forces alert. Our first responders are fighting the war, and we should be funding them.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Souder).

Mr. Souder. Mr. Chairman, first I think it is important that we review why we are in Colombia. Colombia is in the eastern hemisphere that let it be overtaken by the narco-terrorists.

Violence there in Colombia is primarily because of U.S. and European drug addiction. Violence in the U.S., 26,000 deaths a year, far exceeds the terrorist deaths we have in the United States.

Colombia is an important trading partner. Colombia is a model of democracy, the oldest in South America. Colombia is an energy supplier to the U.S., a supply that has been basically blocked by the narco-terrorists.

Now, the fundamental question. If we have all of these compelling reasons to be in Colombia, more than probably any other Nation where we have troops at this point, the question comes, why are we cutting it and what are we cutting?

The gentleman from Massachusetts, who I consider a friend, we do not agree on this subject, but I know he has been down there as I have many times. We have looked at it. We do not agree on some fundamental facts. He sees the glass half empty, I see it half full. We have been making progress on human rights, we have been making progress on controlling the terrorism, and we need to make more aggressive progress and keep it up.

His amendment proposes to cut the funding that provides the intelligence base with which to do the rest of the operations. He did not cut the funding to protect President Uribe, which is critical. The man is under daily attack. They are trying to kill him like they killed his father, like they threatened his family. But we are going to cut the intelligence in this bill to protect Uribe.

We say that we want the Colombian units to go out and eradicate the drugs, but we want to cut with this amendment the money that would enable us to identify where the drugs are. We say we want to help the Colombians tackle the problem, but we are cutting with this amendment the military assistance from SOUTHCOM to help train those Colombian units. That is the $34 million he has in particular targeted, the money that goes to SOUTHCOM.

Now, General Hill from SOUTHCOM said that the terrorist threat coming from Colombia through the narco-terrorists is greater than the other terrorist threats. What does he mean precisely by that? Did he mean al Qaeda, did he mean Hezbollah in Colombia? There may be future ties to the money, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, that the greatest funding of the al Qaeda has come from Asian heroin. However, Hamas, the Russian Mafia, and others have started to interconnect with the narco-terrorists.

Let us be blunt here. I have spent the last 2 years doing hearings on our north and south border. We have better control over Middle Eastern illegal immigrants right now, with the possible exception of at Buffalo, than do our south border. We are completely vulnerable right now to terrorist attacks coming from Hispanic attacks, coming from the south, particularly the FARC and Mexican Mafia-type groups who are directed at us.

As we are more effective in Colombia, as we cut off this multibillion-dollar industry of selling narcotics to the United States, those groups are going to fight back. As they have developed with our money, with our drug users’ in the United States money, as they have developed the shoulder packs with which to attack, as they have had the ability to shoot down our helicopters to go off and take down military forces in Colombia, as they bring that to our soil, we better be focused on Colombia. We better be going after those terrorist groups as well.

I strongly oppose this amendment which would cripple our operations.

The following is a letter to other Members of Congress sent online today by Chairman TOM Davis and me:

Dear Colleague: We strongly encourage you to oppose the McGovern Amendment to cut vitally needed assistance to Colombia and the Andean region. In a time of war, withdrawing America’s aid to help end political instability and conflict in our own hemisphere is shortsighted and against our national interests for several reasons:

Colombian Instability Directly Threatens U.S. National Security: Political violence and instability in Colombia threatens the security of the United States as much as the instability in the Andean region.

Colombia is now engaged in war. Three Americans have been held hostage in Colombia since January by the FARC, which the State Department has designated as a foreign terrorist organization. Other major groups fighting against the democratically elected Government of Colombia have also been designated as terrorist organizations. Recently, it was revealed that Osama bin Laden had visited the tri-border region in South America to...
meet with terrorists. The supplemental funding is directed to a serious and proven national security threat in America’s own hemisphere.

Drug Eradication Efforts Are Succeeding: Nearly 20,000 Americans die each year of drug-induced causes—substantially more than the toll terrorism has taken in the United States in many years. A direct result of U.S.-funded drug control programs. Our efforts have finally reached a turning point, and it would be foolish to cut off the program just as it is beginning to succeed.

Domestic Preparedness Funding Is Currently Available: Currently appropriated funding is already available for assistance in first responders and has not yet been obligated.

Plan Colombia Aids Human Rights: The State Department’s annual Human Rights report this week examined violations of human rights on all sides of the complex conflict in Colombia. American assistance through Plan Colombia addresses human rights issues by providing $200 million in aid to directly improve human rights and administration of justice, preserve the environment, and foster economic development. Further, by bolstering political stability and the acceleration of peace in Colombia American assistance aims to end the root conflicts driving human rights violations.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me repeat, we just approved a few weeks ago $500 million in military assistance to Colombia. Most of that is not even in the pipeline yet. Mr. Chairman, $44 million remains in the supplemental bill that is untouched. The President has requested an additional $700 million for this Congress to consider in the foreign ops and defense provisions bill. We are introducing this amendment because we care very much about our hometown security in the United States of America which is being shortchanged. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. Schakowsky).

Ms. Schakowsky. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disappointed that we cannot just assure our first responders that we must adequately fund our homeland security needs. The McGovern-Skelton-DeLauro amendment moves us in the right direction, cutting $61 million in the bill for Colombia and redirecting resources to states that need it most.

I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

Having traveled to Colombia, I know it is important for the United States to support our neighbor. However, I cannot support sending additional millions above the billions we have already sent to that country to be used for military equipment and military purposes in a failed counternarcotics and counter-insurgency effort. I cannot support this effort, because despite increased U.S. funding the violence in that country persists.

According to the State Department, the Colombian Government is still implicated in gross human rights abuses. I certainly cannot support sending additional aid to Colombia for the wrong reasons, before guaranteeing my constituents that our homeland security needs are met. We are far from being able to make that guarantee.

As of today, every single municipality in my district has informed me that their homeland needs are desperately underfunded. One firefighter in my district told me that he prays every single day when he goes to work that no terrorist attack will occur, because he knows the city he works in, despite all of its best efforts, does not have the necessary resources to respond.

The war in Iraq has exacerbated the problem. Firefighters and police officers from my district have been deployed to the Persian Gulf and their departments do not have the funds to hire replacements. Coast Guard cutters controlling the Great Lakes for suspicious vessels have been redeployed to the Persian Gulf, and our public health infrastructure is not equipped to handle terrorist attacks that have been identified as greater threats to our security than Iraq or the war in Colombia.

How dare we send more money to Colombia, ostensibly for its security, than we are sending to first responders in 49 States in our own Nation? I urge all Members to correct this misguided approach to national security. Support the McGovern-Skelton-DeLauro amendment.

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. Mica).

Mr. Mica. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman who has offered this amendment has intended, and that is to assist our first responders, and we want to make certain that those who are protecting our streets, those who are protecting and defending our infrastructure, who are the threat of terrorism have the adequate resources to do that. But this is, unfortunately, an ill-conceived amendment. It would do a great deal of damage.

I have chaired the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice and Drug Policy, and I can tell my colleagues that we finally have the opportunity, the glimmer of hope of bringing under control some of the devastation that is being wrought by the illegal narcotics that are being produced in Colombia. Today, Colombia produces 90 percent of the cocaine and 60 percent of the heroin sold or seized on America’s streets. To put this in perspective for my colleagues, drug-related deaths in the United States now exceed homicides. Fifty American lives are lost every day. Before this day ends, 50 Americans will die in the streets and communities across our Nation, most of them young people, and more of the deaths will be related to drugs and narcotics coming from Colombia.

This is a bad amendment and bad timing, because we have a President now who is supportive of our efforts to curb terrorism, to curb narcoterrorism, and we cannot cut the millions coming into our streets and communities and killing countless Americans.

So I ask for my colleagues’ careful consideration and defeat of the McGovern amendment. I know it is well-intended, but it is inappropriate at this time.

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would advise the Chair that I have only one remaining speaker to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman has concluded his time.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I feel I need to repeat this one more time. This Congress just a few weeks ago approved $500 million for Colombia. Most of that is not even in the pipeline yet. In the supplemental, we do not touch $44 million. The President has requested an additional $700 million in mostly military aid. We are throwing more money at Colombia than Colombia can absorb. But in my city of Worcester, Massachusetts, they are laying off 20 police officers and 20 firefighters, and that is happening all over my State and all over this country. That means more drugs and more crime, and that is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Watson).

Ms. Watson. Mr. Chairman, I support the McGovern amendment because Los Angeles is a very likely target for a terrorist attack. Our city is known worldwide for its famous landmarks and notable economic assets.

Local transportation hubs, such as the port of Los Angeles and Los Angeles International Airport, are the transit points each day for thousands and millions of people and millions of dollars’ worth of goods. Los Angeles is a center of international tourism, not just for the Southern California area but for the Nation as a whole, accomodating more than 60 million passengers from 28 different countries. LAX handles more than 2 million tons of airborne cargo each year.

I talk about the lives of people being affected by drugs coming up from Colombia, but what about the lives of people who might be at the wrong place at the wrong time because they happen to be at LAX, and we have not allocated any funds to help the first responders?

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of priority. As we have heard over and over
Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the reason to support this amendment is simple: States and local governments are being forced to lay off first responders: police, firefighters, and emergency medical workers. The amount of funding in the committee-passed bill remains inadequate to meet these needs. Our amendment will help provide a modest increase for these men and women who carry the burden of protecting our hometowns from terrorism and other threats.

The costs of the Iraq conflict are steep and the needs of our own domestic security are critical. This supplement is unlikely not to be the last to pay for war-related expenses. Many of us in Congress also share a deep concern about the costs of rebuilding Iraq and providing for its government in transition.

At the same time, with the Nation at war, our priority must remain with these efforts. While the war with Iraq justifies emergency supplemental appropriations to support our troops overseas and to protect our security here at home, there is no such emergency with respect to Colombia that would justify deviating further from the regular order of the authorization and appropriations schedule, especially when our first responders remain in real need of additional funds.

As I have said over and over in this debate, we are throwing more money at Colombia than Colombia can absorb. But in all of our communities, even those that have risen in opposition to this amendment, there is a real need with our local law enforcement community among our first responders for additional funds so they can meet the security needs of their communities.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment in no way distracts from our efforts to combat terrorism or narcotics in Colombia at risk. What this amendment does, it strengthens our war against drugs and strengthens our war against crime and strengthens our security right here at home by providing more assistance to our local police officers.

As I have said before, in my home city of Worcester, Massachusetts, 20 police officers are about to be laid off, 20 firefighters are about to be laid off. That does not enhance the security of our community. That is not unique. It is happening all over this country. We have an opportunity to respond to that crisis.

This is the time to do it. This is a good amendment, this is a reasonable amendment, and I would urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the McGovern-Skelton-Delau amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, who will close.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is perhaps no free people and democratic government in the world that faces a more serious threat from terrorism, and specifically narcoterrorism, than the government of Colombia.

The narcoterrorists in Colombia, because of the fact that they are engaged in the drug traffic, have hundreds of millions, indeed, billions of dollars at their disposal to purchase the most deadly weapons available from rogue states and terrorist groups from throughout the world to cause the most serious damage conceivable.

Those billions of dollars available to the narcoterrorists in Colombia have made it possible for them to engage in a sustained campaign of extraordinary violence against the people of the most horrible conceivable crimes against the Colombian people. Day in and day out the Colombian people and their democratically elected government are fighting the narcoterrorists in an extraordinary way, a valiant way, an admirable way.

What we are doing in this Congress, with the support of the President of the United States, and, indeed, his orientation and his leadership, is we are saying to the Colombian people and their democratically elected government that we support them in their effort against narcoterrorists who have billions of dollars for death and destruction at their service, at their disposal.

These tens of millions of dollars that we are discussing today may be able to be categorized, as they were by the sponsor of this amendment, as a modest proposal. But the challenge before us is not a modest challenge, the challenge posed by the tens of thousands of murderers who engage in thousands of kidnappings each year, including, and I have the latest travel warning from the United States State Department. 26 Americans who are reported as kidnapped in recent months in Colombia.

Those terrorists have, as I said before, billions of dollars at their disposal. Yes, we are, in the words of the sponsor of this amendment, dealing with a modest, a modest amount, tens of millions of dollars in aid, for a democratically elected government that is fighting against the most violent terrorists perhaps on the face of the Earth today, terrorists that attack not only military personnel but civilians, and engage in systematic violence against a people who live in a democracy.

I urge my colleagues to reject, to vote down this ill-timed and ill-conceived amendment and to support our leadership, to support the President, to support the efforts against narcoterrorism that are embodied in our support for the democratically elected government of Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members not to record their votes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by Mr. DeLauro.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by Mr. MCGOVERN.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members not to record their votes on this amendment.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

SEC. 1301. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this chapter, amounts provided to the Department of Defense under each of the headings in this chapter shall be available for the same time period, and subject to the same terms and conditions, as the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002, Public Law 107–248, and Making Further Continuing Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2003, and for Other Purposes, (Public Law 107–6).

SEC. 1302. None of the funds in this chapter may be used to initiate a new start program without prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 1306. Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003, (Public Law 107–248), is amended, under the heading ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’ by striking ‘‘$25,000,000’’ and inserting ‘‘$50,000,000’’. Provided, That the additional funds for the CINC Initiative Fund made available by this section may be expended notwithstanding the limitations in section 166a(1) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 1307. In addition to amounts made available by this Act in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003, (Public Law 107–248), and Making Further Continuing Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2003, and for Other Purposes, (Public Law 107–6), the additional funds for the CINC Initiative Fund provided by this section may be used to develop or procure any item or capability that will not be fielded within five years of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1308. Title II of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003, (Public Law 107–248), is amended, under the heading ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’ by striking ‘‘$34,500,000’’ and inserting ‘‘$69,000,000’’.

SEC. 1309. Section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003, (Public Law 107–248), is amended—

(1) by inserting ‘‘May 31’’ in the fourth proviso and inserting ‘‘June 30’’; and

(2) by striking the sixth proviso, as added by section 112 of division M of Public Law 107–248, beginning with ‘‘as provided further’’ and ending with ‘‘to which transferred’’.

SEC. 1311. In addition to amounts made available elsewhere in this Act for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003, (Public Law 107–248), and Making Further Continuing Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2003, and for Other Purposes, (Public Law 107–6), the additional funds for the CINC Initiative Fund provided by this section may be used to develop or procure any item or capability that will not be fielded within five years of enactment of this Act.
value of drawdown support provided by the Department of Defense under the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002: Provided, That this appropriation shall not increase the limit in section 202(b) of that Act: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided herein to the applicable appropriations of the Department of Defense: Provided further, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the funds to which they are transferred: Provided further, that notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act for the Department of Defense may be used for the drawdown authority in section 202 of the Afghanistan Freedom Support Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–327) prior to notifying in writing the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations of the source of the funds to be used for such purpose.

SEC. 1308. Funds appropriated in this Act, or made available by transfer of funds in or pursuant to this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414.).

SEC. 1309. (a) Of the amounts available to the Secretary of Defense, $65,500,000 may be used to reimburse forthwith available appropriations for the value of support provided by the Department of Defense under the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (including the drawdown authority in section (4)(a)(2) of Iraq Liberation Act of 1998): Provided further, That the use of such funds shall not increase the limitation set forth in section 202(b) of law 107–327 prior to notifying in writing the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: Provided further, That this appropriation shall not increase the limitation set forth in section 202(b) of that Act: (b) Section 4(a)(2) of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 is amended by adding the following subparagraph at the end: "(C) The aggregate value (as defined in section 649m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) of assistance provided under this paragraph, not to exceed $150,000,000 in fiscal year 2003."); (c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act for the Department of Defense may be used for the drawdown authority in section 4(a)(2) of Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (the drawdown authority of this section) unless the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations are notified in writing of the sources of the funds to be used for such purpose at least seven days prior to the exercise of the drawdown authority.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 1310. During fiscal year 2003, amounts in or credited to the Defense Cooperation Account under title 10 U.S.C. 2608(b) shall be available for obligation and expenditure consistent with the purposes for which such amounts are allocated and accepted: Provided, That such amounts shall only be available for transfer by the Secretary of Defense to the Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund for the same purposes and for the same time period as the funds to which they are transferred: Provided further, That such transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority available for the purposes of this Act or any other Act: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall report at least seven days in advance to the Congress of all proposed transfers to be made pursuant to this authority.

SEC. 1311. (a) Hereafter, contributions of money deposited into the 'Natural Resources Risk Remediation Fund' shall be reported in the same manner as the report required for contributions to the 'Defense Cooperation Account' under section 2608, chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) During fiscal years 2003 and 2004, the use of money or real or personal property contributed to the "Defense Cooperation Account' and the "Natural Resources Risk Remediation Fund' shall be subject to the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 1312. The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees, in writing, not later than 15 days prior to the obligation of funds appropriated in this chapter for military construction activities or minor construction in excess of $7,500,000.

SEC. 1313. As of October 31, 2003, all balances of funds remaining in the "Defense Emergency Response Fund' shall be transferred to, and merged with, the "Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund": Provided further, That, of the funds made available in this chapter for proliferation threat reduction funds, including Cooperative Threat Reduction funds, for the value of support provided by the Department of Defense under the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998: Provided further, That, of the funds made available in this chapter, not more than $35,000,000 may be made available for the Second Line of Defense Program to install radiation detection equipment at key transit points outside the former Soviet Union: Provided further, That, of the funds made available in this paragraph, not more than $35,000,000 must be made available for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Authority to use the Department of Energy to prevent smuggling of weapons of mass destruction.

Two of the most effective ways to do that are to give the President the authority to use the Department of Defense funds to dismantle nuclear and chemical weapons facilities around the world, and to support efforts by the Department of Energy to prevent smuggling of weapons of mass destruction throughout the Middle East and central Asia.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), and I have an amendment that would do just that. It provides the President with the authority that he has requested from Congress to expand the use of cooperative threat-reduction funds for projects and activities in countries outside the former Soviet Union.

My amendment also adds $5 million for Department of Defense nonproliferation programs; of that, $20 million for the Second Line of Defense Program to install radiation detection equipment at key transit points outside the former Soviet Union, and $35 million for materials protection control and accounting activities in regions of concern, including Iraq, should any dangerous agents be discovered there.

Both these provisions were contained in the Senate version of the supplemental that was approved by the Appropriations Committee just this past Tuesday. Additionally, CTR authority outside the former Soviet Union is urgently needed for the Defense Department to apply its unique knowledge and capabilities in places like Iraq if and when weapons of mass destruction are discovered.

The additional funds for the Department of Energy would allow for some of the same capability while also enhancing domestic security through radiation detection at transit points overseas.

Two years ago, former Senator Howard Baker and White House counsel Lloyd Cutler concluded, "The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nations and used against American troops abroad or citizens at home." Today it could not be any clearer that our homeland is at risk and that our troops are getting ever closer to potential weapons of mass destruction.
Congress has the duty to let the President use DOD and DOE nonproliferation programs to protect our homeland and our troops.

I understand that my amendment is subject to a point of order and I will withdraw it; but I deeply urge my colleagues to reject this proposal in conference, and I urge my colleagues who are conferees to please re-insert this language and support it in the conference.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk reads as follows:

CHAPTER 4
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FUNDs APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND
For an additional amount for “Child Survival and Health Programs Fund”, $400,000,000.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE
For an additional amount for “International Disaster Assistance”, $160,000,000: Provided, That amounts made available pursuant to section 492(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the purpose of addressing relief and rehabilitation needs in Iraq, prior to enactment of this Act, shall be in addition to the amount that may be obligated in any fiscal year under that section: Provided further, That the Disaster Assistance Fund, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, as amended, associated with these loans or loan guarantees, including any insurance risk: Provided further, That all fees associated with these loans or loan guarantees, including subsidy and administrative costs, shall be paid by the Government of Egypt to the Government of the United States: Provided further, That funds made available under this paragraph and other funds appropriated to the United States Government under the authority of this Act may be used by the Government of Egypt to pay such fees to the United States Government: Provided further, That the Government of Egypt, in determining the terms and conditions for issuing the economic assistance authorized by this paragraph and should take into consideration budgetary constraints undertaken by Egypt: Provided further, That if the President determines that these terms and conditions have been breached, the President may suspend or terminate the provision of all or part of such economic assistance not yet obligated under this paragraph; (3) not to exceed $1,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005, for grants for Turkey: Provided, That during the period beginning March 1, 2003 and ending September 30, 2005, direct loans or loan guarantees may be made to Turkey, the principal amount of direct loans or loans, any part of which is to be guaranteed, shall not exceed $8,500,000,000: Provided further, That the Government of Egypt, in determining the terms and conditions for issuing the economic assistance authorized by this paragraph and other funds appropriated to the United States Government under the authority of this Act may be used by the Government of Turkey to pay such fees to the United States Government: Provided further, That none of the funds made available by this paragraph and other funds appropriated to the United States Government under the authority of this Act may be used for assistance for Turkey until the Secretary of State determines and reports to the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate that, the Government of Turkey is cooperating with the United States in Operation Iraqi Freedom, including the provision of such humanitarian assistance to Iraq: Provided further, That the President shall determine the terms and conditions for issuing the economic assistance authorized by this paragraph and shall take into consideration budgetary constraints undertaken by Turkey: Provided further, That if the President determines that these terms and conditions have been breached, the President may suspend or terminate the provision of all or part of such economic assistance not yet obligated under this paragraph; (4) not to exceed $5,000,000 may be available for administrative expenses of the Islamic Partnership and Outreach program; and (5) funds made available for the Islamic Partnership and Outreach program and other regional programs are subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations.

IRAQI RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)
For necessary expenses to carry out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, in and for Iraq and for rehabilitation and reconstruction in the region of war-torn Iraq, $2,483,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004, including $1,000,000,000 for the economic assistance infra-structure; (2) feeding and food distribution; (3) supporting relief efforts related to refugees, internally displaced persons, and vulnerable individuals; (4) humanitarian demining; (5) healthcare; (6) education; (7) electricity; (8) transportation; (9) telecommunication; (10) agricultural assistance; (11) economic and financial policy; and (12) agriculture: Provided, That these funds shall be apportioned only to the Department of State, the United States International Development, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Health and Human Services, as appropriate, for the FY2004 and, subject to the availability of funds, the FY2005 amounts: Further, That with respect to funds appropriated under this heading in this Act or proposed in other legislation, the President shall ensure that the responsibility of the Secretary of State, as the principal foreign policy official, to report to Congress on matters relating to foreign policy and to present the information he shall have received with respect to the foreign policy implications of furnishing foreign military assistance, and the requirements of the defense strategy shall not be delegated: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to fully reimburse accounts administered by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, not otherwise reimbursed from funds appropriated by this Act, for obligations incurred for purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act of 1976: Provided further, That any fees associated with assistance to Iraq under this Act or other Acts that are made available for assistance for Iraq shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committee on Appropriations, except that such fees shall be transmitted at least 5 days in advance of the obligations of funds.

LOAN GUARANTEES TO ISRAEL
During the period beginning April 14, 2003, and ending September 30, 2005, loan guarantees may be made available to Israel, guaranteeing 100 percent of the principal and interest on not more than $2,000,000,000, of which any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $9,000,000,000, of which up to $3,000,000,000 may be issued prior to October 1, 2003, or thereafter, of which up to $3,000,000,000 may be issued subsequent to September 30, 2004: Provided, That such guarantees shall constitute obligations, in accordance with the terms of such guarantees, of the United States of America and the full faith and credit of the United States of America is hereby pledged for the full payment and performance of such obligations: Provided further, That if less than the full amount of guarantees authorized to be made available is issued prior to September 30, 2005, the amount of guarantees authorized to be issued under this section only to support activities in the geographic areas which were subject to the administrative control of the Government of Israel before June 5, 1967, the Secretary of State may authorize the issuance of such guarantees to extend to the subsequent fiscal year: Provided further, That guarantees may be issued under this section only to support activities in the geographic areas which were subject to the administrative control of the Government of Israel before June 5, 1967: Provided further, That the amount of guarantees that may be issued shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount extended or estimated to have been extended by this Act in any preceding budget period from March 1, 2003, to the date of issue of the guarantee, for activities which the President determines are inconsistent with the national security interests of the United States: Provided further, That the guarantors between the United States and the Government of Israel regarding the implementation
of the loan guarantee program: Provided further, That the President shall submit a report to Congress no later than September 30 of each fiscal year during the pendency of the program, for the fiscal year, a calculation of the amount available under the preceding proviso and that will be deducted from the amount of guarantees authorized to be issued in the next fiscal year. That no loan guarantees authorized under this heading are available for the subsidy costs for these loan guarantees: Provided further, That the Government of Israel will not pay the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, as amended, including any non-payment exposure risk, associated with the loan guarantees authorized under this heading. That the President shall determine the terms and conditions for issuing guarantees, taking into consideration the budgetary and economic circumstances of the United States and the economic circumstances of the Government of Israel to the Government of the United States: Provided further, That funds made available for assistance to Israel under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be utilized by the Government of Israel to pay such fees to the United States to provide the United States with information: Provided further, That if the President determines that these terms and conditions have been breached, the President may suspend or terminate the provision of all or part of the loan guarantees not yet issued under this heading.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For an additional amount for “International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement”, $25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE

For an additional amount for the “Andean Counterdrug Initiative”, $34,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

For an additional amount for “United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund”, $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TELEVISION, DEMINING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Deminining, and Related Programs”, $20,000,000. Provided, That funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1996.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the “Foreign Military Financing Program”, $2,090,100,000. Provided, That funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1996: Provided further, That the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $906,000,000 shall be made available for grants: Provided further, That the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available for grants only for Israel: Provided further, That the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be disbursed within 30 days of the enactment of this Act: Provided further, That to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for nuclear-related activities, grants made available for Israel by this paragraph shall, as agreed to by the United States and Israel, be available for advanced weapons systems, and $500,000,000 shall be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development.

GENERAL OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for “Peacekeeping Operations”, $115,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

Sec. 1401. Assistance or other financing under this Act, notwithstanding any other provision of law: Provided, That funds made available for Iraq pursuant to this authority shall be subject to the regular reprogramming procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, except that notification shall be transmitted to the President within 5 days in advance of obligation: Provided further, That the notification requirement of this section may be waived if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to the national health or safety: Provided further, That in case of any such waiver, notification to the appropriate congressional committees shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than 3 days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable, in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver: Provided further, That any notification provided pursuant to such a waiver shall contain an explanation of the emergency circumstances.

SEC. 1402. The President may suspend the application of any provision of the Iraq Sanctions Act of 1990: Provided, That nothing in this section shall apply to the authority of the President to make a determination granting a license pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act of 1976: Provided, That the authority granted to the President by the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, including any non-payment exposure risk, associated with the loan guarantees shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than 3 days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable, in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver: Provided further, That any notification provided pursuant to such a waiver shall contain an explanation of the emergency circumstances.

Sec. 1403. That the authorities contained in this section shall expire on September 30, 2004, or on the date of enactment of a subsequent Act authorizing assistance for Iraq and that specifically amends, repeals or otherwise modifies the authorities of this section, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 1404. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may authorize the use to Iraq of any nonlethal military equipment controlled under the International Trafficking in Arms Regulations on the United States Munitions List established pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act, (22 U.S.C. 2778), if the President determines and notifies within 5 days after receiving reports of each House of Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives that the export of such nonlethal military equipment is in the national interest of the United States: Provided, That the authorities contained in this section shall expire on September 30, 2004, or on the date of enactment of a subsequent Act authorizing assistance for Iraq and that specifically amends, repeals or otherwise modifies the authorities of this section, whichever occurs first.

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for “Operating Expenses” related to conducting Operation Liberty Shield, $1,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Operating Expenses” for necessary expenses related to conducting Operation Liberty Shield, $30,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

CUSTODIAL AND BORDER PROTECTION

For necessary expenses for “Custodial and Border Protection” related to conducting Operation Liberty Shield and other purposes, $428,000,000, of which $235,000,000 shall remain available until December 31, 2003, and of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the acquisition and deployment of portal radiation detectors and non-intrusive inspection technology at U.S. ports of entry.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for “Immigration and Customs Enforcement” related to conducting Operation Liberty Shield and other purposes, $300,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the total amount provided herein, the following amounts are available for obligation only for the specific purposes below:

(1) physical modification of commercial service airports for the purposes of installing checked baggage explosive detection systems into airport baggage systems, $250,000,000;
(2) reimbursements to local and state law enforcement officers and National Guardsmen for increased security measures at airports and other critical transportation sites, $85,000,000;
(3) port security grants, $40,000,000; and
(4) surface transportation security initiatives, $30,000,000.

In addition, for expenses related to aviation security, $3,178,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided, That such appropriation shall be remitted to U.S. flag air carriers for expenses incurred related to aviation security based on the pro-rata share each such carrier is expected to pay or collect to the Transportation Security Administration for the remainder of the fiscal year: Provided further, That payments made under this heading may be used by an air carrier for such purposes as each carrier determines appropriate: Provided further, That payments made under this heading shall be made within thirty days of enactment of this Act: Provided further, That no airline receiving funds under this heading may be used by an air carrier for such purposes as each carrier determines appropriate:

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING

For necessary expenses for “Federal Law Enforcement Training Center Operating Expenses” related to conducting Operation Liberty Shield, $2,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS

For an additional amount for “Office for Domestic Preparedness”, $2,000,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003, for grants authorized by section 1014 of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–56) and for other emergency programs of which $1,500,000,000 shall be for formula-based grants, and of which $700,000,000 shall be for discretionary grants for use in high-density urban areas, in high-threat areas, and for protection of critical infrastructure: Provided, That 80 percent of the funds provided under this heading shall be allocated by the State to units of local government within the State and shall be distributed by the State within 45 days of the receipt of such funds: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used for construction or renovation of facilities: Provided further, That subsection (c)(3) of such section 1014 shall not apply to discretionary grants made under this heading: Provided further, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days prior to the obligation of any amount of the funds provided under this heading.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses” for the maintenance, care, and operation of buildings and grounds of the United States Capitol Police, $63,868,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER 6

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

For an additional amount for “Disease Control, Research, and Training”, $16,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For an additional amount for “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, $11,000,000:

That such amount shall be available only upon the enactment of legislation authorizing a smallpox vaccination compensation program.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 1601. Section 1113 (d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396) is amended by striking “1991” and inserting “2003”.

CHAPTER 7

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, $11,000,000, as follows:

That no airline receiving funds under this heading may be used by an air carrier for such purposes as each carrier determines appropriate:

CAPITOL POLICE

For an additional amount for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, related emergency expenses for the United States Capitol complex, $37,758,000, to remain available until expended, to be disburscd by the Chief of the Capitol Police or his designee: Provided, That such funds may be obligated without prior approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1305), $311,000.
expended to carry out planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law.

**FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE**

For an additional amount for “Family Housing Operation and Maintenance, Air Force”, $1,800,000.

**GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER**

SEC. 1801. None of the funds in the Defense Emergency Response Fund for any fiscal year may be used to carry out new military construction projects at a military installation inside or outside the United States, to reimburse other appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense used to carry out such construction. For purposes of this section, the terms “military construction” and “military installation” have the meanings given such terms in section 2801 of title 10, United States Code, except that, with respect to military construction in a foreign country, the term “military installation” includes, not only buildings, structures, and other improvements to real property under the operational control of the Secretary of a military department or the Secretary of Defense, but also any building, structure, or other improvement to real property to be used by the Armed Forces, regardless of whether such use is anticipated to be temporary or of longer duration.

SEC. 1802. **NOTIFICATION OF CONSTRUCTION USING OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS.** Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces (including reserve components or for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense may not be used for the construction of a military installation inside or outside the United States unless the Secretary of a military department or the Secretary of Defense, as the case may be—

1. In the case of military construction covered by chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, complies with the requirements contained in such chapter applicable to the use of operation and maintenance funds for military construction;

2. In the case of military construction not otherwise covered by such chapter, submits written notice to the appropriate committees of Congress, not later than 15 days before obligating funds for the construction, containing a statement of the need to use the operation and maintenance funds to carry out the construction and the estimated cost of the construction.

**DEFINITIONS.** For purposes of this section, the terms “appropriate committees of Congress”, “military construction”, and “military installation” have the meanings given such terms in section 2801 of title 10, United States Code, except that, with respect to military construction in a foreign country, the term “military installation” includes, not only buildings, structures, and other improvements to real property under the operational control of the Secretary of a military department or the Secretary of Defense, but also any building, structure, or other improvement to real property to be used by the Armed Forces, regardless of whether such use is anticipated to be temporary or of longer duration.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

**THE CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?
First, so that we can insist that no container in a foreign port is loaded on a ship bound to the United States until that container is searched, sealed and certified by American inspectors. If a country refuses access, it should be prohibited from shipping anything to the United States.

Second, the amendment provides funds to enable the Coast Guard to board and search every single ship before they get within 200 miles of American shores. Only by inspecting every container before it is loaded onto a ship in a foreign port and by searching every ship before it gets close enough to our shores can we be reasonably assured that atomic bombs will not obliterate American cities.

Some will object that this will hinder commerce. But one atomic bomb would halt commerce instantly. Every port would be closed tight until these procedures could be put, too late, into place. This would cost money, about $15 billion a year, but we can afford it. Unfortunately, the administration and Republican Congress prefer to squander hundreds of billions of dollars for tax cuts on the wealthy instead of protecting the lives of our people. We have to realize we are in a serious war that may last decades and we must start thinking and acting seriously.

In wartime the government must spend the money to defend the lives of its people or it violates the fundamental social contract. President Bush and Congress must honor that contract or forfeit the trust of the Nation. So I ask that this amendment be allowed to be considered. I urge the Congress to meet its obligation to fully fund the security measures to inspect every container and search every ship that is contained in this amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment imposes additional duties, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wu:

In chapter 5 of title I, in the item relating to "BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION", strike the paragraph beginning "In addition", insert the following:

"In addition, for an airline ticket voucher program to be carried out by the Secretary of Transportation, $3,178,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided, that until the Secretary shall permit individuals purchasing tickets for air transportation by an air carrier (as such terms are defined by section 40102 of title 49, United States Code) to receive a 50 percent discount on the price of such tickets, if such air transportation will be completed on or before March 31, 2004."

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. WU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.) Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer this amendment with my colleague from Virginia (Mr. Scott). This bill contains $3.178 billion as further assistance to our airlines. There is no doubt that our airlines are in dire financial circumstances. Passenger numbers have never recovered from September 11. Orange terror alerts, other factors have kept passengers away.

By point of illustration, the first Gulf War more than a decade ago. During that time period, four commercial airlines went into insolvency, never to emerge. I believe that this direct handout to the airlines of almost $3.2 billion is not the correct way to proceed. Our amendment, the freedom to fly amendment, would put this money into the hands of passengers. It would stimulate more passenger traffic, put more people on more airplanes, and in so doing also stimulate the ancillary travel industry; that is, all the other components of the travel industry, whether it is hotels, restaurants, car rental, all the businesses that are at airports. And this would also help airline employees in a market-oriented commonsense approach.

Right now approximately 25 percent of airline seats are going unfilled and we know that a lot of flights have already been cut. The freedom to fly amendment would fill these empty seats and I believe stimulates the airlines to bring more flights on line, preserving jobs and generating additional revenues for the airlines and for all the affiliated travel businesses.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WU. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which we have introduced jointly.

The airlines are facing financial difficulties. Bankruptcies, layoffs, increased costs of fuel, and the war with Iraq have led the Republicans to propose a $3.2 billion bailout of the passenger airline industry in the House supplemental war appropriations bill. I believe it is time to have a more focused approach.

The real problem is that every day airlines fly with thousands of empty seats. A recent New York Times article referred to the airlines problem and estimated that, on average, 25 percent of the seats on airplanes are left unused, even though the number of flights have been reduced. The reduction in flights means cuts in the number of pilots, airline flight attendants, baggage handlers, and additional travel industry jobs. So instead of just writing a check for $3.2 billion to the airlines, we should be considering a way to encourage the American people to fly and fill those empty seats in a way that will preserve and create jobs. This will do it.

As a result of this amendment, air travel will naturally increase because the cost of consumer air travel will be cut in half. The plan will benefit not just the airlines but the traveling public. It will stimulate business for hotels, restaurants, rental car companies, travel agencies and other travel-related industries.

This is better than a subsidy. A subsidy will not create new passengers, will not preserve jobs. Over the past week, the airlines have laid off 10,000 workers; and a subsidy will not stem the tide of additional layoffs. Jobs in the airline industry will be no more secure after the subsidy than before.

On the other hand, the proposed program will result in increased airline business and increased demand for workers. This will fill the empty seats, making them more affordable, increasing revenues for the airlines, preserve jobs and generate additional revenues for others involved in travel commerce.

We hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Clause 2 of rule XXI states in pertinent part: an appropriation may not be in order as an amendment for an expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization for the program has not been signed into law.
law. The amendment, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI; and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of parliamentary inquiry, I would inquire of the Chair, is it either required or customary for a point of order to be raised before discussion of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House previously adopted today, points of order against amendments are considered reserved on each amendment.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, is that within the rule that we passed for this particular bill, or is that always a rule of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. It was pursuant to the unanimous consent request agreed to earlier today in the full House. Does the gentleman wish to be heard further on the point of order offered by the gentleman from Florida?

Does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think the plan that we have is a much better use of the taxpayers' money than in the underlying bill, and we would hope that the Chair would rule that it is in order to appropriately spend the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The proponent of an item of appropriation carries the burden of persuasion on the question of whether it is supported by an authorization in law, and whether it constitutes a change in law.

Having reviewed the amendment and entertained argument on the point of order, the Chair is unable to conclude that the item of appropriation or the rebate mechanism in question is authorized by the law; therefore, it is constrained to sustain the point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI. The amendment is not in order.

Are there further amendments to this title of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 39, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by $2,078,300,000)."

Page 39, line 17, strike "That" and all that follows through "Provided further, on line 22.

Page 40, line 4, strike "Provided" and all that follows before the period on line 10.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment today, the reason that I come to the floor today is that I object to the airline provisions being added to this bill because it is a supplemental appropriation bill; and within an appropriation bill, we simply cannot do the things that we need to do long term for the airlines. All we do is ensure that they will be back 6 months later for a similar appropriation.

On an appropriation bill we cannot deal with tax relief, for example, and fund for the airline and the fees to the Federal Government. We cannot deal with that on an appropriation bill.

We cannot deal with regulatory relief as well. There are higher antitrust standards that apply to airlines that do not to other industries. We need to look at that. There are limits as far as access to equity capital that apply to the airlines that do not to other industries. Those we cannot deal with in a supplemental appropriation bill.

The reason for bringing this forward is to ensure that we simply do not appropriate an amount that ensures that we have the airlines come back and simply need the same thing 6 months, 8 months, a year from now; and that is surely what we will have if we go through with this.

We are turning the airlines into folks that want to compete under a regular business model into folks that simply will hire more lobbyists and rely on the generosity of taxpayers and appropriators forevermore. We are creating, unless we change this process, an Amtrak in the air where we simply, through appropriation, keep an industry going.

We cannot do that and for that purpose, I have agreed to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) to talk about what we might do in the future.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, the very distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I thank the gentleman from Missouri, and I would be pleased to have a discussion with my friend from Arizona. Is that allowed, Mr. Chairman, under this arrangement?

I certainly think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is right that we need to look for a long-term settlement to this issue. To continue to handle it as we have, in a crisis moment, is not the right way to do it. To look at the long term, some tax relief is an option to look new obligations that the Federal Government has, in my view, to review our long-term sense of airline security.

Until September 11, 2001, there was a widely held and generally defensible view that the fees that passengers paid for airline security were being paid for the purpose of protecting the passengers; and so it was a pure user fee, and it seemed to be defensible in that regard. We now know that we use our security system to secure people who are on the plane one day but who may never be on the plane; and I think the gentleman senses that we need to review that structure to re-
We must also take into consideration that the airline industry employs a sizable workforce globally. United, which employs thousands in the state of California alone, employs 85,000 worldwide! If we do not help the airlines during these uncertain times, many jobs will be lost and the economy as a whole will be further compromised.

I oppose the Flake Amendment and stand behind the fact that we must do all that we can to keep the industry flying.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the recent colloquy, let me simply say that I am getting whiplash from trying to follow the lead of the majority party and the White House on the issue that was just under discussion.

We had before us earlier in the week this bill essentially pay for the first downpayment on the Iraq war. We were trying to get additional money in the bill for homeland security so that we could protect ourselves at home from the retaliation that was likely to come from the Iraqis in the wake of the war.

The House Republican leadership would not see its way fit to allow us to even debate that amendment and come to a vote on the House floor; and yet they arbitrarily ordered the Committee on Appropriations to include the $35 billion bailout for the airline industry that was just discussed a moment ago. Then, after that happened, then the White House issued a statement saying that, in fact, the package before the House for airline bailout was too generous.

I am having a little difficulty following the lead of the majority and the lead of the White House because they seem to be working at cross purposes, and I am further confused by the fact that this House is willing to consider a huge expenditure of funds like this with no hearings and to have it dealt with by a committee that has no special understanding of the problem; and it seems to me that a much better way, well, it just seems to me that we ought to be asking a fundamental question.

It seems to me we ought to be asking the question of whether or not we have a viable airline industry in this country. I have a bunch of let’s-pretend capitalists who have to come to the government for a bailout every time something happens in the economy.

Now, they are essential to our national welfare and to our economic well-being. So I think we obviously need to keep the airline industry functioning, but I do not know how many times they have to come to the taxpayers for additional money before we decide that a better way is to simply regulate them as a necessary public utility or as a public utility providing necessary service to the country, and that is what I really believe in the long term we ought to do.

But I also must protest the slap dash way that this issue has wound up on the appropriations bill because I find it quite amazing that the House Republican leadership would demand the House go one way while the White House seems to indicate it wants to go another way. It is pretty hard to follow that kind of leadership, and I admire the gentleman from Florida for being a good soldier and responding to the instructions of his leadership; but I would have a difficult time trying to explain this to any taxpayer, any of my constituents.

I would just hope that in the future we can do a better job of managing a problem like this, and I wish we could get to discuss the fundamentals on this issue rather than simply throwing more money at the problem.

We were told that we cannot throw more money at homeland security, and yet we are millions of dollars to the airline industry without doing one whit to help the employees of those same airlines.

I find that quaint. It is always the corporate part of the industry that gets the attention of Congress; and it is the working stiff sort of gets left in the ca-boose, if I can change transportation modes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this title?

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 38, line 21, before the period insert:

This amendment, and I am very gratified that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), has allowed this debate to go forward, this will allow resources...
to provide training, and it is already authorized, specifically on how to oversee the SEVIS tracking system. It is new technology. We will be reviewing it in the Homeland Security Committee, I know.

We know that technology in terms of homefront defense is important, the ability to communicate with each other. But certainly as we promote the idea that immigration does not equate to terrorism, would it not be better to have a tracking system for students that is fair, that helps our universities and helps the Homeland Security Department with something that can monitor without the threat of suggesting that every student is a terrorist? Because that is not the case, Mr. Chairman.

So I offer this amendment to give resources where they are needed, to focus the resources on this gaping hole with overseeing and training these contractors. These contractors may be well-intentioned but, in fact, they are not implementing this system as best as it could be. I hope in the discussions with this new Homeland Security Department we will also get a diversification of these contractors and an expertise that is involved so that they can do the job right.

So this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is simply to allow authorized dollars to be focused on improving the SEVIS system, that is the student tracking system. I am asking the question of training of those staffs that are there at the Homeland Security Citizens Bureau but, as well, to oversee those contractors. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would help this nation's security system and help to protect our borders. The Inspector General for the Department of Justice issued a report last month on the Student Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) program for tracking foreign students at American colleges and universities.

The report concludes that SEVIS has not been implemented fully yet and discusses a system for providing assistance to the school. There are long waits when school personnel call the Help Desk for assistance, and adequate funds are not available to increase the Help Desk staff or to send people to the schools to train school personnel in the use of SEVIS.

This amendment would provide additional funding to correct the implementation problems that are identified in the Inspector General's report, with special reference to the need for additional training.

SEVIS makes it easier for approximately 4,300 schools and 1,400 exchange programs to comply with immigration requirements so that they can include bright, talented foreign students in their programs.

International students and exchange visitor programs are enormously beneficial to the United States. They boost worldwide appreciation for democracy and market-based economics and give future world leaders first-hand exposure to America and Americans.

The Inspector General's report indicates that the immigration service needs additional resources to overcome problems in implementing SEVIS, which is a complex system that requires storage of a huge amount of data. We need money available to implement this system properly.

We can create an effective tracking system that will facilitate bringing talented men and women from different countries to the United States to study and exchange creative thought and ideas. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I would ask the gentlewoman a question. Should this amendment be accepted, would the other amendments, the five other amendments the gentlewoman has tendered, be withdrawn?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would hope in that question would be the opportunity to present them. I would like to present those amendments 5, 001, 002, 005, 003, and 004. Did I miss include?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Well, Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I was prepared to accept the amendment, but if we are not going to save any time by it, I do not see any point in accepting it. So I have no choice but to oppose it. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, if I am not mistaken I understood that we would present this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, if I am not mistaken I thought we had the discussion, because we never have an agreement, but I understood that we would present this amendment and then withdraw them. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, if I am not mistaken I understand the amendment that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I wish, Mr. Chairman, that that was the case, but I believe we have agreed, because of the procedural point of order, that it will be 5 minutes in total. That means I talk very quickly with this very rare occasion.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentlewoman would speak 5 minutes for all of the five all at once, 5 minutes total on the 5 amendments?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I wish to talk about this, Mr. Chairman. Are we talking 5 minutes each on the 5 amendments, or 5 minutes total on the 5 amendments?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I wish, Mr. Chairman, that that was the case, but I believe we have agreed, because of the procedural point of order, that it will be 5 minutes in total. That means I talk very quickly with this very rare occasion.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentlewoman would speak 5 minutes for all of the five all at once, 5 minutes total?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I wish to talk about this, Mr. Chairman. Are we talking 5 minutes each on the 5 amendments, or 5 minutes total on the 5 amendments?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I wish to talk about this, Mr. Chairman. Are we talking 5 minutes each on the 5 amendments, or 5 minutes total on the 5 amendments?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I wish, Mr. Chairman, that that was the case, but I believe we have agreed, because of the procedural point of order, that it will be 5 minutes in total. That means I talk very quickly with this very rare occasion.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentlewoman would speak 5 minutes for all of the five all at once, 5 minutes total?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. In that case, Mr. Chairman, I accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). The amendment was agreed to.

Amendments offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments, which are at the desk: Jackson-Lee 002, 004, 003, and 005, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman ask unanimous consent to consider those amendments en bloc?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider these amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will indicate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows: Amendments offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:
In chapter 5 of title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS", insert before the period at the end the following: (increased by $2,000,000,000)''.

In chapter 5 of title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS", insert before the period at the end the following: Provided further, That, of the funds provided under this heading, $1,400,000 shall be for grants to cities with populations over 1,000,000, and rural communities with populations under 200,000, for fire department hazardous materials response teams.

In chapter 5 of title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS", insert before the period at the end the following: Provided further, That, of the funds provided under this heading, $3,000,000 shall be for grants to cities with populations over 1,000,000, and rural communities with populations under 200,000, for fire department hazardous materials response teams.

In chapter 6 of title I, before the general provisions under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES", insert the following: SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services" for mental health services, $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In chapter 6 of title I, before the general provisions under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES", insert the following: SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services" for the Harris County, Texas Mental Health and Retardation Authority, $1,200,000, to remain available until expended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas to consider the amendments en bloc?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of these amendments, and let me say first of all that sometimes it is very difficult for our colleagues to follow this debate, and I want to start by thanking the leaders of the Committee on Appropriations. Many Members have points and perspectives that sometimes are lost in the procedural aspects of this debate. Let me make it very clear that all of us are concerned, unfortunately, will be subject to a point of order, the ones that I am intending to discuss at this point.

I am not conceding and giving up adequate debate on them, but obviously if they are going to be subject to a point of order, I believe it is extremely important that I move forward on the legislation that will improve the INS services with the $10 million that has just passed, focus on the training issues, and work with my colleagues respectively on elements that I think are very important that are missing in this legislation.

My amendments before us today deal with additional funds in domestic preparedness, because I believe that we do not have enough money for homeland security. Additionally, I would say that we have a problem in our respective fire departments in the hazardous materials teams that offer $2 million to cities above first responders, in particular our hazardous materials team, that will allow additional funds to be given to these teams which will be facing the worst of any biological attack.

I think it is important to recognize that preparedness is key to what we are doing. Let me correct the record and say that domestic preparedness was $2 billion, and the hazardous material is $3 million, on the cities over a million, and rural communities under 200,000.

The reason I offer these amendments is I believe we do not have enough dollars dealing with homeland security. Frankly, I join and I was hoping that the Oney amendment would be made in order because the emergency supplemental does not comply with the Budget Act nor do ours; but it is interesting that these were not made in order but the emergency appropriations was.

I have brought these amendments to the attention of this floor because I come from local communities that are suffering, not having enough overtime, not having enough dollars to ensure that we can provide the fire departments with the kind of staffing that they need in case these communities are subjected to biological attacks.

I am disappointed that a point of order will be subjected to them. Let me also say that my other amendments had to do with providing extra funding for SAMHSA because of the stress that individuals are under with respect to mental health services. I thought it was important to add $7 million because in this wartime, we are all facing the kind of stress that requires enhanced mental health services.

Additionally, I asked for additional funding for Harris County Mental Health Services because they too are suffering by closing clinics and having close to 1,500 clients not being able to be served. I know that a number of Members are not offering personal remarks and so I am withdrawing that along with these other amendments because I understand we are not being allowed that in fairness to the process.

Let me close by saying this. I started out by saying that I was against the war. I maintain that the war has not been officially declared by this body. This body has never debated the question of whether we can agree with the war against Iraq, but I believe we have the responsibility of supporting our troops. I am disappointed that we have not fully discussed the question of peace on this floor today, and that there are no specific funds designated to begin the discussion of peace.

I have an amendment which discusses that, and I hope in striking the last word towards the end of the bill, we have an opportunity to discuss peace. I believe we can help our troops as they are waging war, brave as they are, and those that have lost their lives, and the POWs and their families, by recognizing that as they fight for peace, we need to prevent terrorism and to fight for the freedom of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I support the troops deployed in Iraq. However, I am against this war because I believe war should have been the last option. We are spending $74.7 billion to fund the troops, to rebuild Iraq, to provide aid to our allies, and to fund drug control efforts—this is one of the largest supplemental bills this Congress has considered. Most of the funds in this bill are for the Department of Defense, $62.4 billion. Only $3.5 billion has been allocated for homeland security. While our troops are on the frontlines in Iraq, our first responders here at home—our firefighters, our police officers—in our states and localities are woefully underfunded. Many first responders do not have the equipment, the training, to meet national security needs. While we plan to construct schools in Iraq, schools in our nation are crumbling. While we provide humanitarian aid to many countries, our citizens at home lack affordable health care. And, while we plan to rebuild the nation of Iraq and assist our allies, we continue to neglect our nation's veterans.

We provide $700 million for Jordan; $300 million for Egypt; up to $1 billion for Turkey; and $160 million for Afghanistan through the Bilateral Economic Assistance Account. In the Foreign Military Assistance account we provide $1 billion for Israel; $406 million for Jordan; $170 million to train the Afghan National Army; $175 million to assist Pakistan in counter-terrorism activities; and $115 million for peacekeeping operations.

The Chairman’s Mark provides $2.8 billion for a new Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund. There are funds for the relief and reconstruction for water/sanitation infrastructure, food and food distribution, refugee assistance, counter-terrorism activities; and other humanitarian activities. Yet the Chairman’s Mark only provides $2.2 billion for grants to First Responders through the Office of Domestic Preparedness. I strongly support our troops, but I also believe that we must protect the troops right here at home—the first responders, who will be called on in any emergency and national security threat.

This bill does not do enough for Homeland Security. We are underfunding the national security here at home. Our cities and ports need protection. I offered amendments in the Rules Committee to increase funding for Homeland Security.

My amendment would have increased by $2 billion funding to the Office for Domestic Preparedness. The U.S. Mayors estimates that if the war and/or threat alert levels continue for six months, cities would incur nearly $2 billion in additional costs. These costs are on top of existing homeland security spending already underway or planned since September 11.

State and local governments have undertaken unprecedented new, expensive, and expanded responsibilities in our national efforts
against terrorism. State and local governments have developed and adopted budgets reflecting these increased responsibilities in difficult fiscal times with very little federal assistance. I offered an amendment to provide funds in the amount of $3 million to be set aside as grants to cities with populations under 200,000 for fire department hazardous materials response teams.

Adequate federal resources must be available to assist our urban and rural areas to maintain a heightened level of alert and to assist our first responders during this time of crisis.

First responders have been called upon to identify and to plan for potential threats peculiar to their particular location; these threats include chemical, biological, nuclear, radiation, and explosives.

Additional funding specifically for firefighters in urban and rural areas would help fire departments meet the challenges of responding to threats of terrorism. Firefighters have emergency needs for clothing, equipment, and interoperable communications.

I am troubled that we are in a position today where we are spending money we don’t have, on a war we didn’t need. Of course, I will cast my vote in support of this bill because this predication is not the fault of our soldiers. U.S. troops are doing valiantly in Iraq and they will be victorious. I want them to have all the resources they need to get the job done efficiently and effectively, so that we can bring them home safely to their families and loved ones. I don’t support this war, but I support our men and women who risk their lives for our civil liberties, but we cannot give the President a blank check with which to reward our allies and to neglect domestic priorities.

Many argued that going to war was preferable to doing nothing in Iraq. Perhaps, I agree. But I have never argued that we should do nothing, nor have any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle expressed support for a military option. I think the American people want a government that is in touch with the American people. As a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, I believe that the threat of force can prevent violence. However, the use of force is violence. The use of force must always be the very last resort. However, we must be realistic in these times to recognize the threat both here and abroad. The threat is real in our local communities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe sometimes one must stand for what they believe. I know that there are times when a great nation must answer the call of war to defend itself and its people. Sometimes we must defend our values so that many more can be saved. This is not one of those situations.

Even before the dust had started to settle at the site of the Twin Towers, this war plan seemedly was being devised. From mid-September 2001, this Administration seemed to be resolving our search into Baghdad. The plan was forged before we knew that Saddam Hussein had no known connection to the attacks of 9/11; before we knew that far more insidious dangers lurked in North Korea; before we realized that backed with a true diplomatic and military coalition, inspections could work to disarm Iraq. Even as the true nature of the picture in Iraq came to light, the Administration held its resolve to go to war. But resolve does not equate with reason.

I, and many of my colleagues, and millions of people around the world, have been trying to inject reason into this debate for over a year now. I started by voting against the use of force resolution last Congress. There were two reasons: (1) I did not feel that force was yet justified in the case of Iraq, and (2) I believe that it is unconstitutional for Congress to give the President the power to start a war without a true Declaration from the Congress. Whereas the President controls the military and our nation's intelligence gathering services, before the President takes our soldiers into war he must come to Congress and make the case for war. It is the duty of Congress according to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution to make the decision of whether it is in the best interest of the people we represent to make the Declaration of War. That was never done. I, and 154 of my colleagues, supported the Spratt amendment to the Use of Force Resolution, which would have required the President to come back to Congress before marching to war. But we did not.

Therefore, I have continued to call for a debate here on the Floor of the House to make that decision—between war and peace, and between life and death. Early this year, I offered a bill, H. Con. Res. 2, a bill to revisit and debate the question of going to war in Iraq. Although I questioned the war in Iraq, I have always been in full support of our troops in the region. Indeed I have argued that keeping a force in the region to support weapons inspectors—50,000 soldiers strong—was absolutely appropriate and prudent. That is because I believe that the threat of force can prevent violence. However, the use of force is violence. The use of force must always be the very last resort. However, we must be realistic in these times to recognize the threat both here and abroad. The threat is real in our local communities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe sometimes one must stand for what they believe. I know that there are times when a great nation must answer the call of war to defend itself and its people. Sometimes we must defend our values so that many more can be saved. This is not one of those situations.

For we are living in a glass house these days, and are throwing stones left and right. We are making enemies around the world and under-funding the domestic forces who would protect us from them. I have offered several amendments to today’s supplemental, an amendment to make sure that in addition to supporting our troops overseas, we also take care of security issues here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to the fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriations bill to help our Nation’s security and to provide funds to the people on the frontlines in our own homest first responders.

I believe that our domestic priorities and our first responders must not be overlooked as we consider this supplemental appropriations bill. I know my amendments violate the Budget Act, but the supplemental appropriations bill itself violates the Budget Act. My amendment would provide additional funds for first responders in our nation’s cities and rural communities.

My amendment would increase by $2 billion funding to the Office for Domestic Preparedness. The U.S. Conference of Mayors estimates that if the war and/or threat alert levels continue for six months, cities would incur nearly $2 billion in additional costs. These costs are on top of existing homeland security spending already underway or planned since September 11. While the Chairman’s Mark provides $2.2 billion, $200 million over the President’s request, for grants to local and state governments, this amount is still not adequate to fund the domestic security needs of our Nation’s states and localities.

As you know, state and local governments have undertaken unprecedented new, expensive, and expanded responsibilities in our nation’s defense. State and local governments have developed and adopted budgets reflecting these increased responsibilities in difficult fiscal times with very little federal assistance.

Adequate federal resources must be available to assist our urban and rural areas to help first responders meet the challenges of responding to threats of terrorism. State and local governments have developed and adopted budgets reflecting these increased responsibilities in difficult fiscal times with very little federal assistance.

Additional funding specifically for firefighters in urban and rural areas would help fire departments meet the challenges of responding to threats of terrorism. First responders have emergency needs for clothing, equipment, and interoperable communications.

Additional funding specifically for firefighters in urban and rural areas would help fire departments meet the challenges of responding to threats of terrorism. First responders have emergency needs for clothing, equipment, and interoperable communications.

First responders have been called upon to identify and to plan for potential threats peculiar to their particular location; these threats include chemical, biological, nuclear, radiation, and explosives.

First responders stand ready to answer the call of our nation. We must provide them with adequate resources for equipment, training, and supplies. In particular, fire departments are in desperate need of funding. I have heard from my fire department in Houston and hope to secure funding for the fire fighters there for hazardous materials response teams.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the record an amendment recognizing that I hope we can do more for domestic preparedness, for the hazardous materials teams and our fire departments, and we recognize that we have a crisis in this Nation and we need to help those facing mental health challenges by providing more mental health funding.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, unanimous consent is not required. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson-Lee) withdraws the amendments offered on behalf of the committee.

The amendments were withdrawn. Are there further amendments to this title?
If not, the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 2001. Division F of Public Law 108–7 is hereby amended under the heading “United States Fish and Wildlife Service, State and Tribal Grants” by striking “$3,000,000” and inserting “$5,000,000”.

SEC. 2002. The matter under the heading “Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, Health Resources and Services” in Public Law 108–7 is amended—

(1) by striking “Heart Beat, New Bloomfield, PA” and inserting “Heart Beat, Millerston, PA” in lieu thereof;
(2) by striking “Tressler Lutheran Services, Washington, PA” and inserting “DIAKON Lutheran Social Ministries, Allen-town, PA, for abstinence education and related services in Berks County, PA, and Dauphin County, PA, to establish centers of excellence for the treatment of autism.”;
(3) by striking “Office of the Secretary, Public Health and Human Services Emergency Fund”, in title II of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003, (Public Law 108–7; div. G) is amended by striking the proviso provided in section 215 of the Domestic Volunteer Services Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–7; div. G), in order that the proviso be deemed to read as follows: “$5,000,000”.

SEC. 2003. The matter under the heading “Department of Education, School Improvement Programs”, in Public Law 108–7 is amended—

(1) by striking “$508,100,000” and inserting “$571,300,000”;
(2) by striking “$4,132,167,000” and inserting “$4,233,167,000”;
(3) in the statement of the managers of the conference committee accompanying H.J. Res. 2 (Public Law 108–7; House Report 108–10), in the matter in title III of Division G, relating to the Fund for the Improvement of Education under the heading “School Improvement Programs”—

(1) the provision specifying $150,000 for Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, IL, for computer and software for the implementation of Fast ForWord reading program to the Pleasant Plains Community Unit District #8 shall be deemed to read as follows: “Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, IL, for implementation of Fast ForWord reading program to the Pleasant Plains Community Unit District #8 and for improving mathematics achievement in Peoria School District #190 and Jacksonville School District #117, $150,000”;
(2) the provision specifying $2,000,000 for Pinellas County Florida School District, St. Petersburg, FL, for technology shall be deemed to read as follows: “St. Petersburg College, St. Petersburg, FL, for the Pinellas County EpiCenter, $2,000,000”; and
(3) in the provision specifying $50,000 for the Milwaukee Public Schools, WI, to expand before- and after-school programs shall be deemed to read as follows: “Milwaukee Public Schools, WI, for before- and after-school programs, $50,000.”

SEC. 2004. Amounts made available to carry out part E of title II of the Domestic Volunteer Services Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–7; div. G) is amended by striking the proviso provided in title II of that Act and inserting “$50,000”.

SEC. 2005. (a) In addition to the authority provided in section 215 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–7; div. G) is amended by striking the proviso provided in section 215 of the Domestic Volunteer Services Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–7; div. G) in order that the proviso be deemed to read as follows: “$5,000,000.”

SEC. 2006. (a) The matter under the heading “Department of Education, School Improvement Programs”, in Public Law 108–7 is amended—

(1) by striking “$508,100,000” and inserting “$571,300,000”;
(2) by striking “$4,132,167,000” and inserting “$4,233,167,000”;
(3) in the statement of the managers of the conference committee accompanying H.J. Res. 2 (Public Law 108–7; House Report 108–10), in the matter in title III of Division G, relating to the Fund for the Improvement of Education under the heading “School Improvement Programs”—

(1) the provision specifying $150,000 for Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, IL, for computer and software for the implementation of Fast ForWord reading program to the Pleasant Plains Community Unit District #8 shall be deemed to read as follows: “Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, IL, for implementation of Fast ForWord reading program to the Pleasant Plains Community Unit District #8 and for improving mathematics achievement in Peoria School District #190 and Jacksonville School District #117, $150,000”;
(2) the provision specifying $2,000,000 for Pinellas County Florida School District, St. Petersburg, FL, for technology shall be deemed to read as follows: “St. Petersburg College, St. Petersburg, FL, for the Pinellas County EpiCenter, $2,000,000”; and
(3) in the provision specifying $50,000 for the Milwaukee Public Schools, WI, to expand before- and after-school programs shall be deemed to read as follows: “Milwaukee Public Schools, WI, for before- and after-school programs, $50,000.”


(2) by striking “$1,000,000” and inserting “University of Massachusetts-Boston, to purchase research equipment and technology infrastructure shall be deleted; and
(3) the provision specifying $100,000 for Slippery Rock University, Slippery Rock, PA, for Knowledge Pointe at Cranberry Woods, as part of an initiative to provide life-long educational services to Pittsburgh’s regional industry and community residents shall be deemed to read as follows: “Regional Learning Alliance, Marshall Township in Allegheny County, PA, as part of an initiative to provide life-long educational services to Pittsburgh’s regional industry and community residents, $100,000.”

SEC. 2008. The provision specifying $100,000 for Slippery Rock University, Slippery Rock, PA, for the North Hill Educational Alliance shall be deleted; and,

(4) the provision specifying $250,000 to the National Aviary Conservation Education Technology Integration in Pittsburgh shall be deemed to read as follows: “National Aviary Conservation Education Technology Integration in Pittsburgh, for the Remote Audio-Visual Engagement Network (RAVEN) project, $250,000.”

SEC. 2009. Section 336 of Division I of Public Law 108–7 is amended by striking “Transpor-tation Management” and inserting in lieu thereof “Urbanized.”

SEC. 2010. Amounts made available to carry out sections 121(k) and 5117(b)(6) of title 112 Stat. 107 et seq. shall be used to carry out item number 1278 of the table contained in section 1602 of such Act (112 Stat. 263).

SEC. 2011. To liquidate obligations previously incurred, $64,000,000 is provided to
the National Service Trust of the Corpora-
tion for National and Community Service: 
Provided, That the second proviso under the 
heading “Corporation for National and Com-
munity Service” in Division K of Public Law 
108-7 is deemed to be amended by inserting 
after “section 501(a)(4)’’ the following: “with 
not less than $2,500,000 for the Office of the 
Chief Financial Officer to enact financial re-
form in the Corporation, notwithstanding 
the provisions of section 501(a)(4)(B) of the 
Act’’.
SEC. 2012. Section 115 under the heading 
“Department of Veterans Affairs, Administra-
tive Provisions’’ in Public Law 108-7 is 
amended by striking “2’’.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS 
ACT
SEC. 3001. No part of any appropriation 
contained in this Act shall remain available 
for obligation beyond the current fiscal year 
unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY
Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an 
amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will desig-
nate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
ows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROWLEY:
At the end of the bill (before the short 
title), insert the following:

SEC. 412. Of the amount provided in chap-
ter 4 of title I, in the item relating to “FOR-
EIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM’’, not 
more than $100,000,000 may be made available 
to Pakistan.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chair-
man, I ask unanimous consent that the de-
bate on the pending amendment offered 
by the gentleman from New York (Mr. 
CROWLEY) be limited to 20 minutes, to 
be equally divided and controlled by 
the gentleman from New York (Mr. 
CROWLEY) as the proponent and myself 
as the opponent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection 
to the request of the gentleman from 
Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman 
from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the 
gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) 
each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman 
from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I 
yield myself such time as I may con-
sume.

I rise today in strong support of the 
amendment at the desk put forth by 
myself and the gentleman from New 
Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), which I sup-
port.

India has been a strong ally in the 
war on terrorism, and has also felt 
the pain of terrorist attacks, as we have 
felt those same pains here in the 
United States. The most recent attack 
on India was last weekend, resulting in 
the brutal murder of 24 Hindus known 
as Pandits. The 24 murdered included 
women and children. This act of ter-
rorism occurred in the Indian state of 
Jammu-Kashmir.

As we all know, last year Pakistani 
Islamic militants entered the Indian 
Parliament and opened fire, killing 
some of our colleagues in the Indian 
Parliament. I happened to be in India 
only 2 weeks after this horrific attack,
under waiver authority that was granted to President Bush by Congress, he waived this coup-related sanction to allow $50 million in military assistance to Pakistan for their antiterrorism measures. Given the current military dictatorship in that country and the fact that just weeks ago it received a significant sum of money in military aid, I support striking $75 million in military assistance in this bill and perhaps either returning it to the FMF fund or to reallocate this amendment to first responders or to other priority homeland security needs.

In addition, it is encouraging that the Bush administration is starting to publicly acknowledge Pakistan's role in transferring nuclear equipment to North Korea. I would like to thank the Bush administration for imposing both contracting and licensing sanctions on the Khan Research Laboratories nuclear firm in Pakistan. They are no longer authorized to export nuclear material to the United States. And I am encouraged by this first step on the part of the administration to both publicly recognize Pakistan's role in supporting North Korea's covert nuclear weapons program and to impose punitive sanctions accordingly.

Normally, because of Pakistan's nuclear transfer to North Korea, Symington sanctions barring U.S. military assistance to Pakistan would be automatic, but those sanctions have been waived by the President, and military assistance continues to flow to Pakistan. I am disappointed that the administration continues to support military assistance to Pakistan when it is clear that Pakistan exchanged equipment with North Korea most likely for missiles to challenge India.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I cannot argue against the fact that Pakistan has been a friend of the U.S. in fighting against global terrorism. However, the case is much different when we look at Pakistan's own backyard of Kashmir. Terrorism and violence by Islamic militants in Kashmir have escalated to a devastating degree, and I am very concerned that military assistance to Pakistan will be used to perpetuate the terrorist acts in Kashmir and elsewhere throughout India.

Mr. Chairman, based on the history of our laws in place that prevent the U.S. from providing military assistance to Pakistan in certain situations, such as military dictatorship or transfer of nuclear equipment to other countries, and for all the related reasons that I have just detailed, as has the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), striking $75 million in military assistance to Pakistan from this bill today is more than justified; and most importantly, it is important to recognize that any dollars that would be cut can be redirected to our own homeland security or to other first responders and that really should be a priority rather than giving this money to Pakistan.

I support the amendment, and I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY); and I would hope that the administration would pay more heed to these issues of Pakistan's anti-democratic policies and its transfer of nuclear technology to Pakistan. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

I understand that the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) does intend to withdraw this amendment at the conclusion of this debate, but I do not think the remarks that were made with regard to Pakistan should stand without some comment, without some kind of rebuttal. I do understand and I do desire, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) have spoken so eloquently about the conflict in South Asia between Pakistan and India, I desire as much as they do to have a satisfactory resolution to this conflict. And I think instead of leveraging and dividing these two countries and providing a source of conflict of two nuclear superpowers on the Asian subcontinent.

But this is not about an amendment about nuclear technology for our friends in India. This is an amendment about Pakistan, and Pakistan is one of the most critical front-line states in this global war against terrorism. It has paid a very high price, including the lives of its soldiers because of its decision to side with the United States in the fight against the al Qaeda and terrorism. Their cooperation on terrorism has been excellent. Our nations have coordinated to apprehend nearly 500 suspected al Qaeda and Taliban operatives, including the operational commander, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, and the September 11 conspirator, Ramzi bin al-Sheibh.

Mr. Chairman, this is not blood money. Some have talked about this with relation to some of the other countries for which money is being provided. This is not money to get their support in the war against Iraq. This is funds to help Pakistan help us prosecute the war against terrorism. The $75 million in funding in the committee's recommendations is going to increase Pakistan's capability to apprehend and disable terrorists hiding and operating on its own territory. In the regular 2003 appropriation bill, we included money for fixed and rotary wing transport, including C-130s and Cobra/Huey helicopters. This supplemental provides urgent items needed to counter al Qaeda and Taliban pockets in the border area next to Pakistan. Key equipment identified for this mission includes ground radars and communications equipment. Surveillance systems are needed for the border, and communications can improve with interoperability between our forces and those of Pakistan. The supplemental will also provide for procurement of 10 OH-58D Kiowa reconnaissance systems to interdict the terrorists and to provide for drug interdiction.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by repeating what I said a moment ago. This is not about giving something to Pakistan because they have been supportive of us. They are being given to help prosecute the war against terrorism. That is our war, and Pakistan is deeply engaged in that war, as has been evidenced by the seizures of people that we have made along the border. We need their continued involvement, and we need their support; and this amendment ought not to be adopted.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs for yielding.

I rise simply to share with my colleagues from New York and New Jersey that I feel very, very strongly about our ally India and the role she may play in this war against terrorism. And I agree with my colleague would know, I spent a decent amount of my life in India. I consider it to be my second country. In the case before us, however, we are talking about Pakistan, who has been our great ally in this war on terrorism. To mix the two at this moment could be a very dangerous procedure for us to follow. I am very appreciative of the fact that the gentleman is going to withdraw this amendment. I hope that we could carry forward this discussion, and I look forward to the next time for there is a lot of work that needs to be done here. India is our ally and our friend and a great democracy. In turn, Pakistan today is helping us in a very special way in the war against terrorism.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I think they summarize precisely my point, which is really this is not about India. It is about Pakistan and having them continue to be involved in the war against terrorism. And I agree with him that India remains a great democracy in the region.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I appreciate the discussion. At this time I am prepared to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York withdraws his amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

**TITLE IV—UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE FOR DISPLACED AIR TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEES**

SEC. 4003. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Air Transportation Employees Assistance Act”.

SEC. 4002. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term “eligible individual” means an individual whose eligibility for temporary extended unemployment compensation is or would be based on the exhaustion of regular compensation, entitlement to which was based in whole or in part on qualifying employment performed during such individual’s base period;

(2) the term “qualifying employment”, with respect to an eligible individual, means employment—

(A) with an air carrier, at a facility at an airport, on the provisions of transportation to or from an airport, or with an upstream producer or supplier for an air carrier;

(B) determined by the Secretary, separation from which was due, in whole or in part, to—

(i) reductions in service by an air carrier as a result of a terrorist action or security measure;

(ii) a closure of an airport in the United States as a result of a terrorist action or security measure;

(iii) a military conflict with Iraq that has been authorized by Congress;

(3) the term “air carrier” means an air carrier that holds a certificate issued under chapter 411 of title 49, United States Code;

(4) the term “upstream producer” means a firm that performs additional, value-added, production processes, including firms that perform final assembly, finishing, or packaging of articles, for another firm;

(5) the term “supplier” means a firm that produces parts for, or supplies, and contract services considered to be a part of the production process or services for, another firm;

(6) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Labor; and

(7) the term “terrorist action or security measure” means a terrorist attack on the United States on September 11, 2001, or a security measure taken in response to such attack.

SEC. 4003. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES.

In the case of an eligible employee, the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21), as amended by Public Law 108-1 (117 Stat. 3), shall be amended as if it had been amended in accordance with section 2004.

SEC. 4004. MODIFICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 4003, the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-147; 116 Stat. 21), as amended by Public Law 108-1 (117 Stat. 3), shall be treated as if it had been amended as provided in this section.

(b) PROGRAM EXTENSION.—Deem section 208 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by Public Law 108-1 (117 Stat. 3), to be amended to read as follows:

**SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY.**

"(a) In General.—Subject to subsection (b), an agreement entered into under this Act shall apply to weeks of unemployment—

(1) beginning on or after such date for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this Act, including such compensation payable by reason of amounts deposited in such account after such date pursuant to the application of subsection (c) of such section.

(2) ending before December 29, 2003.

(b) TRANSITION FOR AMOUNT REMAINING IN ACCOUNT.—

"(1) In General.—Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of an individual who has remaining balances in an account established under section 203 as of December 28, 2003, temporary extended unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual in an amount from such account after such date pursuant to the application of subsection (c) of such section.

(2) LIMITATION.—No compensation shall be paid by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after December 26, 2004.

(c) ADDITIONAL WEEKS OF BENEFITS.—Deem section 203 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, as amended by Public Law 108-1 (117 Stat. 3), to be amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "50" and inserting "150"; and

(B) by striking "13" and inserting "39"; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting "16 of" after "equal to".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE OF MODIFICATIONS DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION (C).—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments described in subsection (c) shall be deemed to have taken effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, but shall be deemed as applying only with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment this Act, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In the case of an eligible individual for whom a temporary extended unemployment account was established before the date of enactment of this Act, the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (as amended by this section) shall be applied as if it had been amended in accordance with subsection (c)(1).

(b) IN GENERAL.—The amendments described in subsection (c) shall be deemed to have taken effect as if included in the enactment of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, but shall be deemed as applying only with respect to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act, subject to paragraph (2).

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of an individual who has remaining balances in an account established under section 203 as of December 28, 2003, temporary extended unemployment compensation shall continue to be payable to such individual in an amount from such account after such date pursuant to the application of subsection (c) of such section.

(2) LIMITATION.—No compensation shall be paid by reason of paragraph (1) for any week beginning after December 26, 2004.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will disclose the amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:
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Borrowing money to help people all around the world. Can we not do something for the airline employees? It is true that this administration does not want to spend the $20-some-odd billion balance in that fund and does not want to extend this benefit to airline employees who have exhausted their unemployment; but the fact is we must have to borrow the money to do it and it helps Americans. We are borrowing money to help people all around the world. Can we not do something for the airline employees? The Senate has acted on this issue, and hopefully we will come to a conference agreement that will provide for this long-overdue benefit; but if the House would send a message tonight, if the committee would accept this and waive a point of order against it, again, not having to appropriate funds, only authorize expenditures from the trust fund, we would begin to help these people who have been sorely hurt by 9-11 and now by this war in Iraq.
Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support Mr. DEFAZIO's amendment to provide an additional 26 weeks of unemployment compensation to workers in the air transportation industry. This industry and its workers have borne the brunt of the continuing war on terrorism and have been under the burden of our sluggish economy. In fact, the industry is expected to lose $6.7 billion this year. In addition, approximately 200,000 airline workers have lost their jobs since September 11, 2001, and another 70,000 workers are expected to be laid off this year.

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

In order to be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits, individuals must sustain an economic loss due to a situation created by factors beyond their control. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is defining his amendment to be presented, Mr. Chairman, in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. D EFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if I might give an anecdotal comment in speaking to the point of order, just 7 days ago, flying Delta Airlines, I was asked to, one might say for many reasons, but I was asked to leave the plane because the plane was going to another location than what I thought it was going to, causing me to miss an important connection, because they canceled a flight and they had to go to another city to pick up some other, if you will, passengers. That meant that they canceled the work of other employees who would have been on that plane. Those employees did not work. They were canceled out.

So there is a crisis when airlines are telling passengers we are canceling flights, we are laying off employees; these employees have no unemployment benefits. If we are operating under an emergency, Mr. Chairman, then I believe that this employment amendment that deals with extending the employment benefits for employees is a crisis, and we should be subject to a waiver to do this. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. D EFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if I could speak to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. D EFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I did last evening go to the Committee on Rules. There was a Republican member who was a principal sponsor of this legislation who was supposed to come to the Committee on Rules and ask for a waiver. He did not, but in his stead I asked the committee to protect this or, even better, to open up this section of the bill which goes to aviation and allow it to be amended outside of the rules of the appropriations process since this section of the bill was written totally, basically, behind closed doors. Unfortunately, apparently the Committee on Rules saw fit not to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) may be heard on the point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for being persistent in this very important initiative.

He is correct. In fact, I was in the Appropriations Committee. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee. I was not a member of the Appropriations Committee. I was not a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate or launch military actions except as authorized by Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

Mr. D EFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I hoped that this amendment would be accepted as noncontroversial. It would, in fact, end a bill that was begun by the Appropriations Committee, and it was begun by the Appropriations Committee, and it was begun by the Appropriations Committee, and it was begun by the Appropriations Committee. It would be an amendment that is extraordinarily noncontroversial, and I would ask that this amendment be allowed to be debated on the basis of a waiver. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTENREICH). Does anyone else care to address the Chair regarding the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that this amendment directly amends existing law. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate or launch military actions except as authorized by Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.
I probably have 2 minutes left. But he is not jumping to his feet, so I will keep talking for another 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I find it hard to believe that this House, the people's House, would not feel that in borrowing huge sums of money to the administration, would not want to protect its constitutional prerogatives and make certain that those funds were not used beyond the purposes of the already existing authorizations. So I would be puzzled if this House were to reject the amendment, and I would wonder what they know that I do not know, or what plans to use this money in ways that are not already authorized by law might be out there; and that would cause me grave concern, particularly when I sometimes listen to the Secretary of Defense, who was then contradicted by the Secretary of State.

Ms. J JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeFazio amendment.

The gentleman and I both offered two similar pieces of legislation, and I applaud this initiative which spoke to the question of whether or not this war was authorized. So I would be puzzled if this House were to reject this amendment, and I would wonder what they know that I do not know, or what plans to use this money in ways that are not already authorized by law might be out there; and that would cause me grave concern, particularly when I sometimes listen to the Secretary of Defense, who was then contradicted by the Secretary of State.

Ms. J JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeFazio amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I support the DeFazio amendment. It is very clear what we are saying here. Military actions except as authorized, none of the funds may be used to initiate a launch. This is beyond those already authorized. I had other language which went to that. The Parliamentarian stripped it out. But this is clearly saying we have already authorized the current actions, we authorized them under the 911 resolution, Afghanistan and other actions. Those are authorized. This would be future actions which would go outside the scope of the Afghanistan war and/or the war on terrorism, whatever those might be, and Secretary Rumsfeld has an active mind.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand what the gentleman is saying, but oftentimes what one intends in a very simple amendment is not really the effect.

Now, if the gentleman is talking about no further military action without a declaration of war, and I think that is what he is talking about, because Article I, section 8 refers to declaring war, let me make the point that the United States has not declared war since World War II. Korea was a massive war, but there was no declaration of war. We worked on resolutions passed by the Congress to authorize the President to take whatever steps necessary to protect America's interests or whatever the purpose was at the time.

So what I am suggesting is that this is a mischievous amendment for those who are opposed to this war in Iraq. They certainly have a right to oppose the war, and I wish we did not have to go to war as well. But I know that if we do not take care of the problem before it gets out of control, then it becomes out of control.

Now, I want to say something about those who are opposed to the war, and again they have the right to be opposed to the war, although I do not think that they are supporting our troops very effectively.

I wanted to tell the gentleman that since the wounded soldiers have started coming back from Afghanistan and Iraq, something that my wife and I do in a regular basis is visit these soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, Coast Guardsmen in the military hospitals at every opportunity, especially if they have no family there with them. We have been doing that quite actively.

I want to tell the gentleman a story about a young soldier who, when we entered his room, began to cry. Soldiers never cry. He tried to console him. She did not cry too well, although she normally does.

I went and talked to him, and asked, Are you in pain? He said, No, I am not.
in pain. I said, The injury could be repaired? He said, Yes, they told me they could fix the injury. I asked, Well, why are you crying? He said, I am crying because I am watching the television, and I am watching the people out there on the streets objecting to my colleagues and myself being in harm's way.

He was crying because of the antiwar protesters. Again, they have the right to protest, but they offended this soldier, who had been wounded defending their right to do it. Now, I am not suggesting that this amendment is anything like that; but I am suggesting that it does lend credence to those who would like to portray the United States as being totally wrong in what we are doing.

I want to say to the gentleman, whatever his position is on this war, if we do not fight the terrorists there is no doubt what would happen. We have already proved that al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein are in bed together. That has already been proved in this military action. But if we do not prevent another September 11, another destruction of two main towers in New York or the Pentagon with the loss of thousands of lives, if we do not do something now to prevent it and it happens again, none of us will be able to excuse our way out of it for not having done what was necessary to keep it from happening again.

I am determined to do everything that I can do, and I hope that all of my colleagues in the House will as well. I heard their speeches after September 11, stating that they would do everything possible to prevent these events from ever happening again, and to rid the world of the threat of terrorism and those who support terrorism.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: Page 164, line 32, insert the following: 

SEC. 807. (a) The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available in chapter 3 of title I for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide” by, and reducing the amount made available in chapter 4 of title I under the heading “OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE” for “Economic Support Fund” (and the allocation within that amount for grants for Turkey) by, $207,000,000, which, in the case of the additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide,” shall be available to establish National Guard Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team as authorized by law, including section 1253(s)(c) of title 10, United States Code, in order to carry out the requirement in section 1403 of Public Law 107-314 (116 Stat. 2676), that an additional 23 such teams be established, for a total of 55 such teams, with at least one team established in each State and territory.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I will take part of the time to respond to the chairman, since he did not give me time.

Mr. Chairman, I resent the broad-scale implications about the “proven linkage” between Saddam Hussein. They have been able to put Saddam Hussein in the same sentence with al Qaeda; but the CIA, DIA, and others have not been able to find or prove a single link, except for the group that he did not control up in the northern part of the country behind the Kurds, who have now been eradicated.

But there are proven links to the Saudis, there are proven links to the Pakistani intelligence service, there are proven links to others who in fact will receive assistance under this bill.

That aside, and we will not get back into the debate tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.

My other amendment is really simple. I know it will be opposed, but here it is.

This Congress authorized that we would make the American people safe by setting our weapons of mass destruction civil support teams in every State of the United States and the territories. Guess what, we have not delivered on that. We do not have enough money. We have been told there are budget constraints. We cannot afford to do a here tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.

My other amendment is really simple. I know it will be opposed, but here it is.

This Congress authorized that we would make the American people safe by setting our weapons of mass destruction civil support teams in every State of the United States and the territories. Guess what, we have not delivered on that. We do not have enough money. We have been told there are budget constraints. We cannot afford to do a here tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.

My other amendment is really simple. I know it will be opposed, but here it is.

This Congress authorized that we would make the American people safe by setting our weapons of mass destruction civil support teams in every State of the United States and the territories. Guess what, we have not delivered on that. We do not have enough money. We have been told there are budget constraints. We cannot afford to do a here tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.

My other amendment is really simple. I know it will be opposed, but here it is.

This Congress authorized that we would make the American people safe by setting our weapons of mass destruction civil support teams in every State of the United States and the territories. Guess what, we have not delivered on that. We do not have enough money. We have been told there are budget constraints. We cannot afford to do a here tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.

My other amendment is really simple. I know it will be opposed, but here it is.

This Congress authorized that we would make the American people safe by setting our weapons of mass destruction civil support teams in every State of the United States and the territories. Guess what, we have not delivered on that. We do not have enough money. We have been told there are budget constraints. We cannot afford to do a here tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.

My other amendment is really simple. I know it will be opposed, but here it is.

This Congress authorized that we would make the American people safe by setting our weapons of mass destruction civil support teams in every State of the United States and the territories. Guess what, we have not delivered on that. We do not have enough money. We have been told there are budget constraints. We cannot afford to do a here tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.

My other amendment is really simple. I know it will be opposed, but here it is.

This Congress authorized that we would make the American people safe by setting our weapons of mass destruction civil support teams in every State of the United States and the territories. Guess what, we have not delivered on that. We do not have enough money. We have been told there are budget constraints. We cannot afford to do a here tonight, but I believe the gentleman mischaracterizes my amendment. This was raised in light of Secretary Rumsfeld threatening to take action against Syria. We have heard that “real men” go to Tehran and other things from this administration. I am concerned what adventures they might have in mind in terms of further preemptive wars.

I was trying to make the statement that before we fight any more preemptive wars, that we would live up to our authority under article 1, section 8, which we failed, and we failed the troops and the American people in the Congress in the matter of this current action, although it was authorized under other auspices by this Congress.
the coalition that we find so important in fighting this struggle.

I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment as soundly as they defeated the previous amendment. We ought not to be reducing this money that is so important to maintaining our relationships with Turkey and maintaining Turkey's involvement in the war against terrorism and the war against Iraq.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO).

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO) will be postponed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply point out to the House that there are still, as near as I can count, 14 amendments remaining. If we are going to debate these amendments, Members can calculate for themselves how long we will be here.

That is all I have to say.

Amendment offered by Mr. ROTHMAN

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROTHMAN: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 2. The Transportation Security Administration shall place into effect flight restrictions, substantially similar to those applicable to the Washington, D.C., area, that prohibit general aviation aircraft within a 15 mile radius of the City of New York, New York.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, under current Transportation Security Administration restrictions, no general aviation aircraft can fly within 15 miles of the Washington Monument. So why, then, does New York City, the other target of the worst terrorist attack in the history of the United States, not have the very same safeguards being provided to it by the Transportation Security Administration against general aviation aircraft within 15 miles of New York City?

Before I continue, I want to make it clear to my colleagues that I am not talking about commercial aircraft, the 737s, 767s, and so forth that so many Americans depend on each day for travel into our Nation's major airports. What I am talking about are the smaller, private aircraft - primarily operated by members of smaller, general aviation airports such as Teterboro Airport in New Jersey. Those airports do not have the same restrictions that are in place.

Transportation Security Administration security procedures that the major airports have.

While these general aviation aircraft by themselves, because of their size, may not seem to be able to inflict a great deal of damage even if they were filled with chemical or biological agents they could potentially cause a tragedy greater than the one we had on September 11.

The restrictions that I am calling for, which would be the same restrictions that are in place for Washington, D.C., would keep general aviation aircraft from flying within 15 miles of New York City, the other major target of al Qaeda. That would mean that no general aviation aircraft would be able to fly over Times Square, fly over the Empire State Building, over Giants Stadium in New Jersey, or over the Continental Arena.

There would be exemptions provided, and if one was provided to a general aviation aircraft, that aircraft, and by the way, these exemptions are available here in Washington, D.C., simply requires those general aviation aircraft first to fly into what is called a gateway airport outside of the 15-mile restricted zone. There, the plane, pilot, passengers, and luggage would be inspected by Transportation Security Administration officials before these general aviation aircraft would be allowed to continue on to Teterboro or these other airports within 15 miles of Manhattan, such as JFK or LaGuardia. Again, these same restrictions are now in place for Washington, D.C., but not New York City.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stand with me and support my call for Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge and this Administration to immediately put into effect these new restrictions and protect the people of the New York metropolitan area, just as they have chosen to protect the people of Washington, D.C.

Government's number one responsibility is to protect the people. Security is the reason why general aviation aircraft are restricted in coming into airports within 15 miles of Washington, D.C. My amendment would seek the same restriction for general aviation aircraft which would seek to fly to or within first being inspected outside the 15-mile zone flying into New York City.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the Chair will rule that this amendment is not in order to be voted on tonight, so I will forego this evening, be withdrawing my amendment. But let it be clear, Mr. Chairman, I will continue to press this issue both in committee and on the floor.

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. ROTHMAN:

In section 201 of title II, after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $64,000,000)."

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, thousands of our Nation's troops woke up today with the express task of defending our country against Saddam Hussein's reign of terror in order to protect the safety and freedom of his people, neighboring countries and other nations like ours across the globe.

Our Nation's founders tasked Congress with the authority and power to wage war and the responsibility to fund these efforts. The bill before us today appropriates additional money to fund the work of our men and women fighting in this war. This bill provides critical dollars for efforts to protect and defend the homeland security of the United States. It provides vital resources to first responders, law enforcement officials, and public health workers across the Nation who have developed safety plans to counter the increased national threat posed by terrorism.

The President asked that we keep this a clean bill. Unfortunately this emergency wartime supplemental appropriations bill also seeks to fund an extraneous program entirely unrelated to national defense, homeland security or counterterrorism efforts. Included in this supplemental is a supplemental declaration for the Corporation for National and Community Service in order to make the corporation's Americorps trust fund solvent.
Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my opening statement be printed in the Record.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be stricken as not in order. I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be stricken as not in order. I yield the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be stricken as not in order. I yield the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for bringing forward this amendment. For myself I am not sure this is a proper way to spend AmeriCorps funding, but certainly it is not the right place as part of this bill. As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) correctly pointed out, for moving forward we need to have a vehicle where you can actually make changes, where you can actually reform, where you can actually do good things moving ahead. You cannot do that as part of the supplemental. Just like it was with the airline money. You cannot reform. You cannot do what you need to do as part of an emergency war supplemental.

What kind of message are we sending to our constituents and taxpayers across the country when we say that AmeriCorps funding, $64 million, needs to be part of a war supplemental? That just breeds the cynicism that it ought to. We should not be doing this. The amendment is justified. I would urge support of it and I thank the gentleman for bringing it forward.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, if you follow the logic of the last speaker, what you are saying is that we should provide in this bill $3.25 billion to the airline industry,
which we do not owe, but that we should not provide the funds in the bill to reimburse the volunteers for services, for which we do owe. I find that that makes no sense whatsoever.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Walsh) has pointed out that American taxpayers have an obligation which government has. We should not blame the recipients, we should not blame the participants in this program for the screw-ups of the government on their bookkeeping balances. The fact is that this is totally defendable at a time when we are trying to encourage volunteerism, at a time when we are trying to encourage a sense of self-sacrifice. It would be a strange message indeed to say that we are not going to meet our obligations to the volunteers under this program.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have heard my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), object to the inclusion of $64 million for the Corporation for National Service in a wartime supplemental appropriation.

I take the opposite view. I think including this funding in this bill is entirely appropriate precisely because we are at war against terrorism, and national service is a vital part of winning that war. National service is the right prescription during these times because the best antidotes to terror and hate in society are acts of kindness and service. For instance, just last week, the U.S.A. Freedom Corps launched a new resource for people seeking to support our troops, their families, and their communities called “On The Home Front.”

The point of the program is that while hundreds of thousands of men and women from all over America are serving and protecting our country away from home, those on the home front can make a difference too. Partnering with the Department of Defense, the U.S.A. Freedom Corps is offering resources to Americans who want to express their support for members of the military and their families in a meaningful way.

As a fiscal conservative, I believe national service is one of the most productive and cost-effective investments our government can make. Through service, Americans of all ages gain a sense of commitment to their community (which is an American value) and to the rest of their lives.

National service benefits both the recipient and the giver. Volunteers not only address an immediate need; they lead and teach through example, and through their example, they lead the way toward a value society and a helping others. We need to harness the energy and commitment of those anxious to contribute to their country. We should not only defeat this amendment, but we should finally pass the Citizen Service Act. Let me just say, as a former Peace Corps volunteer, we were paid a minimum wage so we could live, and we were given a small stipend. I have always been a strong advocate of keeping this legislation focused on the troops.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute just to respond to my colleague from Connecticut.

As he well knows, this $64 million appropriation has nothing to do with enlisting people for this year to be a part of national service. That is a distortion of where this $64 million is going.

This $64 million is going for mismanagement of the trust fund and accounting changes that have not been reviewed by the authorizing committees to determine whether the problems have been fixed. My colleagues know very well that I support the reauthorization of the corporation, and we are working together on the reauthorization bill in place so that we can be proud of the organization and the promise that they make to our young people.

This is to fix abuses within the program that have occurred, and this is not saying no to community service. This is saying a big yes to community service, but let us make sure that we do it right.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoekstra amendment striking the provision that provides the Federal AmeriCorps program with $64 million in funding. I have been a strong advocate of keeping this legislation clean, preventing the addition of costly, extraneous or unrelated spending.

The supplemental funding bill was meant to support our troops. It was meant to ensure that the men and women in uniform, like those from Fort Campbell in my home district, have every bit of support they need.

Funding for AmeriCorps simply does not belong in the legislation by any stretch of the imagination. Furthermore, there is a long history of financial mismanagement at the Corporation for National and Community Services, which includes the AmeriCorps program. The corporation has not been able to account for expenditures in recent years. It has had repeated difficulties with audits and a troubling tradition of not matching its funding commitments against the moneys appropriated by Congress. The AmeriCorps program has attempted to clean up its act; the problem still persists.

AmeriCorps does not merit additional funding of $64 million at a time when we are asking agencies to make across-the-board spending reductions. This supplemental package should not be a funding rescue for AmeriCorps.

The supplemental was intended to provide for our men and women in uniform, to get them the equipment and supplies they need to bring freedom and democracy to Iraq. Let us keep this legislation focused on the troops.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose my friend, the gentleman from Michigan’s (Mr. HOEKSTRA), amendment today because it cuts national service and breaks promises to thousands of American men and women who voluntarily choose to serve their country and communities.

I agree that we must hold the national service corporation accountable for any improper accounting or tracking procedures that they have engaged in. However, we should not punish the rest of innocent Americans who seek to serve their country and communities. They are responding to the President’s call asking for volunteers to serve their country.

The Hoekstra amendment would slash funds to national service just as a record number of Americans are engaging in community and public service opportunities. The Hoekstra amendment would eliminate funds for AmeriCorps education awards. Upon completion of their service term, AmeriCorps members earn an education award.

The Hoekstra amendment breaks a promise made to thousands of AmeriCorps members who proudly chose to serve their country. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Hoekstra amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in strong opposition to the Hoekstra amendment. I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

This amendment does, in fact, do great damage to those who have already earned their educational stipend. As my colleagues have pointed out, these individuals that have joined the Freedom Corps have joined AmeriCorps for the purposes of rendering service to our country and a bargain that we struck at the end of that service, a stipend that would be available.

Yes, it is true that apparently there has been some mismanagement in this program, but this administration has made this request for two reasons: one, they say to clean up and deal with the problems that have been discovered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and others; and the other is to pay the commitments that they already have.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY). Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, whenever there are problems such as this $64 million shortfall, we need to have clear answers and a remedy for such a problem. I am definitely in support of the Hoekstra amendment. This Supplemental Appropriations Act is for one main purpose, and that is, to support the troops in this ongoing war and also in support of homeland security.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and others, to help and assist some of these families.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for providing this opportunity to speak on what I think is an important issue. AmeriCorps is one of the programs that has shown that it is possible to engage young people in service, and we should be proud of what they are accomplishing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 1 minute.
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Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on this issue. AmeriCorps is one of the programs that has shown that it is possible to engage young people in service, and we should be proud of what they are accomplishing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on this issue. AmeriCorps is one of the programs that has shown that it is possible to engage young people in service, and we should be proud of what they are accomplishing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on this issue. AmeriCorps is one of the programs that has shown that it is possible to engage young people in service, and we should be proud of what they are accomplishing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on this issue. AmeriCorps is one of the programs that has shown that it is possible to engage young people in service, and we should be proud of what they are accomplishing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on this issue. AmeriCorps is one of the programs that has shown that it is possible to engage young people in service, and we should be proud of what they are accomplishing.
was no intent to do this in the dark of night. This was an honest response to an honest request from an honest President.

To paraphrase Mitch Daniels’ letter, the Director of OMB, the $64 million request is to liquidate legitimate prior-year obligations for eligible participants in the Americorps program and to address this longstanding problem.

Mr. Chairman, after 9/11, the President called on us to do better, to put our better instincts. He called on volunteerism across the country. This is the vehicle. It is the best vehicle. And now he has asked us to provide these funds to keep a promise. A promise is a promise. Support a wartime President who has the vision to see beyond the war. Vote “no” on the Hoeckstra amendment.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoeckstra amendment to strike a non-emergency provision in this bill that provides $64 million in new funding for the Corporation, National Community Service.

Last month, the Administration requested $64 million in new funds for the Corporation to “liquidate obligations incurred in previous years” in the National Service Trust.

The Administration requested these new funds as a liquidation shortfall that was incurred because of poor tracking procedures at the Corporation with regard to AmeriCorps participants and a recent decision by the Office of Management and Budget to change the way the Corporation has been determining the amount of funds available in the National Service Trust.

The purpose of the Administration’s request is to “complete the implementation of a comprehensive corrective action plan developed by CNCS to strengthen financial management of the Trust, change reporting procedures, and restore [National Service Trust] fund balances.”

While I will continue to work with President Bush and Mr. HOEKSTRA to reach agreement on a bill to reauthorize our national service laws—next time or place to address Corporation financial difficulties.

Mr. HOEKSTRA is currently working on this very issue in his Subcommittee. In fact, he held a hearing this week on “Performance, Accountability, and Reforms at the Corporation for National and Community Service.” There was significant discussion on this $64 million shortfall.

I am concerned about adding money to the National Service Trust at this time because, we can’t exactly figure out why there is a $64 million shortfall. Right time or place to address Corporation financial difficulties.

Mr. HOEKSTRA is currently working on this very issue in his Subcommittee. In fact, he held a hearing this week on “Performance, Accountability, and Reforms at the Corporation for National and Community Service.” There was significant discussion on this $64 million shortfall.

I am concerned about adding money to the National Service Trust at this time because, we can’t exactly figure out why there is a $64 million shortfall. Right time or place to address Corporation financial difficulties.

In addition, the Committee on Education and the Workforce has been examining this issue and this provision was added to the supplemental without prior consultation with our Committee.

Accordingly, I believe that funding to eliminate the shortfall should be addressed after Mr. HOEKSTRA and other Members on our Committee have had time to make sure that these financial problems do not continue at the Corporation. This is a specific issue that will be examined during reauthorization and I ask my Colleagues to let the Committee do its work and to support the Hoeckstra amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I could not hear the unanimous consent request.

Mr. STUPAK. To proceed out of order. According to the ruling of the Chair, only yourself and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) can move to strike the last word.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Maybe the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would move to strike the last word.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am told that I am asking permission to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for getting us over that procedural hurdle, and I will not take the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer an amendment tonight on health care, but I decided not to because I am sure it will take all of the time we have in the process we are provided with here tonight. But I wanted to make this point here on the floor tonight.

There is a provision in the supplemental that just sort of baffles me. What the Republicans are proposing is that we provide universal health care coverage for the Iraqi people. This Republican supplemental proposes, and I quote, “to facilitate rapid universal health care service delivery to the Iraqi population.”

I must ask why are they willing to do this when they have staunchly opposed universal coverage for the American people for years now? I understand that special provisions need to be included to care for the Iraq citizens injured in war. But if we are going to provide universal health care to the Iraqi population, we should do the same for our people here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the rest of my statement along with my proposed amendment, for the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the 41.2 million Americans who lack coverage should not have to suffer from lack of quality health care any longer. And our heroic soldiers, who will soon become veterans, should not be denied future health care.

The GOP Budget Resolution, that we passed 2 weeks ago, will deny and increase the cost of VA care. In my home state of Michigan, 25,000 veterans will be adversely affected and 5,000 of these veterans reside in my district.

Instead of honoring their commitment to our soldiers, the Republicans are proposing universal health coverage, for.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer an amendment tonight on health care, but I decided not to because I am sure it will take all of the time we have in the process we are provided with here tonight. But I wanted to make this point here on the floor tonight.

There is a provision in the supplemental that just sort of baffles me. What the Republicans are proposing is that we provide universal health care coverage for the Iraqi people. This Republican supplemental proposes, and I quote, “to facilitate rapid universal health care service delivery to the Iraqi population.”

I must ask why are they willing to do this when they have staunchly opposed universal coverage for the American people for years now? I understand that special provisions need to be included to care for the Iraq citizens injured in war. But if we are going to provide universal health care to the Iraqi population, we should do the same for our people here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the rest of my statement along with my proposed amendment, for the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the 41.2 million Americans who lack coverage should not have to suffer from lack of quality health care any longer. And our heroic soldiers, who will soon become veterans, should not be denied future health care.

The GOP Budget Resolution, that we passed 2 weeks ago, will deny and increase the cost of VA care. In my home state of Michigan, 25,000 veterans will be adversely affected and 5,000 of these veterans reside in my district.

Instead of honoring their commitment to our soldiers, the Republicans are proposing universal health coverage, for. Maybe now they will finally stop blocking Democratic attempts to cover the 41.2 million Americans who go without health insurance, and maybe now they will join in our other efforts on the health care front, such as providing American seniors access to a true pre-scription drug benefit through Medicare.

Amendment to H.R. 1559, As Reported

Offered by Mr. Stupak from Michigan

Page 59, after line 25, insert the following: Sec. 3002. None of the funds made available under chapter 4 of title I of this Act may be used for the provision of universal health care to the Iraqi people beyond those amounts needed to cover related physical injuries to the Iraqi people from the war in Iraq and other diseases or injuries caused by public health conditions resulting from the war in Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that I appreciate the gentleman’s comments and would simply say this. I share the wonder that we can be in the process of planning to provide universal health care in Iraq and provide a lot of education reconstruction as well.

I guess my view of it is this: If we are going to be bombing the devil out of a country, I suspect that we have a considerable moral obligation to the population afterwards to help repair the damage and to help repair the human misery. So I do not begrudge what we will be trying to do for the people of Iraq after this miserable war.

What I do hope, however, is that we will be able to reduce and perhaps lower the future tax increase contemplated right now here at home so that we can in fact provide universal health care for the people at home; so that we can in fact provide some school construction in our own districts; and so that we can in fact modernize hospitals in our own country. I think that is the proper way to do it, and I appreciate the gentleman’s comments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for getting us over that procedural hurdle, and I will not take the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to offer an amendment tonight on health care, but I decided not to because I am sure it will take all of the time we have in the process we are provided with here tonight. But I wanted to make this point here on the floor tonight.

There is a provision in the supplemental that just sort of baffles me. What the Republicans are proposing is that we provide universal health care coverage for the Iraqi people. This Republican supplemental proposes, and I quote, “to facilitate rapid universal health care service delivery to the Iraqi population.”

I must ask why are they willing to do this when they have staunchly opposed universal coverage for the American people for years now? I understand that special provisions need to be included to care for the Iraq citizens injured in war. But if we are going to provide universal health care to the Iraqi population, we should do the same for our people here at home.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the rest of my statement along with my proposed amendment, for the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the 41.2 million Americans who lack coverage should not have to suffer

from lack of quality health care any longer. And our heroic soldiers, who will soon become veterans, should not be denied future health care.

The GOP Budget Resolution, that we passed 2 weeks ago, will deny and increase the cost of VA care. In my home state of Michigan, 25,000 veterans will be adversely affected and 5,000 of these veterans reside in my district.

Instead of honoring their commitment to our soldiers, the Republicans are proposing universal health coverage, for. Maybe now they will finally stop blocking Democratic attempts to cover the 41.2 million Americans who go without health insurance, and maybe now they will join in our other efforts on the health care front, such as providing American seniors access to a true prescription drug benefit through Medicare.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. I thank both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), and I am pleased to engage in a collaborative spirit with my colleagues on the House Subcommittee on Homeland Security, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

First of all, I want to thank both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the Committee on Appropriations for bringing this supplemental appropriations measure to the floor. As my colleagues know, I was going to offer an amendment that would have provided $30 million for research, development, and the initial deployment of technology to protect our commercial aircraft from the threat posed by shoulder-fired missiles. A terrorist attempting to attack a commercial aircraft is most likely to use a small portable surface-to-air missile. Unfortunately, there are thousands of these weapons worldwide that are available and obtainable on the black market. At least some 27 nonstate groups have these weapons. But there is military technology to defend against this particular potential threat, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) can elaborate on this issue.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for recognizing the threat and their leadership in addressing this issue.

Mr. Chairman, time is of the essence. Thirty terrorist organizations, including Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda network, are already believed to own such missiles. It is only a matter of time before they are filtered into the United States. They have the weapons and we have the technology to protect against those weapons.

The threat is real, but so is the defense. It is operational on U.S. and British military transports. Technology that the U.S. military uses to protect transports from missile attacks could be quickly and easily adapted for our own commercial air fleet. All Americans deserve that defense.

I had intended to offer an amendment on this issue, but in view of the work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) on this, I will withdraw it.

Mr. Chairman, let me once again thank these gentlemen for their leadership on this issue, and I look forward to working with them in the future.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe it is vitally critical that we fully understand the threat of shoulder-fired missiles and respond now accordingly. Therefore, the focus of my amendment was to reduce the cost and use existing military technology and adapt that technology to the commercial aviation environment.

I have, however, decided not to offer the amendment tonight because I understand this issue will be addressed in conference. Understanding that the gentleman from Kentucky has agreed to support language in the conference report that would require the Transportation Security Administration to report to Congress within 30 days and that report will specify the financial and technical requirements of reducing the costs and also adapting existing military missile defense technology for deployment on our commercial aircraft.

I just want to thank again the gentleman from Kentucky and would ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether this is his understanding as well.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Florida will continue to yield, I would respond that the gentleman from Kentucky has agreed to support language in the conference report that would require the Transportation Security Administration to report to Congress within 30 days and that report will specify the financial and technical requirements of reducing the costs and also adapting existing military missile defense technology for deployment on our commercial aircraft.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman both of the full committee and of the subcommittee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN:

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. . FULL FUNDING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.

There is appropriated an additional $9,500,000,000 for programs under section 611 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411).

SEC. . FULL FUNDING FOR THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001.

There is appropriated an additional $5,155,000,000 for programs authorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–110).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, the supplemental bill provides emergency funds for the war in Iraq, but right here at home, our States and our school systems are facing an emergency as well. I understand that the amendment that I have offered can be ruled out of order and I will withdraw it, but I am here because I cannot find another way to make the point that I am trying to make.

Our school systems in Maine are struggling and our school administrators and school board members do not know what to do because the Federal Government is not fully funding the special education that was passed in 1976 and we are not fully funding the No Child Left Behind Act, so all of these school systems, all of these people are basically faced with laying off teachers or raising property taxes. What is going to happen is some combination of both.

So tonight we stand here trying to figure out how to pay for a war in Iraq that we have to pay for, we have to support our troops, but we have these emergencies here at home that we are completely neglecting. I wish there was some way for me to bring this issue up on the floor at one time and say on the one hand the Republicans in this Congress is proposing hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts for the richest people in the country and on the other hand not adequately funding our schools. That is the priority.

I know that I cannot bring an amendment before this body and say that we have to cut $30 billion out of this year and actually fully fund special education. We could do that. It is a piece of cake, if you do both at once. It would take $5 billion. Reduce the tax cut and you could fully fund the obligations that we are imposing on States through the No Child Left Behind. Again, it is simple math. It could be done. But the truth is we are barred from doing that. We cannot make that happen.

I came here tonight to say that is what we ought to be doing. That is what we ought to be doing with legislation like this in some form so we could deal with our expenditures and our revenues at the same time, the way people deal with their personal budgets and businesses deal with their budgets: look at the revenues, look at the expenditures and make them come out roughly balanced. We can do that. We can support education. But not without reducing the President's tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Ms. WATERS: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Requiring that United States urge the Inter-American Development Bank to resume lending to Haiti.

Sec. . The Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the United States Executive Director at the Inter-American Development Bank to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to urge the Inter-American Development Bank to immediately resume lending to Haiti, and disburse all loans to Haiti that have been approved by the Inter-American Development Bank.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide development assistance loans to Haiti. The amendment would require the United States to use its voice, vote, and influence to urge the Inter-American Development Bank to immediately resume lending to Haiti and disburse all previously approved loans.

There is no money being requested in this amendment. It is simply language. The Inter-American Development Bank is denying Haiti any access to loans for development assistance. Haiti has already had $145.9 million in development
The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

As the Chair noted earlier today, the fact that points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI were waived against provisions in the bill does not under the precedents permit amendments adding further legislation.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rules state in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment imposes additional duties. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Ms. Jackson-Lee) wish to be heard on the point of order? Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the point of order deals with the question of a waiver on this particular amendment, and I would just say that in the context of the emergency supplemental, we cannot deal with this issue without considering the appropriations because we said it was a crisis. And in waiving that, we allowed $700 million for Jordan, $300 million for Egypt, and $1 billion for Turkey, which I just voted on, and the reason is I believe we need the money.

The point we would make in waiving it for Haiti is that Haiti represents a loophole in defense, if you will. They represent a potential loophole for terrorism, and not that they are housing terrorists, but if you have a country that is near collapse and there is no appropriating of monies here, clearly I believe this should be considered a crisis and be subjected to a waiver because as we help Turkey and Egypt, so should we help Haiti because it provides for the security of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain further arguments from the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Waters) on the point of order.

Ms. Waters. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, the point was well made earlier today when our ranking member talked about the way we have been treated; and while the chairman and the majority party have waived points of order, have waived the rules so that they could have their amendments so they could do whatever it is they want to do on this bill, they basically closed us out.

Then of course the point that was made by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson-Lee) that the gentleman from Florida has waived the rules when they have wanted to, are points that are well made. On the point of order, while it could be considered legislating on an appropriation, it is not that it has not been done, it is not that it will cost any money, it is not that it will cost anything except the will of this body to say to the IDB, go ahead and disburse the money that has already been appropriated. It is not too much to ask of the other side of the aisle. On the point of order, I believe if the chairman was of the mind to do so, he could do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rules state in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law." The amendment imposes additional duties. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Ms. Jackson-Lee) wish to be heard on the point of order? Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the point of order deals with the question of a waiver on this particular amendment, and I would just say that in the context of the emergency supplemental, we cannot deal with this issue without considering the appropriations because we said it was a crisis. And in waiving that, we allowed $700 million for Jordan, $300 million for Egypt, and $1 billion for Turkey, which I just voted on, and the reason is I believe we need the money.

The point we would make in waiving it for Haiti is that Haiti represents a loophole in defense, if you will. They represent a potential loophole for terrorism, and not that they are housing terrorists, but if you have a country that is near collapse and there is no appropriating of monies here, clearly I believe this should be considered a crisis and be subjected to a waiver because as we help Turkey and Egypt, so should we help Haiti because it provides for the security of this Nation.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rules state in pertinent part: “An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.” The amendment seeks to do additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. WATERS. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would insist on the comments being directed to the point of order rather than to the issue.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida can insist on whatever he wants to insist on, choose to speak on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on the point of order.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the chairman is exercising his right to make this point of order. He has not been doing it this way all evening. I would dare say that he has indeed waived the rules when he found it convenient to do so. This would not be a precedent this evening.

This particular amendment that I am addressing would simply point out all of the funding that is being done in this supplemental appropriation, and it would raise the question of why if we are building schools and providing universal health care, if we are doing it in Afghanistan and Iraq, doing it in other countries that are not even associated with the war, why not do it right here at home in the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Ms. Waters:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. 2. (a) LIMITING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—If an officer described in subsection (b) was, at any time during the covered period, a member of the board of directors of a company or a senior management official of a company, such officer may not—

(1) otherwise directly or indirectly communicate with such company, or any officer or employee of such company, during the period any such negotiation is in progress or the exercise of authority is considered.

(b) DESIGNATED OFFICERS.—The following officers are described in this subsection for purposes of subsection (a): the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Administrator of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Director of the Government Accountability Office, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of Financial Management and Accountability, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

(c) COVERED PERIOD.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term “covered period” means the 4-year period preceding the beginning of a negotiation of a contract or the exercise of authority in connection with an existing contract.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an entitled amendment that would eliminate conflicts of interest and would ensure that senior level officers in the administration could not use the conflict with Iraq to obtain financial benefits for companies with which they have been affiliated. Specifically, the amendment prohibits senior level officials in the administration from being present at or participating in any negotiations or contracts with companies in which they were senior managers or members of the board of directors within the last 4 years.

There has been considerable amount of suspicion about the motives of this administration in pursuing a war with Iraq. Many Americans have expressed concerns that our country initiated military action in order to secure control of Iraqi oil fields and other Iraqi resources. While these suspicions are based on rumors and allegations, we in Congress should not do anything that would contribute to doubts about the sincerity of our country’s motives.

Prior to the 2000 election, Vice President Dick Cheney spent 5 years as the chief executive of the Houston-based energy services company Halliburton. On March 24, 2003 Kellogg, Brown & Root, a Halliburton subsidiary, announced that it was awarded a contract by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to put out fires and make emergency repairs in Iraq’s oil infrastructure. Prior to the onset of hostilities, Halliburton was one of the companies that the administration invited to bid on up to $900 million in contracts to rebuild roads and bridges and other facilities in Iraq.

Although Halliburton declined to bid for a primary contract for reconstruction work in Iraq, the company’s officials have indicated their interest and they are going to do it another way. They want to do it through subcontracting. Halliburton contracts and subcontractors could, and apparently did, indicate that the Vice President may be using his position to increase his former company’s profit in time of war.

My amendment would protect the individuals who are advising the President on matters of war and peace from conflicts of interest. It would also help to eliminate the appearance of conflicts of interest at a time when the administration’s decisions are affecting millions of lives around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure this will be ruled out of order, and it may be embarrassing to some folks. It is a mild amendment. It does not prevent any company from getting a contract. It would simply take the person out of the room who is an adviser to the President who may be in the President’s cabinet, who may be in a strategic position to help influence contracting. They would have to recuse themselves from those particular meetings.

Now, if we had the will and if we were interested about our image, and if we were interested in allaying the allegations and the fears that something is going on in the back room, we would indeed adopt this amendment.

I want to tell Members that there are too many people who believe that there are committees and advisory committees that are serving people in very key roles and that on these committees we have folks who are looking for contracts who represent the defense industry. We have cronies and associates who are well placed.

This amendment would go a long way in improving our image and sending a message to the American people that we are not divvying up the spoils of this war in Iraq, and it would certainly say to our young men and women who are fighting for what they believe is protecting the freedoms of American people, it would say to them that they are not fighting so that someone could end up with some contracts.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rules state in pertinent part: “An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.” The amendment imposes additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order again, I make the point that the chairman has on other occasions this evening waived the rules, and certainly this would not be a precedent. He could do it if he had the will to do it. Again, I think just as on my other two amendments, he has failed to give an opportunity to have some very serious issues heard. He is dozing on it. It is true that there should not be room for this kind of amendment, but simply because in this case he wants to protect the administration and allow them to continue to
divvy up the spoils and give contracts to cronies.
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The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds this amendment includes language imparting direction. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. The amendment is out of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RODRIGUEZ

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. 48. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are reduced by the amounts made available in chapter 4 of title I for "Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund" by appropriating under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS" an additional amount for "Veterans Health Administration—Medical Care" of $122 million in the case of the amount appropriated for "Veterans Health Administration—Medical Care", $70,000,000 is for additional health care, as authorized by Chapter 17, Title 38, United States Code, for the provision of medical care for emergency preparedness centers in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that since the 9–11 attacks the VA has been forced to address issues and has never received any funding to undertake that. My amendment would allow the VA to be able to get additional resources that they need in order to take care of some of that cost and be able to respond to the time of war, also in part to the National Disaster Medical System.

The VA was responsible for several roles within the Federal response plan. The VA is currently diverting its scarce funds from the VA patient care mission to fulfill this mission.

I know that the other side would indicate that $122 million has been allocated, but it is coming from existing patient service. In fact, the VA has recently come out with a report, and on that report it basically indicates, and I have the figures here, that there is a real need for right now, just in terms of getting ready to prepare and what it costs, $248 million dollars, and that report was put together by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs Principi. So I would ask that as we look at providing the resources and patients have access to adequate supplies of necessary drugs and state-of-the-art protective gear for decontaminated equipment.

The amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) would ensure that the VA is adequately funded for these purposes; and as he indicated, it would allow the VA to establish four new centers of excellence in bioterrorism.

The amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) would ensure that the VA is adequately funded for these purposes; and as he indicated, it would allow the VA to establish four new centers of excellence in bioterrorism. These centers, created by legislation introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), would allow the VA to draw from expertise that it has had in the past such as environmental hazards, post-traumatic stress disorders, as war-related illnesses, environmental hazards and others.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that the VA has many areas of expertise in such diverse topics as biomedical research, as post-traumatic stress disorders, as war-related illnesses, environmental hazards and others.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment.

The VA has many programs they have put in place to address returning servicemembers' health care needs, to train their personnel, and to ensure that the providers and patients have access to adequate supplies of necessary drugs and state-of-the-art protective gear for decontaminated equipment.

The amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) would ensure that the VA is adequately funded for these purposes; and as he indicated, it would allow the VA to establish four new centers of excellence in bioterrorism. These centers, created by legislation introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), and would allow the VA to draw from expertise that it has had in the past such as environmental hazards, post-traumatic stress disorder, and I understand the VA has had a lot of work in helping those people.

We cannot continue to erode resources for VA's medical health care system and other.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that the VA is hurting right now. Our veterans are reaching that age where they need our help and assistance. The resources are needed and would appeal to both sides of the aisle to take into consideration this issue. I am not going to ask for a vote, but I want them to seriously consider what we are doing with our veterans. I know I have had a chance to dialogue with the Gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), and we really need those preparative centers now. We need about $20 million to start them and get those contracts going throughout this country, and I ask the Committee on Appropriations to seriously consider that issue.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and I do so regretfully. The gentleman has great concern for America's veterans, and they've always showed that concern; and he does so in this amendment, and I share that concern. I am also pleased that he has decided not to request a vote on this.

I think there is logic to his argument, I would just like to say that we on the subcommittee have taken great pains to provide the veterans medical centers with the resources that they need. In fact, the Committee on Appropriations has provided record increases to VA medical care in the last 3 years. We provided $122 million to the VA for medical care for emergency preparedness activities in the fiscal year 2003 bill which we just passed several weeks ago, fully funded. We fully funded the computer cybersecurity initiatives for $75 million. We fully funded the personal protective equipment and training needs of $15 million. Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield since I am not asking for a vote?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is sincere about indicating $122 million, but I also understand that $122 million comes from existing programs that were taken away from services to veterans. I would hope that we just kind of take that into consideration.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I beg to differ with the gentleman. These funds were appropriated in the 2003 bill to provide for resources across the board for a VA medical center; and we fully supported that very strongly, close to 400 votes by the House. So I oppose the gentleman's amendment for those reasons.

We received a letter just a week ago requesting $5 million as opposed to the $20 million being requested today. I know the $5 million will be made available to the VA because I placed language in this bill to do so, and that will give the VA the time and the money they need to plan these medical emergency preparedness centers, and I spoke with the Secretary about it. He is pleased with that number. So I would ask that we oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to rise in support of the gentleman from Texas's (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) amendment. We happen to come from the same State and are facing the same issue because Texas has one of the highest numbers of veterans among about four or five States. I know that he has a veterans facility in his congressional district or...
near there, and I have one as well. The reality of it is that we are trying to provide new money because what we are facing, Mr. Chairman, is that many of our veterans are being de-enrolled or not allowed to be enrolled for veterans medical care. In addition to this, as Mr. Rodriguez talks to the paralyzed veterans, they will say that they are getting fewer services, and since we are standing on this floor debating on an emergency appropriation to help our troops, the real question will be how will we treat these veterans, who will be returning and who will need medical services along with their families. What is the aftermath? What is the after attention that we will give the very young men and women who are fighting for us?

We already know we are going to have the wounded and some severely wounded. These individuals will be hospitalized in our veterans facilities. We are already closing the door on these veterans, and the money that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez) is talking about is money that is going to help in homeland security, and I think that is a key element that he is adding to the centers dealing with bio-technology. And I might add that when we talk about homeland security, my veterans hospital was a lifesaver because it opened its doors to the patients who had to be evacuated from the medical center. So these facilities are crucial to the community. They do require, they think, our attention; and I believe that well needs.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Let me just indicate that my understanding is that $122 million is not new dollars. It is existing dollars coming from existing services for veterans. In addition to this, and once again I appeal to both sides, the demographics on veterans is growing. Our World War II, Korean veterans are reaching that age where they need us now. They were there for us. We need to be there for them now. So we need to be able to provide those resources; and in all honesty, it does not make any sense for us to look at providing resources for health care for Iraq, which is needed and I do not disagree, but the fact is we also have our veterans and for those soldiers that are coming back because one of the objectives also is to serve the individuals in active military. In addition to that letter that the gentleman received for $5 million, I am hoping that that is in there because if that is not in there, then he is going to hear from me once again.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez) I thank him for his very hard work. What we are seeing is that the doors of veterans hospitals are being closed in the face of our veterans, and what are we going to do when the young veterans come home after they have valiantly fought for our freedom or our values? Whether we agree or disagree with what this war is about, we certainly agree with our troops. And I believe that this amendment from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez) is talking about, these expanded centers will provide training, which will be a timeless element to our fight against terrorism and homefront security.

So I would ask that we support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas and add the additional funding for Veterans Affairs.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I will use only a small part of the allotted time.

Let me just first say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez) that I really respect his support for veterans. I know it comes from his heart, and I know how strongly he feels about it and how hard he has worked. Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine that we would not want to say that the expanded centers that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez) is talking about, these expanded centers will provide training, which will be a timeless element to our fight against terrorism and homefront security.

So I would ask that we support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas and add the additional funding for Veterans Affairs.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I will use only a small part of the allotted time.

Let me just indicate that my understanding is that $122 million is not new dollars. It is existing dollars coming from existing services for veterans. In addition to this, and once again I appeal to both sides, the demographics on veterans is growing. Our World War II, Korean veterans are reaching that age where they need us now. They were there for us. We need to be there for them now. So we need to be able to provide those resources; and in all honesty, it does not make any sense for us to look at providing resources for health care for Iraq, which is needed and I do not disagree, but the fact is we also have our veterans and for those soldiers that are coming back because one of the objectives also is to serve the individuals in active military. In addition to that letter that the gentleman received for $5 million, I am hoping that that is in there because if that is not in there, then he is going to hear from me once again.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me just say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez) I thank him for his very hard work. What we are seeing is that the doors of veterans hospitals are being closed in the face of our veterans, and what are we going to do when the

young veterans come home after they have valiantly fought for our freedom or our values? Whether we agree or disagree with what this war is about, we certainly agree with our troops. And I believe that this amendment from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez) is talking about, these expanded centers will provide training, which will be a timeless element to our fight against terrorism and homefront security.

So I would ask that we support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas and add the additional funding for Veterans Affairs.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

This kind of conduct is outrageous. It

Some of the retired executives decided to make the letter public after last week's formal disclosure by Delta that it spent $25.5 million in 2002 to start creating protected pension trusts for Mullin and 32 other top executives. 'This is not a spectacular idea or example of rip-off capitalism, I do not know what is. This is enough to give capitalism a bad name.

Mr. Chairman, I would just suggest that before we are so anxious to provide the funding that the Republican leadership in this House insists that we provide to these companies, I would suggest that Members recognize that the story tells us that there ought to be a few more stringent conditions on the use of that money by those airlines.

This kind of conduct is outrageous. It is an example of why 50 percent of...
Americans do not vote, because they do not think that their elected representatives will protect the interests of working people nearly as eagerly as they will protect the interests of the corporate elite of this country. Delta Airlines management should be ashamed of itself, and anybody who comes into a congressional office looking for a bailout after they are trying to protect these kinds of pensions should be thrown bodily out of congressional offices.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 209. None of the funds made available in this Act for reconstruction efforts in Iraq may be used to procure goods or services from any corporation or other business entity organized under the laws of France, Germany, any other European country, the People’s Republic of China, or Syria.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order, points of order are reserved for all amendments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself as an opponent, and that I be permitted to yield 10 minutes of my 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Oasby).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I was having difficulty hearing. The chairman indicated that 15 minutes would be reserved for the gentleman from Washington, 5 minutes for the gentleman from Florida, and 10 minutes for yours truly? Is the gentleman opposed to the amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, I am.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) will be recognized for 5 minutes, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for the time agreement.

I rise in support of this amendment, which has one fundamental premise attached to it. That is, it is a limitation amendment that says that American dollars to be used in the reconstruction of the post-Saddam Hussein Iraq will be permitted only if used to support and defend the coalition of the coalition, those that were the coalition of the unwilling: France, Germany, the Russian Federation, or Syria.

It is a commonsense amendment. It is an amendment that was discussed at length in Appropriations earlier this week, and it underscores one fundamental concept, and that is that in the postwar Iraq, there will be American dollars expended for reconstruction, and in that reconstruction effort, it seems only commonsensical and advisable that American taxpayer dollars be spent for American corporations that are doing business there, to create jobs in this country, and also to provide corporate and contract authority to companies engaged in those coalition countries that supported America and Great Britain and the rest of her allies in this joint effort to try to liberate the country of Iraq. It seems to me to be common sense. It makes sense and is well expected with respect to a responsible expenditure of dollars, American taxpayer dollars in postwar Iraq.

It also recognizes that there will be many kinds of expenditures and contributions across this world to help the people of Iraq get back on their feet. This amendment does not prevent the French or the Germans or the United Nations or anybody else from participating in that reconstruction effort. The limitation is not with American tax dollars.

So I am pleased to present this amendment. I believe it has broad support, and I am happy to acknowledge the cosponsorship of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), Mr. KENNEDY the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENshaw), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the gentleman from California (Mr. Ose), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Souder).

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise today in support of the Nethercutt amendment.

Last month I introduced legislation to block any French company in particular from participating or receiving any U.S. Government aid or financing in any reconstruction of Iraq in the post-conflict setting. From the beginning, in particular, the French position was to be opposed to any aid to Iraq in defiance of the United Nations Resolution 1441. In fact, the French position was probably well received in Baghdad itself, and resulted in the opinion of most people in encouraging Saddam Hussein to continue to fail to cooperate with the U.N. inspectors and into compliance with Resolution 1441.

I heard on the news just the other day that the French continue their diatribe against the coalition forces. In fact, I have received some current publications from France that I would like to share with the Members in case there is any doubt about the situation involving the French attitude.

Here is a publication called The Observateur, and the cover headline is “Iraq: The Traps of a Crazy War.” The article that follows is entitled, “The Insane Ones of God” and goes on to say that they are crazy, meaning anyone who has ever supported a use of force to disarm Saddam Hussein, saying they are crazy and do not have an ounce of judgment. That refers to a lot of people who voted to support the use of force who happen to be here in this Chamber.

Another publication called L’Express has an article entitled, “Baghdad Victory at What Price?” And then we have Le Point. They refer to this action in disarming Saddam Hussein as “the tragedy.” It is the cover story, and uses words such as ‘arrogance’ and ‘propaganda’ to describe the U.S. position.

So I commend the gentleman for moving forward with this amendment and I ask everyone to support it.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My understanding is that there is some confusion at the desk about the text of the amendment. It was originally designated as number 11. I substituted another text of language that was, my understanding was number 11.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the text that was substituted well ahead in place of the original amendment be considered as read.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to try to sort this out.

The gentleman’s amendment number 11 indicates that he has written this thing 11 times. I know that we started working on this issue at the committee markup. I support and agree with what the gentleman is trying to do. But frankly, I am not satisfied that the language that he has adversely affect other U.S. interests. That is the reason I rose in opposition to his amendment. It is just that I think there is too much confusion on that amendment as we speak, and the fact that we are considering an amendment that is different than the one the gentleman thought he offered I think just further worsens that situation.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What I did was put number 11 on the text, expecting that that is what the Chair was considering at the time that I called up the amendment. So I guess,
competitive procedures in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the U.S. Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation. The company that was not competitive bidding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would simply respond briefly to the gentleman that the gentleman claimed to offer and the Clerk reported the only amendment numbered 11 which was at the desk. The other amendment which the gentleman had at the desk was not numbered.

**POINT OF ORDER**

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is in violation of clause 2, rule XXII.

Mr. Chairman, the minority has been told all day and all evening that we had to abide by the rules, even though the rule waived points of order against the majority bill. Now we have a situation where a majority Member chooses to try to substitute another amendment for the amendment that was presented by the Clerk. I am sorry, but if we are going to stick by the rules, I am sticking by the rules, and I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) wish to be heard on the point of order? Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering to withdraw the amendment which has been designated 11 by the Chair with the expectation that the real amendment number 11 will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) in due course under the same circumstances, so we will be able to debate in full the issue before the House, rather than be denied on a technicality.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his amendment? Mr. NETHERCUTT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH**

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for the procurement of goods or services without the use of competitive procedures in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the U.S. Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation. The company that was not competitive bidding.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago, Kellogg, Brown & Root, the engineering and construction division of Halliburton, was granted a contract to put out Iraqi oil fires. This contract was awarded without competitive bidding. The contract also contained no set time limit or cost limit. This means that U.S. taxpayers will have to pay for whatever Halliburton chooses to charge; that is, whether they are the top contractor or the prime contractor. There is danger to the taxpayers when contracts are awarded without competitive bidding.

USAID, which gave out the contract, stated there was no competitive bidding. The job involved a “complex emergency” and “national security” issues. According to the Federal acquisition regulations and AID acquisition regulations, such waivers exist.

Okay, maybe that is understandable. But what about contracts for the post-war reconstruction of Iraq?

The uncontracted contract acquisition of Kellogg, Brown & Root to put out Iraqi oil fires raises serious concerns for the continued acquisition of contracts with big oil. The fact that the Department of Defense’s Army Corps of Engineers did not conduct competitive bidding for this contract implies that an uncomfortably cozy relationship still exists between Halliburton and the administration.

There is an issue that really goes far beyond this particular piece of legislation in the supplemental bill, that is, this administration should be going out of its way to reaffirm their commitment to competitive bidding. The amendment would reaffirm already-existing law for this supplemental bill, stating that all contracts awarded for the reconstruction of Iraq must be subject to competitive bidding, as stated in the Federal acquisition regulations and the AID acquisition regulations.

Mr. Chairman, I think Members of this Congress, having been informed of this conversation this evening, should take steps in our various congressional committees to assure appropriate oversight; to make sure that competitive bidding laws are used to protect the American people, to protect the taxpayers of the United States.

This is an issue that really goes far beyond this particular piece of legislation in the supplemental bill, but I wanted to use this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to let Members of both sides of the aisle know that this issue is not going to go away and that the appropriate forum for dealing with it would be congressional investigative subcommittees or committees which could call the administration to an accounting. In the meantime, this forum is an appropriate place to demand competitive bidding.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA**

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for the procurement of goods or services from any entity that includes information on a request for Proposal (RFP) that indicates that such entity is organized under the laws of France, Germany, the Russian Federation, or Syria.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment offered...
by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, could I suggest that the gentleman, since it is late and we do have other amendments to dispose of, how much did the gentleman suggest it be limited to 20 minutes?

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. My suggested time is 30 minutes, to be equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

Mr. OBEY. Could I suggest that we cut it to 20?

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would be happy to change that. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OSE. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. May I clarify, Mr. Chairman, do I have just 5 minutes and no time to yield time outside of the proposal?

The CHAIRMAN. At this point, the committee is operating under the 5-minute rule. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment. This amendment that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LUCAS), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) put forward was amended. This amendment is strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Florida. I would hope.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage Members to not only support this amendment but also to throw in the underlining supplemental appropriation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and the gentleman from Washington.

Let me ask all Members to think about this, because there are some things we all agree to. We all agree that we are winning the war, but I think we all believe that it is going to be harder to establish the peace. That is our concern now. We have won the war, but we have to be successful in winning the peace.

We all agree, both sides of the aisle, that we are facing anti-American sentiments. We should ask ourselves, where have those sentiments come from? They have come from the regime in Iraq, but they have also come from those that have supported them. France, Germany, Russia, Syria, the person that is president, have caused a great deal of the anti-American sentiment that we are now facing. I ask Members to picture themselves a citizen of Iraq. We hear what the French and Germans have said, that we are there to get the oil. Then we see the American tanks; we see the American bullets. There is a lot of work for Americans to do after that. The last thing we want is to then see the French coming in and the Germans coming in and rebuilding Iraq; America coming in and controlling Iraq; America invading, according to the French, and then the French rebuilding. That is going to do nothing to dissolve the anti-American sentiments.

In fact, we know the French intentions are not good. We know what they said; we know what they have done. It would add tremendous insult to the injury that American families have had, those who have sent loved ones into Iraq and lost those loved ones, for us now to send the French in behind them, capture the will and the hearts of the Iraqi people.

It is the American people; it is the British. We are the ones that ought to be at the forefront and those visible in building the peace and rebuilding Iraq: not those who have made our job harder, those who have openly promoted anti-American sentiments, not only in Iraq but around the world.

Mr. Chairman, the Members, let us not compound the immense problem we have today in establishing the peace and in trying to restore our credibility with the people of Iraq. Let them see Americans rebuilding Iraq. If the French want to be there, we ought to let them see the French taxpayers can pay for the French companies who come in and rebuild. But with our money, it ought to be Americans because of this tremendous amount of ill will in the world, and particularly in Iraq.

If we lose this opportunity, we will always be viewed as those that came in with tanks and bullets and guns, and the French and the Germans will come behind us and self-promote themselves and that came in and repaired the damage.

I close by simply saying this: If the French had not supplied Iraq with many articles of war, and the Germans, if they had not encouraged Saddam to stand on that job would be a lot easier. They have caused some of the damage in Iraq. They have not acknowledged that. Even today in their newspapers they are continuing to stir up ill feelings. Let us not take our money and give them an opportunity to continue to do that.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the best evidence of the President’s success in winning this war against terrorism is the silence outside, the absence of any attack on our homeland since September 11, when terrorists used 737s as fuel air bombs and blew them into buildings, two in New York and one here. It is no coincidence. It is part of the President’s good judgment, the fact that we can trust this good man; that he has so successfully fought this war against terrorism, war on terrorism that he has prevented any further attacks in the United States. With the knowledge that he has of the scope of the threat and where it lies around the world, the President of the United States made the measured judgment to go after the dictator in Iraq, not only to enforce the sanctions that were imposed, not only to free the Iraqi people from this terrible, brutal dictator; but, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States is fighting this war to protect Americans here at home.

This war is being fought and will be won to free the Iraqi people, enforce the U.N. sanctions; but most of all, and I cannot stress this enough, the President is fighting this war to protect our constituents, to protect our families, to protect America and to protect our neighborhoods from further terrorist attacks.

So when the French, Germans, Russians, Chinese, and Syrians stood up
and actively opposed American intervention. British intervention in Iraq, the French were, in essence, endangering our own homeland, endangering our constituents and our families. It is absolutely unacceptable that the French, the Russians, the Chinese, and the Syrians who have opposed the United States' efforts to protect ourselves against terrorist attacks should be allowed to profit from the reconstruction of Iraq.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) to make sure that, as the guardians of the Federal Treasury, that the Congress of the United States will not permit any Federal tax dollars to be used to purchase goods or services from any company or any business from France, Germany, China, Syria, or Russia, because those countries actively engaged in preventing United States' efforts to protect ourselves, freeing the Iraqi people, and enforcing the U.N. resolution. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution and urge all Members to vote for it.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, on Veterans Day 2000 I was privileged to lead a CODEL to the beaches of Normandy. At that time it was very moving to me to meet with a number of French mayors, be at Omaha Beach and Utah Beach cemeteries, to visit some of their local cemeteries, the people who sacrificed their lives defending the freedom of the French people to liberate Germany. The people at Normandy said they would never forget.

But clearly the people in Paris forgot. So did the people in Germany. I know Germany has protected our bases. I know they have helped root out terrorist cells. I know they have allowed movement of troops through their country, which others countries have not. That is a good argument not to move all of our bases from Germany, and that should be factored there. But not after the insulting remarks of some people in the administration towards our President, after the insulting remarks of people in their government about our country, should they use American tax dollars to help rebuild.

Nor should Russia. Russia, Syria, Germany, and France gave aid and comfort to Saddam Hussein at a time when American men and women were at risk of losing their lives through sweat and blood. They destroyed the last hope of peace with the war. We now have a united U.N. go in, encourage Saddam to leave and to turn over the government to people who wanted democracy and freedom in that country and get rid of weapons of mass destruction. But they encouraged him to go on. The blood is on their hands of Americans.

Our men and women who are now risking their lives should not also have the paychecks from those countries that brought us into this war. Furthermore, many of those countries, particularly Russia and Syria, as well as France and Germany, have given and sold weapons illegally into the war. Furthermore, at least Russia and Syria, and possibly others, have been giving consulting and helping monitor tracking systems during the war.

Now, what I want to know is what am I supposed to say to the people in my district, such as Mr. Harrison Triplett who has two sons in Iraq? He was out the other day with an American flag in one of the main sections of Fort Wayne, asking people to support his son and the troops. So I am supposed to tell his sons are over there risking their lives, that after this is over we are going to use our tax dollars to give the people who provided the weapons, who provided the aid and comfort to the people against him.

And I think there are French men and women who still love America. And I think there are French women who still love America and who should not have proceeded in war.

Furthermore, and even more tragically, I have a young corporal from Warsaw, Indiana, football star, who was moved, accord ing to his dad, by the events of 9/11. Corporal David Fribley volunteered for the military. He was sent over to Iraq. He was one of the American soldiers who was shot under a white flag. Murdered by Iraqis. We do not know whether those weapons were provided by the French or the Germans or the Russians or the Syrians. We do not know whether this battle would have occurred without the French, or did it? But what I know I will not face his parents and say that their tax dollars are going to be used to go to companies that are headquartered in those countries, rather than to American companies, to people who fought with us in the coalition, to the British, to the Spaniards, to the Australians, to those who are with us this moment.

France, Germany, Russia, Syria, other countries are important in trade. I voted for the trade agreements. I know we trade with these countries. We are not cutting off relations, but not one cent of my tax dollars or the dollars of the parents who have their sons and daughters over there at risk, and we need to pass the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chair, every Member in this Chamber is familiar with my position on the administration's actions in moving towards war against Iraq. And I think that while we have our respective positions, we should be careful not to expand the conflict which the United States finds itself in and not to take people who have been allies consistently for this country and turn them into something other than allies.

The world community has differences with the United States and we are going to have to heal those rifts. But it is more than interesting to have Members standing up condemning the French when we would not be in this Chamber today if it was not for one of the heroes of the Revolutionary War whose image and picture looks upon this Chamber, Lafayette. And we are familiar with Lafayette. Lafayette is not only a place in Indiana, Lafayette is one of the heroes of the American Revolutionary War. And the father of our country to my right, George Washington, and Marquis de Lafayette one of the great American and French statesmen, look upon us and watch these debates.

Let us stand up for ourselves with all of the nations of the world who may be disagreeing with this administration. We cannot be standing here singling out Russia and France and China and Syria as if they are outside the world community, because when this war is over, we must be the repairers of the breach. Let us not forget that the very symbol of liberty which generations of Americans sailed into New York harbor under, that Statue of Liberty came from France. There are deep spiritual connections between France and the United States.

I happen to agree that this country should not have proceeded in war against Iraq, and I love this country. And I think there are French men and French women who still love America and despite the action that the administration has taken. So let us start looking ahead. Let us not condemn nations if they are not agreeing with the administration. Let us find a way to be the repairers of the breach of not agreeing with the administration. Let us find a way to look to the next challenge for America to bring the world communities together once again. We have had a genius for that in this country.

We need to remember where we came from. And we came from a relationship with Great Britain, who is now our ally, a relationship which was transformed through the Declaration of Independence, and we fought a war of liberation in this country with the help of the French, and we should never forget that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.
Mr. Chairman, I want to say this to the previous speaker: I certainly agree with him, the French have had a great role in our history and I certainly am a proud fan of Lafayette. I want to say Lafayette was a man of freedom, and there were many in my mind who side in this conflict Lafayette would be fighting for, and that is for the liberation of the oppressed Iraqi people. And that is why his portrait is here. That is why we have a squad named after him in my hometown of Savannah. That is why we even have a city named after him in the gentleman from Georgia's (Mr. COLLINS) district. Only we pronounce it the correct way. We call it Lafayette, if you all ever want to come to visit.

The thing about the French, and I like the French but I dislike the French rhetoric that we have heard for the last 6 months. I dislike the French politics, which I think the rhetoric has fueled the politics and it is maybe some EU positioning that is going on.

The things that Mr. Chirac has said about my country are offensive. And the reason we are not the French companies or Syrian companies that were standing up for the United States over the last 4 months. And it is such a shame, because I think they could have helped prevent this conflict if they would have said, Saddam Hussein, we stand against you in a unified world, in the community of the United States and the community of common law; we think what you are doing to the people of Iraq is outrageous. But instead, for whatever reason, they chose to apparently be on the side of oppression and the side of Iraq, and thereby we have American and British soldiers and 49 different countries, a coalition, fighting Iraqi oppression right now.

I had an interesting issue last week with a company from France that is actually providing food to the American Marine Corps. A French company actually caters to the American Marines. They have contracts worth SB801 million. And I find it somewhat outrageous, and I have raised the question and many of you have joined me in raising that question to the DOD. But you know what, I will say, to that company's credit, they have written me a letter and said, you know what, we are on the record in this country. And I tell you what, they get it. And I am glad to see that they are exercising what I would say would be good corporate responsibility. I want to have further conversations with them.

But the rumors, and it was reported by Sean Hannity, who is pretty doggone careful of what he reports, but he was saying that there are apparently and sadly some French companies are providing, up conflict, helicopter and jet parts to the Iraqi regime. There were Russian companies that were apparently selling night vision goggles to the Iraqis.

Now, that is per one reporter. But I hope that as this conflict unfolds, we do not find that some of these countries who were opposing us in the Security Council had a profit motive of their own. I hope we find that their opposition was in fact ideologically. The Council was founded in idealism and passivism and not in, wait a minute, we have got some business deals at stake here; we got to stand for the sides of the Iraqis. And this gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) have done is offer a reasonable amendment so that we can offer our objections as a collective body to these people who, when they had the chance to stand up for America and stand up against oppression, they chose instead the path of politics and rhetoric against America. And I hope that we pass this. And I hope down the road we have an opportunity to redress it.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) who I think a lot of, was telling me, you know what, after the war is over, we ought to go back and see everybody and get them on the side of the new tomorrow to rebuild Iraq. And you know what? I think he has some good points to it because we do not want to have a fissure between us and Russia and Germany and France and Syria or China or any of these other countries forever.

Indeed, we have 49 countries in our coalition right now. We do want to bring as many as possible to build a democratic republic, a free republic of Iraq after this. And I hope that these folk come on board. I hope that they not only bring their know-how, but I hope they bring some of their own dollars to the table. And if they can, at that point, I think they absolutely should be welcome to help rebuild this country, the country of Iraq.

Mr. BAKER, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) for his good work. I have some concerns about the proposed language, it is not broad enough in its constitution. For example, when we construct the list of those who have been intransigent and unwilling to listen to the rational thoughts of all of us, we only have the liberty to do that in the face of tyranny. We have left off the list the country of Turkey who refused to let our troops cross their territory to bring about freedom to those oppressed people from Iraq.

It was only a few years ago when we conducted our operation in Afghanistan, when we asked those in Mexico to stand by our side. They refused to send troops. But when they were on the verge of bankruptcy, the President of the United States went around the Congress and sent billions of dollars to rescue them from financial calamity.

Vincente Fox has been unusually quiet in the recent weeks and days as America's young men have placed their lives at risk.

Yes, this group of identified nations should be known as an axis. It is called the “axis of weasels,” those who refuse to take a stand in defense of freedom, in the face of tyranny and oppression.

Tonight, as we sit and debate this resolution, the axis of weasels is watching as our young men and women storm the streets of Baghdad, trying to free young men and women from the fear of oppression and the Fejadin taking the lives of kids.

Is there any doubt? Is there any question? Is any Member of this House standing here tonight listening to this debate in question about what should be done about the axis of weasels? Are we going to tax the American workers, take their money and send it back to people to rebuild Iraq who criticized our efforts from its outset?

What about us? They are our allies who have laid their lives on the line, who have more than adequate resource and contracting capability to join with American hardworking people to rebuild Iraq to a standard of living to which they are entitled, which was taken from them not by a coalition forces, but by the despot Saddam Hussein, whose fortunes I hope are not favorable this evening.

We have to join together in this House, stand up not only to this axis of weasels, but to all of those who stand in the face of Americans who fight only for one thing, to bring democratic opportunities to poor people around the globe.

Oh, I know there are those who say this was fought for the case of big oil. If we wanted oil, we would have simply taken Kuwait. If we wanted to oppress, we would not have left Afghanistan. Look at our record. We stand here tonight united as a Congress not for the cause of dominating the world interests. We stand united in the face of tyranny to free people who are oppressed. It is only a few years ago that the women of Afghanistan got the right to drive a car, to teach their children how to read publicly. Their tyranny cannot be fully comprehended, but what we are about tonight is the beginning of a new day, a day that brings justice and responsibility to those who refuse to give dignity to humans.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have a Member of this body by the name of Jimmy Burke, and Jimmy Burke said once to the freshman class incoming, he said, oh, I understand your problem; you think this place is on the level. Well, Jimmy, man, it does not matter what you do on this amendment. This amendment ain't on the level. This amendment is consumer fraud masquerading as legislation, and it ain't going to do nothing to nobody and let me tell you.

If you look at the language carefully, the language purports to send the message that what we are doing is, oh, oh,
look at the muscles. We are telling those Frenchies and those German companies, you cannot participate; but if you look at the actual language, the language allows those companies to get around this limitation by doing the same thing that corporate expatriates have done in this country by simply setting up a mailing address in Bermuda or any other offshore place.

So it is what I call a holy picture amendment. The politicians pause for holy pictures; we really did something, but you have got language that does not do nothing to nobody.

This language has absolutely no effect whatsoever except that it makes the job of the White House and the State Department more difficult, which is I assume why we have the letter from the State Department which says that such an amendment would jeopardize the type of support we are attempting to build in the United Nations. I support that which aims to unite the international community in a forward-looking effort to build a better future for the people of Iraq.

Now, if we were wise, and I know that is bastante expectations often in a legislative body, but if we were wise, what we would, in fact, be doing is looking at tomorrow rather than yesterday.

We are going to, whether we like it or not, need to rebuild the alliances which have been temporarily shaken by our divisions in this war. We are going to have to rebuild the United Nations and rebuild NATO so that we are more ready to deal with promotion, or is it Iraq and the rest of the world; and we are going to have to overcome the fact that because of divisions we have right now, pro-U.S. responses in public opinion polls throughout Europe have dropped by about 20 percent.

Now, to me, the way that we overcome the world's cynicism is by demonstrating traditional American magnanimity, which is what we did in the Marshall Plan, which is having been done so many times in our country's history.

So I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, who am I to stand in the way, if majority party members want to make life a little more difficult for a Republican administration?

Now, I stand here, I hope as a patriot; and I believe that this amendment does cause the administration additional problems. I am so proud of the chairman, and I have got a little bit of respect for the committee produced legislation which guaranteed that the executive branch could not cross the line and trample on legislative prerogatives, and I congratulate and I honor the chairman for having a good house.

But we also, we also as legislators from time to time have to restrain ourselves and recognize that sometimes we do the Nation no good when we impeinge upon executive branch prerogatives, as this amendment I believe does.

So I am standing here as a Republican who has a minimum of, as the Democrat, as my friends know, I started out life as a Republican but then when I learned to read I switched parties.

But let me simply say, I stand here, I hope, as a patriot, and I think that this amendment is the place where George Bush needs some sleeping room. If you do not have enough confidence in him to let him make the right choice, then by all means vote for this amendment; but you know, it does not do nothing to nobody except enable politicians to pose for political holy pictures. What is new around here?

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Wisconsin just recited a very amusing tale about learning to read and becoming a Democrat. When I learned to count, I became a Republican.

The night is late, the hour is late, and we have many, many challenges in front of us. We have people arrayed from the heart of the and our interests; and in the face of that, I do something tonight that I rarely do and that is come to the well and speak in favor of the Nethercutt amendment and the Kennedy amendment.

I have heard a lot of citations to our indebtedness, to our friends Lafayette and others, the German Russian soldiers and the like; and yet across this world there is but one country that uniformly puts its young people and its resources into the protection of freedom and democracy for people who do not even live here. Think about that. Think about what we are doing in this short period of time in particular.

We have young people, particularly in Iraq today, putting their lives on the line to bring freedom and democracy to people who have not enjoyed it for many, many decades.

It comes before us tonight on an appropriations bill with an amendment proposed by congressmen from Minnesota and Washington to say to the world that the Americans know who we are; that we believe in the concept of accountability; and that we will not vote to continue to spend American lives on a goal that benefits those lacking the courage to do the necessary thing, lacking the commitment to stand with those who will confront evil where it is found and lacking the qualifications to judge those of us who will.

Mr. Chairman, we are at a point that is at the heart of what our country is about. It is a country that sends our young people across the world to defend the interests of freedom and democracy, to then yield those same interests to someone who simply seeks 12 pieces of silver. I urge this body to think long and hard about the standard of accountability that we want in this world and the standard we set for our children and the generations to come.

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding, and I would just like to respond to the ranking member to say, yes, we have carefully crafted this amendment in a way that protects American jobs and does not put those jobs at risk that the State Department to a degree a modicum of flexibility, and we do need to rebuild those entities around the world; but we need to rebuild them with the understanding that America does remember who stands with America and America does remember who stands opposed to America on our efforts to defend peace and freedom and to liberate oppressed people around the world.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

This has been a very heated debate and a welcome one, especially for me. As I look at this body, both sides of the aisle are right; but here is my problem. The problem is represented by my colleague, the core of the gentleman from Minnesota's (Mr. Kennedy) amendment is about respect. Every once in a while a person has to stand up and get some respect.

I have however one feels about this war, I want my colleagues to think about World War II; and I want my colleagues to think about a country, France, a country that would not pick up a rifle to defend its ownself, for 10,000, 10,000 of our troops hit the shores of Normandy and gave their lives in one day to stand for a country's freedom, that would not stand and fight for its own freedom. That is the price that many of our American soldiers pay.

Maybe that would not be so bad with me if it were not for what they did. It is one thing to have your say, but it is another thing to go and help a country visibly with weapons, with arms, with their support at a time when we are sending our boys and girls into battle. As I look at World War II, standing was very personal with me because one of those troops that put their lives on the line in World War II, to go help free France, was my own father. That is amazing, but that is important.

This amendment may or may not go anywhere. We are all here to stand up to say a word in support for our troops. I am going to vote for this amendment. I am going to vote for it for the respect of those World War II veterans who fought and those billions died for France, but France did not come to our aid, for those who are giving their lives and dying in Iraq today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I think over my right shoulder stands George Washington, known to many of us as the Father of this Nation. As he looked on the eve of the British soldiers seeking to preserve the freedom of the 13 colonies, he looked for allies where he could find them. My history tells me
that one of those happened to be a country called France. It is interesting that as we have grown to be the singular power of this Nation, we seem to have lost both the decorum, the respect, and the dignity of many of our Founding Fathers is not unredeemable.

Now, it is well known that I came to this Nation first in the bottom of the belly of a slave boat, but I realize that I live now in the most powerful Nation in the world, a Nation that first started with a government, let us call it, the government on the floor of the House. This is not about France. This is about patronage and payback to the 40 babies that say they are part of the willing coalition.

What is this, a Las Vegas gambling game? Are we in the stakes, you get a piece of the action? This is not what this war is about.

I am against the war as it is presently constructed, as they would say. But we are here supporting these troops in this legislation. What are we handing out dollars to people just because they are part of the coalition? It is the question to the United States that if we are to rebuild our world alliance and our position in this world, then however we do the peacekeeping it must be in a coalition, whether it is the United Nations, NATO, or whether we engage the European Union. We cannot do this alone. Because if you have a military occupation, you can be assured that it is going to fail, not because of the military's lack of excellence, they are excellent, but because of the world's perception that we are occupiers as opposed to people who have come to induce democracy.

This is fraudulent that we would undermine the dignity of those who knew what coalitions were all about. And I am particularly offended that my colleagues would cite Mexico as an unwilling ally. We should not denigrate our friends, not because we named to failure, not because of the military's lack of excellence, they are excellent, but because of the world's perception that we are occupiers as opposed to people who have come to induce democracy.

Oh, there may be politics. There may be coalitions like this every body has a hand out in this. The baby NGOs do not get a chance to do their real work because they do not have any money. Small businesses, minority businesses, women-owned businesses do not get anything. The big guys are knocking everybody over. Is that what it is about; money? We have to move in the world tomorrow and next year, and the decade after. We should not burn our bridges that we have to cross again.

This would not be the kind of debate that would be befitting of a Nation pre-mised on a constitution that says "to form a more perfect union." What an insult that we do not tolerate the sovereignty of nations. I can assure my colleagues that there will be weeks and years and days to come when we will look to the allies that we denigrate now.

Coming from Texas, I am particularly insulted that one would question Mexico, who has tried to work with us over the years on border issues, and crying and sending troops during 9/11. We begin to get on shaky ground when we begin to attack individuals and nations ourselves, which have differences of opinion on this war.

This war itself should be questioned, and I hope that we will be able to move in peace for those of us who have opposed the war and supported the troops; move in dignity reflective of the Constitution and reflective of this founding Nation and our Founding Fathers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will re- move all persons in the gallery they are here as guests of the House, and any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I do think it is important to put this debate into perspective. That is a good thing we are doing. We should be debating issues of expenditure of taxpayer dollars. This is not holy pictures. This is an important time for our country to talk about how we spend billions of dollars in this country.

Why in the world would our legislative body cede the authority for that to the administration? I respect this administration, but this is a congressional responsibility. And just because there is a political argument last year is an issue that is before the House does not mean that this is posing for holy pictures. I think that is an objectionable declaration about what this is. This is in the best traditions of this House.

On the Committee on Appropriations just this week we had a fabulous debate on this precise issue and on an amendment that was very near to this one. It was a broader amendment, frankly, that gave the President great waiver authority to decide whether exceptions could be made with respect to the expenditure of taxpayer dollars for reconstruction in Iraq. So beyond being something that is frivolous, this is very serious business, and I would argue to my colleagues that this is in the best tradition of this House to talk about this issue of how we spend the money that the taxpayers send to us to decide how to spend.

I would argue that we make a judgment about what foreign countries should benefit with taxpayer dollars that are sent to Washington by loyal Americans. But it is the Congress' decision to decide whether a priority might be American jobs and American companies, American industries, American companies, American jobs. What is wrong with having friends in the world and communicating with those friends especially creating jobs in this country?

I would argue that anybody who votes against this has the potential to favor French job creation rather than American job creation. How in the world are we going to feel in 2 months, when perhaps our country would award a contract to a German or a French or a Russian company to the exclusion of American interests, to an American company that could do the job just as well? I would argue, my colleagues, that we should be concerned about this.

So this is a good debate. This is a good amendment. It is the amendment that I intended to have before the House before a point of order was raised. So that is fine. I appreciate the gentle from Minnesota (Mr. KENNY) being there to offer this amendment. But we should never confuse a good debate and a difference of opinion on the issues as being unworthy or worthy. We can make our judgments about the validity of our arguments, but to say that this is not worthy of the House or not an appropriate debate as to how taxpayer dollars will be spent misses the mark.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment. This is what we are sent here to do, to guard the Treasury of the United States. This is the taxpayers' money. This is the people's House. The House of Representatives decides the appropriations for this country. I urge us to exercise our obligation and to vote for this amendment, and I believe it will pass.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNY) being there to offer this amendment. But I think this debate has shown what is some of the very best and perhaps what sometimes can be the worst in a legislative body in a great democracy like ours.

Passions can flare, passions can drive legislation. Passion is important. As legislators, as people who make policy, passion is important. We ought to believe in what we do. But as legislators we also have a responsibility to temper our passions with careful thought, to make sure that passions do not alone drive us, drive our legislative proposals. So that
sometimes what looks good, what feels good, what sounds good, may not be good.

These are just some of the concerns that I have about the legislation, the proposal which is before us at this time, and I would just share some of these thoughts. I know these thoughts do not carry any of the weight of the passions that people feel. But I also think as legislators we need to keep these things in mind.

For one thing, we are deeply involved in the World Trade Organization with a number of trade agreements that we have entered into and this body has approved, and I have serious concerns that this violates a number of those obligations that we have freely entered into. No country has fought harder for the government procurement provisions in the World Trade Organization than the United States, because we are the largest exporter of contracting services. We have the most to benefit, and similarly, perhaps, the most to lose if others retaliate against us.

Secondly, I am concerned about the application of this to the defense part. This does not limit it to the foreign assistance part, but to the defense side. There are times when you need to be able to buy equipment, to buy spare parts, to buy goods, and those need to be free for a foreign company. I am concerned about the foreign assistance part of it as it applies to spare parts. Let us say an American contractor is given the job of rebuilding hospitals in Iraq. We know that a lot of equipment comes from countries like Germany. What if we are trying to replace a part in an x-ray machine and we have to order those parts under this provision? I presume it would be forbidden to do so. So we would have to pay all the money to buy a new piece of equipment instead of being able to repair another piece of equipment.

Lastly, let me just ask this. Does this provision apply to a company like Chrysler, DaimlerChrysler? I think it might. It is not at all clear. I guess if they do not put that return address on their envelope, their RFP, maybe it does not. But if they happen to put the RFP as coming from the corporate headquarters in Germany, then indeed it would. And thousands of American jobs could be lost as we try to buy equipment from what is essentially an American company but happens to be a subsidiary of a country that is organized in Germany.

These are just a few of the considerations that I have and I think we need to take into account. If this amendment passes this evening, I will be looking to my colleagues on the conference report to look at them as well and that we will work to make sure that we have a piece of legislation, when it comes from conference, that does not do more damage to jobs, more damage to American contractors, than it would if we had this piece of legislation not included in the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are nearing the end of this debate and getting ready to pass this bill. I think there is one other amendment that we will deal with later and I will not include this. So I want to take a few minutes to say a word of compliment to the Committee on Appropriations members and the staff. We got this request just a little over a week ago. We were able to read it, vet it, understand it, hold hearings with the relevant agencies and now write the bill, go to full committee, amend it and bring it to the floor in a little over a week. I think the committee and the staff, especially the Members, did a tremendous job.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, you have been in the chair for nearly 12 hours today and have done an outstanding job. That applause is very well deserved. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THOMAS) and I managed this debate extremely well.

And now I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, yield?

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the evening the distinguished ranking member read accurately from the Atlanta Journal Constitution a news article regarding the actions of the board of directors of Delta Airlines. The ranking member also accurately reflected his disappointment and disappointment shared by others in that action.

What was not entered into the RECORD were the actions of the CEO of Delta Airlines, and I will not read it all, but I would like to read the following:

...who affirmatively, instead of accepting the compensation reduced his compensation by 25 percent, will not accept an annual incentive pay included in his contract for the year 2003, rescinded any retention award and deferred any awards, as the proxy statement details. This pro...

Mr. Chairman, corporations are persons under the laws, and sometimes they do not have hearts. CEOs are individuals and when corporate CEOs take appropriate actions, and I think consistent with the times we are in, that should also be in the RECORD.


To: All Delta Employees

From: Leo F. Mullin, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer

Subject: Executive Compensation

Following the release of Delta's proxy statement at the end of March, much attention by the media and within the company has been focused on the subject of executive compensation. Today, I would like to address this issue with you directly, beginning with the context in which the Board of Directors made the decisions described in the proxy statement, over the course of 2002. I would also like to share with you the actions I have in regard to my own compensation, given the dramatic ways in which that context has now changed.

Let me begin by noting that Delta's proxy statement, which outlines the Board's executive compensation decisions during 2002, was issued on March 25, 2003. The date of issue was set in order to comply with Security and Exchange Commission requirements for distribution prior to our April 25 annual shareholders meeting. However, the actions described in the proxy statement apply to the full course of 2002, with many of those actions rooted in the events and the aftermath of September 11. As the Board explains in the proxy statement, a key priority in response to the nation and industry crisis following 9/11 was to maintain a management team capable of responding effectively to the extraordinary challenges ahead. The Board in January 2002 established a Special Retention Program, as discussed in the proxy statement. This program was approved by our employees, in the industry, and the Board, in January 2003, approved the final 2002 incentive awards, as the proxy statement details.

Also as part of its effort to retain Delta's management team during the extraordinary challenges ahead, the Board in January 2002 established a Special Retention Program, as discussed in the proxy statement. This program was approved by the Board, in January 2003, approved the final 2002 incentive awards, as the proxy statement details.

In these and every other executive compensation program outlined in theproxy statement, the Board has consistently acted in the best interest of Delta. Air Lines, meeting all legal and ethical requirements and expectations at every step. The decisions in respect to executive compensation were fully appropriate in the context of the time in which they were made.

Continuing, deeper than expected plunge in revenue and traffic.

Increased competitive concerns as United and US Airways restructure under bankruptcy protection.

Further competitive pressure as American Airlines manages to reorganize outside of court and US Airways (and most recently Air Canada) declare Chapter 11.

Need for immediate action in Washington to provide federal relief from post-9/11 security costs and tax burden.

Competitive requirement that Delta's labor costs be brought in line with that of the restructuring carriers.

With this said, I understand the concerns that have been raised in the current context. Most importantly, I want to provide a basis for moving forward so that we can resume our focus on the crucial core business and strategic issues we face. Hence, I have chosen to take the following steps:

1. Announced at the end of March that I would reduce my own compensation by 25 percent (to $596,250, down from the beginning of year salary rate ($795,000); this reduction includes
Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make it clear that the way this is worded, it would be highly unusual this would be putting any American jobs at risk, and we have gone to great pains, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and myself, in reviewing these approaches to make sure that we do not.

I think it is appropriate. This is not just about American jobs, but it is, the gentleman says, about American people, American Congress, remembering who has stood with us and making sure that those who stood with us as we go to liberate Iraq would also be standing with us as we go to rebuild Iraq.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, there is a much greater chance that American jobs will be lost if we do not make this declaration to the policymakers and to the bureaucrats and to the government officials who will enforce the law once we pass the law. We are making it very clear to them that American companies and companies from countries which helped us, which stood by us, will have preference over those companies from countries which stood aside at the moment when it counted or even harped and backbit our leaders when they were taking tough stands.

We will not forget what happened during these last 3 and 4 months. We will not forget the actors who play President of the United States, but spend their own time in the real world undercutting American Presidents who have had to make tough decisions about the national security of our country.

We will not forget the impotence of the United Nations. We are not going to place our faith in that institution again. We will not forget that NATO is dominated by the Germans and French, and we will not forget that the British and the Spanish not only stood by us but joined us and put the lives of their young people on the line as well.

Finally, I would like to end with one small story. I hope our French brethren in Le Général Rusk in his memoirs talks about how Lyndon Johnson called him into the Oval Office in 1964 after Charles de Gaulle declared that France would be out of NATO and declared that all American troops would have to be off of French soil in 90 days. Mr. Rusk gave Mr. Johnson the job of going to France, talking to the General, and asking him a question and coming back and reporting verbatim what the General said. So Mr. Rusk, our outstanding diplomat, went to Paris to meet with General de Gaulle.

He said, President Johnson has tasked me with asking you this question: When you demand that all American soldiers are off of French soil within 90 days, are you including those thousands of Americans buried in Normandy?

General de Gaulle was speechless. He turned away and could not speak.

I would hope that the French people, now that this war is coming to a conclusion with the great victories that we have had in these last few days, when they see that we have put the lives of our people on the line again, I hope they will become speechless, because we just dealt with how America should treat nations who do not support us in our war against Iraq.

This amendment deals with the issue of how we treat American companies who have turned their back on the families of our military servicemen and women who are fighting that war against Iraq tonight. Let me read from the Atlanta Journal Constitution just 4 days ago. "The use of Delta's funds for this purpose left us in disbelief. That is why 30 former Delta executives said about the CEO of Delta Airlines and 32 executives spending $25 million of Delta Airlines funds to set up special pension trust funds for themselves."

Mr. Chairman, the CEO of Delta who comes before this House asking for billions of Federal tax subsidies was recently part of providing $25 million in expenditures to protect 33 executives while 16,000 employees are being laid off. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in disbelief that the same Delta Airline executives who could spend $25 million to rebuild Iraq and protect their pension trust funds said today in Killeen, Texas, in my district, that they cannot afford to continue air service during a time of war to the community that is the home of the only division Army installation in America, Fort Hood.

That is correct. The same executives that had $25 million to protect their future said to the families of soldiers who are deploying tonight, some of whom are Fort Hood, some of whom from Fort Hood are POWs in Iraq tonight, that we are not going to provide air service anymore. In fact, we are going to cut off air service to Fort...
Hood and its two Army installations and the 44,000 soldiers that represent Fort Hood, we are going to cut off that air service even while we are at war in Iraq. They even had the audacity to tell employees today, while Delta lobbyists were running around the halls of this Capitol saying we need millions, in fact billions, in tax subsidies to support our efforts at Delta Airlines. I find myself in disbelief, just as 30 former executives at Delta found themselves in disbelief at the actions of executives of this company.

My amendment sends a clear message to the executives of Delta and to Continental Airlines and any other airline: Do not come to the House of Representatives, to these hallowed halls, during a time of war and ask for the taxpayers of military families to subsidize the continuation of those air services that are putting their lives on the line in Iraq tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to yield because he and I discussed this at length earlier in the evening, and I think the gentleman realizes, as I do, that since I did not get the news, employees of my district did not get the news today after the committee on Rules had established the rules for amendments on this bill, technically this amendment could be ruled out of order. For that reason, in a moment I will respectfully pull down the amendment in my appreciation of the chairman for his recognizing the importance of talking to airlines about not cutting off airline service to major military installations during a time of war when we are asking those families, taxpayers, to help subsidize the continuation of those air lines.

I do not know what the intention is of Delta and Continental who have made these recent announcements to cut off air service to so many military families which are sacrificing so much for us. I will say to them, if they are willing to reconsider what I consider their incredibly unfair decisions tonight and in the days ahead, I will be the first to applaud them for their patriotism and sense of public service during this time of war.

But I also want to send a clear message. If all they offer us is lip service for the next 3 days until they get this bill passed and then they cut off air service to tens of thousands of military families who might lose loved ones as they are cutting off that service, I may be only one Member of Congress, but I hope they understand there will be millions of American veterans and millions of American families who will show our outrage that it is wrong, it is unpatriotic for these companies to turn their backs on the military families who are facing death and risk of life in Iraq tonight.

I thank the chairman, and I look forward to solving this problem.
The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was taken.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 113, noes 312, not voting 10, as follows:

[Bill No. 107]

AYES—113

The Speaker pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered by the Committee of the Whole.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; the Chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 172, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

(Mr. LAHODD asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

DEBT OF GRATITUDE

Mr. LAHODD. Mr. Speaker, I think we owe a big debt of gratitude for the way that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY) has conducted the proceedings of the House all day today. Mac, you did a great job.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 12, as follows:

Not voting 9, as follows:

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The House will convene on Monday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under a suspension of the rules and a final list sent to Members' offices by the end of the week.

We may also consider a motion to go to conference on the Armed Services Tax Fairness Act and any votes called on these measures, though, will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday we expect to consider several additional bills under suspension of the rules, as well as S. 380, which is virtually identical to the Postal Service Reform Bill that we had scheduled for consideration tonight.

For Wednesday and the week we have several measures that we will consider under a rule. These include the gun manufacturers liability Reform Bill that was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary earlier today, the comprehensive energy policy bill, the FY 2004 Budget Resolution Conference Report, and the Conference Report on the FY 2003 War Supplemental.

I would note for Members that we plan to stay in session into the weekend if necessary in order to complete the supplemental before our spring recess.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Monday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under a suspension of the rules and a final list sent to Members' offices by the end of the week.

We may also consider a motion to go to conference on the Armed Services Tax Fairness Act and any votes called on these measures, though, will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday we expect to consider several additional bills under suspension of the rules, as well as S. 380, which is virtually identical to the Postal Service Reform Bill that we had scheduled for consideration tonight.

For Wednesday and the week we have several measures that we will consider under a rule. These include the gun manufacturers liability Reform Bill that was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary earlier today, the comprehensive energy policy bill, the FY 2004 Budget Resolution Conference Report, and the Conference Report on the FY 2003 War Supplemental.

I would note for Members that we plan to stay in session into the weekend if necessary in order to complete the supplemental before our spring recess.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am happy to answer any questions.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for his information. First, if I might, Mr. Leader, you indicate that we may also consider a motion to go to conference on the Armed Services Tax Fairness Act on Monday. Do you know whether that is more definite now? The reason I ask is that I may want to have a motion to instruct on this side.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and wish I could give him a more definite answer. We are trying to consider how we would approach this very important bill and we want to get it out before the Easter break. And the best I can tell the gentleman is it looks like we are going to conference on it or we want to go to conference on it. But I do not want to mislead him. There may be other alternatives available to us after we consider work with the Senate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information, and I would appreciate as soon as you know how you are going to handle this if you would let us know.
Mr. DELAY. Absolutely, I will let the gentleman know, so he will have plenty of time to write a motion to instruct.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you, Mr. Leader. Will there definitely be votes next Friday? Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, “definitely” is a very tough word in this business and on this floor. I would think, looking at the work ahead of us, that the probability of having votes on Friday is more to the affirmative than to the negative.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman certainly has outlined some very significant pieces of legislation that may be on the floor.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, I do want to repeat that it is very possible that we could have votes on Friday and we intend to pass the War Supplemental Conference Report and send it to the President before we break for the break. And if things get a little difficult, we could actually be here through the weekend.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comment and I hear him talking about the supplemental. Does the leader believe that the budget conference report is a necessary piece of legislation for us to pass before we leave? I know you mentioned that you might want to try to do that, but does your side believe that is necessary before we leave next week?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, I have not personally consulted with the Speaker or the rest of the leadership, but it is my own understanding that the conference report on the budget is as important as doing the supplemental. But the word that I have is things are progressing with that conference report. There are very few issues to resolve, and we have the greatest expectation that that conference report will be on the floor sometime next week and will not slow down our ability to go into the Easter break.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

Related to the budget conference, Mr. Leader, do you expect that we will have a debt limit vote on the floor either as a part of the conference report or as a freestanding bill of some type or other in the week to come?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is very well aware that we re instituted a very important rule called the Gephardt rule that includes in the budget conference report the number that is needed in order to raise the debt ceiling. So the vote on the conference report as far as the House is concerned is the vote on the debt ceiling.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for reminding me. Is that the same Gephardt rule that the minority, when the Democrats were in control, thought was undemocratic, masked the desire of Democrats to raise the debt limit and spend more money; is that the same rule you are talking about re instituting and you have re instituted and are going to apply? I just want to clarify and make sure that is the same awful rule that you attacked so vigorously when you were in the minority.

Mr. DELAY. I think it is a different rule. I think it is the Hastert rule now.

Mr. HOYER. A rule by any other name, my friend.

The energy bill, Mr. Leader, do you have a pretty good estimate as to which day of the week that bill might come to the floor?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, as the gentleman knows, this is a very complicated piece of legislation that has had at least four committees consider it. All four committees have reported, and we have to get together with the minority to pull this bill together and bring it to the floor, and we hope to schedule that bill for some time on Wednesday; if not Wednesday, on Thursday of next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

May I also ask him, and I see the chairman of the Committee on Rules on the floor, you correctly observed, Mr. Leader, this is a complicated bill, a lot of different subjects, very important subjects, very consequential subjects. What, if you know, perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Rules, do you contemplate an open rule such as the rule we had on the floor today?

Mr. DELAY. The discussion in the conference committee has not been forthcoming, and certainly we would hope that a rule would be fashioned to give every Member of the House the greatest opportunity to express himself on a very important and complicated piece of legislation like the energy bill.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, we share the leader’s hope.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has on every piece of legislation, we demonstrated that this evening, allowing an opportunity for Members to consider a wide range of issues. And we know, as has been said by everyone, that the energy bill is going to be a very complex piece of legislation. There are a number of committees that have been involved in the process, and we are very much forward to resolving some of those questions in the Committee on Rules, and then we will come forward with an opportunity for a wide range of considerations.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I would say again in all sincerity to my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the leader, this is the kind of legislation, which you are absolutely correct, which is very serious, very complicated, and ought to have the fullest airing on the floor of this House. Obviously, it has had a full airing in a number of committees.

We would urge and very strongly hope that the goal that the gentleman has expressed as his will, in fact, be followed so that alternatives can be offered by committee or individual Members on this side of the aisle as well as that side of the aisle when this bill comes to the floor.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that we will certainly take the recommendation of our friend, the minority whip, into consideration as we proceed; and I thank my friend for yielding.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in executive session under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING H.R. 1036, PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT OF 2003

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of April 7 to grant a rule which would limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1036, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H–312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 8. Members should draft their amendment to the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on April 3, 2003.

Members are advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules today.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.
CUBA'S CRACKDOWN ON DISSIDENT COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pallone) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week I stood before this House and spoke of the opening stages in Castro's outright assault on human rights and democracy. I spoke of Castro's decision to arrest over 80 nonviolent human rights advocates, pro-democracy leaders and independent journalists, in what has become a campaign by the regime to silence all voices of opposition on the island. Hoping that his actions would be overshadowed by the situation in Iraq, Castro has declared war on his own people.

Among those arrested include signers and supporters of a joint statement from the Cuban dissident community, delivered to the European Union, promoters of the Varela Project, members of the independent press, owners of independent libraries, and members of Cuba's independent civil society.

When I last spoke on this situation, it was feared that those arrested would be prosecuted under a much-criticized 1999 Cuban law that makes it a crime to publish subversive materials provided by the U.S. Government, and that carries with it a harsh prison sentence. Those fears, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, have become a reality, as Castro has begun the trial of many of the detainees, seeking sentences that range from 12 years to decades and even requesting life in prison for some.

Furthermore, the prisoners have been refused access to their wives and families, have been allowed little or no legal defense, and have even been denied the ability to read the State's case against them.

Mr. Speaker, the Cuban Government has provided no information about the trials. Authorities outside two of the trials barred access to international journalists.

Castro's wave of oppression was also accompanied by a decision to limit the travel of Americans with the U.S. Interests Section, quarantining our diplomats to the province of Havana. Castro has become increasingly irritated by the actions of James Cason, chief of the U.S. Interests Section, and Cason's continued contact with members of the Cuban pro-democracy movement. Cason and other American diplomats have met in public with opposition leaders and independent journalists in an effort basically to encourage democracy and freedom of information on the island.

Mr. Speaker, these recent actions by the Castro regime are simply the next step in the systematic denial of even the most basic human rights for the citizens of Cuba. I, and many of my colleagues, have often urged this body to be wary of Castro and the Cuban Government. These latest developments are nothing new, but we must continue to be vigilant and not allow these deeds to go unnoticed.

Castro must know that despite his hope that the world would be looking the other way, we are noticing, and that these actions will not be allowed to continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Smith) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor George "Godfather" Thompson, one of the most remarkable men in my life and many of the lives of individuals who have played Rattler football at Florida A&M. Tomorrow night, friends and families and other players at Florida A&M are going to come together to pay tribute to this wonderful man who has done so much on behalf of so many, a man of great humility and compassion. When he speaks of Florida A&M and Rattler football, he gets chill bumps all over his body.

His heart is so big that those who go to Florida A&M with very little money, very little guidance or those that have great guidance, he takes the time to speak with them.

This Nation loves sports and for good reasons, but the right coach and guidance and sports, particularly in team sports, are fun and effective ways to teach young people the great lessons of life, that discipline and hard work are necessary for success but not necessarily guaranteed; that those who are
try to beat their opponents, they are not necessarily their enemies; that winning with grace and dignity often requires as much character as losing with grace and dignity; and that teams succeed over the long haul when there are people working together, helping each other and supporting each other.

These are the great lessons of George "Godfather" Thompson.

I played defensive end for Florida A&M University, and this is where I met Godfather. He gave me a great, great insight on life, even though he was just an equipment manager. He was one of great dignity and pride and told many Rattler football players about the programs and stories. Even though it was not his responsibility to be the counselor, he took that responsibility as being someone to head young men in the right direction, or point young men in the right direction.

For everyone who calls George Thompson "Godfather," and we still do, it is not a godfather that we may see on a movie or what have you, but it is out of respect and love for someone who took the time with everyone and opened his heart to accommodate not only their feelings but to guide them in the right direction.

He came to Florida A&M from Melbourne, Florida where the blood runs orange and green. He was just an equipment manager. He had the opportunity to have him train his 507th Ordnance Maintenance Company. Tragically, Private Johnson's body exhibited the rich tradition of our military and to spreading those freedoms to the victims of an oppressive regime halfway around the world.

Mr. Speaker, Howard's family is fortunate that they can rely on a rock-solid faith and a loving God to provide personal strength and comfort during these difficult days. Reverend Johnson, Howard's father, is pastor of the Truevine Missionary Baptist Church in Mobile where Howard played drums and was active in Sunday school in the children's ministry. Right before Howard was prepared to ship off to Kuwait, he reassured his father that "I'm ready, and I know what I'm facing, and I just believe that God is going to do it for me.''

Mr. Speaker, Howard Johnson's willingness to pay what has become the ultimate sacrifice has contributed immeasurably to the freedom and security of this Nation, to Iraq, and the world.

The 507th's "One team, one fight" motto also embodies this worldwide mission that our servicemen and women have undertaken. May the prayers of a grateful Nation bring some comfort to the Johnson family and to all other families who have lost loved ones during this war, and may God continue to bless America, the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

ESTABLISHING A PERMANENT PRESENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention a fascinating article in this month's issue of Mother Jones magazine, written by Robert Dreyfuss, and it deals with the question of establishing a permanent presence in the Middle East. I wanted to point out that this issue of oil, which fuels military power, national treasuries and international politics, is no longer a commodity to be bought and sold within the confines of traditional energy supply and demand balances. Rather, it has been transformed into a determinant of well-being of national security and of international
power. I recommend it to the attention of all of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the above-mentioned article for the RECORD.
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[122x77]...mentioned article for the RECORD.

One of the leading foreign-policy thinkers in the Bush administration—Chairman Donald Rumsfeld, who has been joined by Vice President Cheney and Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, they played important roles in President Reagan's academic policy centers in the 1980s. Led by hardline, pro-Israeli thinkers, especially the Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, they came to be known as the Carter Doctrine, which effectively declared the Gulf a zone of U.S. military presence.

In the geopolitical vision driving current U.S. policy toward Iraq, the key to national security is global hegemony—dominance over any and all potential rivals. To that end, the Bush administration has been determined to project its military forces anywhere, at any time. It must also control key resources, chief among them oil—and especially Gulf oil. To the hawks who now set the tone at the White House and the Pentagon, the region is crucial not simply for its share of the U.S. oil supply (other sources have become more important in the last decade), but also because it would allow the United States to maintain a lock on the world's energy-life line and potentially deny access to its global competitors. The administration believes that the end of the Cold War left the United States able to impose its will globally—and that those who have the ability to shape the world with power have the duty to do so. It's ideology.

Iraq, in this view, is a strategic prize of unparalleled importance. Unlike the oil behemoths in Saudi Arabia, locked in the steps of central Asia, or buried under stormy seas, Iraq's crude is readily accessible and, at less than $1.50 a barrel, some of the cheapest in the world to produce. Al- ready, over the past several months, Western companies have been meeting with Iraqi exiles to try to stake a claim to that bonanza. But in the face of the regime led by Saddam Hussein, the push to remove Saddam Hussein hasn't been driven by oil executives, many of whom are worried about their investments. Nor is Vice President Cheney and President Bush, both former oilmen, looking at the Gulf simply for the profits that can be earned there. The administration is thinking bigger, much bigger, than that.

"Controlling Iraq is about oil as power, rather than oil as fuel," says Michael Kinsley, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College and author of Resource Wars. "Control over the Persian Gulf translates into control over Europe, Japan, and China. It's having our hand on the spigot." Even since the oil shocks of the 1970s, the United States has steadily been accumulating bases, selling weaponry, and forging military partnerships. Now, it is poised to consolidate its might in a place that will be a fulcrum of the world's balance of power for decades to come. At a stroke, by taking control of Iraq, the Bush administration can solidify its foreign policy objectives. And it is the Kissinger plan, says James Akins, a former U.S. diplomat. "I thought it had been killed, but it's back."

Akins learned a hard lesson about the politics of oil when he served as a U.S. envoy in Kuwait and Iraq, and ultimately as ambassador to Saudi Arabia during the crisis of 1973 and '74. At his home in Washington, D.C., shelves filled with Middle Eastern pottery and other memorabilia cover the walls. He's a man of the facts of a former CIA officer. Nearly three decades later, he still gets worked up while recalling his first encounter with the idea that the United States should be prepared to occupy Arab oil-producing countries.

In 1975, while Akins was ambassador in Saudi Arabia, an article headlined "Seizing Arab Oil" appeared in Harper's. The author, who used the pseudonym Miles Ignatius, was identified as "a Washington-based professor down whose closed circuits percolate the latest in high-level U.S. policy-makers." The article outlined, as Akins puts it, "how we could solve all our economic and political problems by expelling the Saudis from Kuwait and Iraq and driving in Texans and Oklahomans to operate them." Simultaneously, a rash of similar stories appeared in magazines and newspapers. "I knew that it had to have been the result of a deep background briefing," Akins says. "You don't have eight people coming up with the same screwy idea at the same time, independently."

"Then I made a fatal mistake," Akins continues. "I said on television that anyone who read that article was a madman, a criminal, or an agent of the Soviet Union." Soon afterward, he says, he learned that the background briefing had been conducted by Henry Kissinger, then National Security Advisor. Kissinger fired him by telephone.

Kissinger has never acknowledged having planted the seeds for the article. But in an interview with Business Week last year, he delivered a thinly veiled threat to the Saudis, musing about bringing oil prices to high levels in order to force them to recognize the United States as a major producer of oil. "I said on television that anyone who read that article was a madman, a criminal, or an agent of the Soviet Union." Soon afterward, he says, he learned that the background briefing had been conducted by Henry Kissinger, then National Security Advisor. Kissinger fired him by telephone.

STEP ONE: The Rapid Deployment Force.

In 1973 and '74, and again in 1979, political upheavals in the Middle East led to huge spikes in oil prices, which rose fifteenfold over the course of a year. The Kissinger plan, he said, is back. The United States sold billions of dollars' worth of arms to the Saudis in the early '80s, from AWACS surveillance aircraft to Patriot missile systems. And at the end of the war between Iraq and Iran, the U.S. Navy created the joint Task Force-Middle East to protect oil tankers plying the waters of the Gulf, thus expanding a U.S. naval presence of just three or four warships into a flotilla of 40-plus carrier aircraft, battleships, and cruisers.

STEP TWO: The Central Command.

In the 1980s, under President Reagan, the United States sold more than $43 billion worth of arms to the Saudis, the most of all countries. President Reagan's Defense Secretary, Caspar Weinberger, a former Senator from New Mexico, went to Riyadh in 1983 to try to consolidate its commercial and military ties; by the time U.S. Ambassador Chas Freeman arrived at the end of the decade, the United States had fallen to fourth place among arms suppliers to the kingdom. "The United States was being supplanted even in commercial terms by the British, the French, even the Chinese," Freeman notes.

All that changed with the Gulf War. Arab oil and both states now oppose a direct U.S. military presence, and American troops, construction squads, arms salesmen, and military assistance teams rushed to the Gulf. The Gulf War and Kuwait, made straight to this place in a direct line from the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea. The United States is now in the same position as the U.S. military has been in the past century.

Throughout those years, and especially after the Gulf War, U.S. forces have steadily encroached on the Gulf and the surrounding region, from the Horn of Africa to Central Asia. In preparing for an invasion and occupation of Iraq, the administration has been借鉴 the steps of the Carter Doctrine and policy planners over the past quarter century.

STEP THREE: The Gulf War. This summer, the United States was unable to persuade the Arab states to allow a permanent American presence on their soil. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia has been rushing in Texans and Oklahomans to operate them. And in 1986, at the height of the war between Iraq and Iran, the U.S. Navy created the joint Task Force-Middle East to protect oil tankers plying the waters of the Gulf, thus expanding a U.S. naval presence of just three or four warships into a flotilla of 40-plus carrier aircraft, battleships, and cruisers.
and granting the United States pre-positioning rights. “Our military presence in the Middle East has increased dramatically,” then-Defense Secretary William Cohen boasted in strategy papers.

Another boost to the U.S. presence was the unilateral imposition, in 1991, of no-fly zones in northern and southern Iraq. A billion-dollar US-led operation, mostly by U.S. aircraft from bases in Turkey and Saudi Arabia. “There was a massive buildup, especially around Incirlik in Turkey, and no-fly zones were drawn around the [Saudi] capital of Riyadh, to police the southern no-fly zone,” says Colin Robinson of the Center for Defense Information, a think tank. A billion-dollar, high-tech command center was built by Saudi Arabia near Riyadh, and over the past two years the United States has secretly been completing another one in Qatar. Saudi facilities “were built with capacities far beyond the ability of Saudi Arabia to use them,” Robinson says. “And that’s exactly what Qatar is doing now.”

Step four: Afghanistan. The war in Afghanistan—and the open-ended war on terrorism, which has led to U.S. strikes in Yemen, Pakistan, and elsewhere—further boosted America’s strength in the region. The administration has won large increases in the defense budget, which now stands at $350 billion, up from just over $300 billion in 2000—and a huge chunk of that budget, perhaps as much as $60 billion, is slated to support the war effort in Afghanistan and Iraq. Military facilities on the perimeter of the Gulf, from Djibouti in the Horn of Africa to the island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, have been expanded, and a web of bases and training missions has extended the U.S. presence deep into central Asia. From Afghanistan to the landlocked former Soviet republics of Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Kyrgyzstan, U.S. forces have established themselves in an area that had long been in Russia’s sphere of influence. Oil-rich in its own right, and strategically vital, central Asia is now the eastern link in a nearly continuous chain of U.S. bases, facilities, and allies stretching from the Mediterranean and the Red Sea far into the Asia hinterland.

Step five: Iraq. Removing Saddam Hussein could be the final piece of the puzzle, cementing an American imperial presence. It is “higher on the to-do list than any other priority,” says Lawrence Murawiec, who was sent to the Gulf as a CIA official, oversaw a CSIS task force that examined plans to occupy Saudi Arabia, says Robert E. Belfield, director of the energy program at the American Enterprise Institute, an influential think tank whose advisers include Kissinger; former Defense Secretary and CIA director James Schlesinger; and Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter’s national security adviser. “If something happens in Saudi Arabia,” Belfield says, “if the ruling family is ousted, if they decide to shut off the oil supply, we have to go in.” Two years ago, Belfield, a former mid-level CIA official, oversaw a CSIS task force that included several members of Congress as well as representatives from industry including ExxonMobil, Arco, BP, Shell, Texaco, and the American Petroleum Institute. Its report, The Geopolitics of Energy Into the 21st Century, concluded that the world will find itself dependent for many years on unstable oil-producing nations, around which conflicts and wars are bound to swirl. “Oil is the world’s most high-stakes, most volatile, most strategically vital, national power, national treasures, and international politics. It is no longer a commodity to be bought and sold within the confines of corporations, states and demand balances. Rather, it has been transformed into a determinant of well-being, of national security, and of international power.”

As vital as the Persian Gulf is now, its strategic importance is likely to grow exponentially. “Out of every three barrels of oil reserves in the world lie under just two countries: Saudi Arabia (with 259 billion barrels of proven reserves); and Iraq (with 116 billion),” Ebel reports that the U.S. military wants to use its own oil fields in the event of a crisis.

By 2020, the Gulf will supply just one-fifth of the world’s oil, according to the report produced by Belfield’s CSIS task force. “They have different political interests in the gulf than we do,” Belfield says. “It is to our advantage to have another competitor for oil in the Persian Gulf.”

David Long, who served as a U.S. diplomat in Saudi Arabia and as chief of the Near East bureau of the CIA’s National Intelligence Council, three-quarters of the Gulf’s oil will go to Asia, China, and Japan. “The United States has become dependent on the Gulf could cause it to develop closer military and political ties with countries such as Iran and Iraq, according to the report produced by Belfield’s CSIS task force.”

Until the 1970s, the face of American power in the Gulf was the U.S. oil industry, led by companies such as Gulf Oil, Mobil, Chevron, and ARCO. But in the early 70s, the United States has worked to diversify its sources of oil with Venezuela, Nigeria, and the Philippines. Today, a growing number of Washington strategists are advocating a direct U.S. challenge to the world’s oil-producing countries, especially the Persian Gulf. The U.S. military wants to use its own oil fields in the event of a crisis, and it has been completed another one in Qatar. The American administration has been pursuing energy policies that are controversial.

“Russia is now, its strategic importance is likely to grow exponentially. “Out of every three barrels of oil reserves in the world lie under just two countries: Saudi Arabia (with 259 billion barrels of proven reserves); and Iraq (with 116 billion),” Ebel reports that the U.S. military wants to use its own oil fields in the event of a crisis.

By 2020, the Gulf will supply just one-fifth of the world’s oil, according to the report produced by Belfield’s CSIS task force. “They have different political interests in the gulf than we do,” Belfield says. “It is to our advantage to have another competitor for oil in the Persian Gulf.”

David Long, who served as a U.S. diplomat in Saudi Arabia and as chief of the Near East bureau of the CIA’s National Intelligence Council, three-quarters of the Gulf’s oil will go to Asia, China, and Japan. “The United States has become dependent on the Gulf could cause it to develop closer military and political ties with countries such as Iran and Iraq, according to the report produced by Belfield’s CSIS task force.”

Until the 1970s, the face of American power in the Gulf was the U.S. oil industry, led by companies such as Gulf Oil, Mobil, Chevron, and ARCO. But in the early 70s, the United States has worked to diversify its sources of oil with Venezuela, Nigeria, and the Philippines. Today, a growing number of Washington strategists are advocating a direct U.S. challenge to the world’s oil-producing countries, especially the Persian Gulf. The U.S. military wants to use its own oil fields in the event of a crisis, and it has been completed another one in Qatar. The American administration has been pursuing energy policies that are controversial.

“Russia is now, its strategic importance is likely to grow exponentially. “Out of every three barrels of oil reserves in the world lie under just two countries: Saudi Arabia (with 259 billion barrels of proven reserves); and Iraq (with 116 billion),” Ebel reports that the U.S. military wants to use its own oil fields in the event of a crisis. "They have different political interests in the gulf than we do, "Belfield says. "It's to our advantage to have another competitor for oil in the Persian Gulf."
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes. Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

CUBA BEGINS TRIALS OF DISSIDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me draw your attention to a headline that appeared in the Associated Press today, and the headline reads “Cuba Begins Trials of Dissidents. Cuba pressed forward Thursday for dissidents rounded up across the island and reportedly seeking life sentences for at least 10 of them.”

My colleagues are at this moment attempting to liberate Iraq from a dictator, Saddam Hussein. Our men and women are in harm’s way. Regrettably, in this very Chamber, we have had our own colleagues, our own colleagues advocating open trade and opportunity with Fidel Castro.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the very person who is arresting and charging people in Cuba to life sentencing. At least 78 dissidents have been arrested since March 18. If you dare to speak out against the government, and I say that loosely because it is not a government, it is a dictatorship, if Fidel Castro, you are arrested. My colleagues from south Florida will tell Members at length what is considered a chargeable crime, and they will tell some of the things that this dictator is charging his citizens with.

Let me read what Elsa Pollan said about her husband, Hector Fernando Maseda. She says, “I feel so defenseless. Where can I find someone to defend my husband?”

Her husband is going to be on trial, and no one will stand up for him. Why are our men and women in Iraq? To free and liberate people. And yet the very Members who voted to send our men and women into harm’s way in Iraq, some of those people here on the Floor gleefully say the embargo has not worked. Forty-two Members voted against the embargo, and 42 Members will defend Cuba’s embargo if it is just trade with Cuba because if we embolden this dictator, he may give up and we will have freedom for people.

I have never heard such nonsense in my life. I hope those Members who advocate free trade with Cuba will look at today’s headlines. If they feel comfortable doing business with a person who will incarcerate people for simply speaking their free will and their free mind, then have at it. I want no part of it.

If Members can look Elsa Pollan in the eyes and say her husband should be locked up for life because he spoke out against Fidel Castro, join with the heroes in Cuba and advocate free trade with Cuba. I challenge those Members who believe in free trade with Cuba, would they today, based on the political reality, advocate free trade with Saddam Hussein? Would they stand up in this well and say let us do business with Saddam Hussein because if he gets a little economic commerce, he will become a nicer person?

It is different because they keep saying if we do grain sales and medicine and food, it will not work, the embargo must somehow we are going to loosen Fidel Castro’s grip on his people. Obviously, Fidel Castro has a different opinion on what loosening the grip on his people means. They probably rounded up 78 people, defendants, and sentences sought for each. Several Cuban exile groups have distributed slightly longer lists. We are not sure. We hear 78 by the Associated Press. These are probably people who will never hear from again because they will probably be dead at the hands of Fidel Castro’s henchmen.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I ask my colleagues to carefully look at the headlines, think about our men and women in harm’s way, and think if they really want to pursue a policy of appeasement with a man who is in fact locking up his own citizens as we speak. The parallels between Saddam Hussein and Fidel Castro are absolutely identical. One has a beard, one is south of Florida, the other is north of the Middle East. But if the citizens dare speak out against either, they are dead or imprisoned for life. If they advocate health care or opportunity, they are arrested. Please do not fall for the trap; trade will not work. The embargo must stand. Fidel must go, and Cubans on that beautiful island south of Florida should have a chance for democracy and free elections.

CUBAN REGIME ARRESTS PRO-DEMOCRACY ACTIVISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for at least half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and then my distinguished friend from Florida, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY),
with regard to the crackdown that the Cuban dictatorship is engaged in at this moment against the pro-democracy movement in Cuba.

An entire new generation of leaders has developed and sprung up in Cuba; and even though they make a very pure, moral argument, their struggle always to a totally peaceful means, the dictator in Cuba is nervous, precisely because an entire generation of leadership that signifies and represents the future of Cuba has arisen. So this crackdown has occurred while the attention of the world, and it is occurring while the attention of the world is obviously upon Iraq because of the liberation of Iraq taking place by coalition forces led by the United States.

So taking advantage of the fact that the world is looking at Iraq, the Cuban dictator has once again filled his prisons with men and women who are peaceful pro-democracy activists or independent journalists, including Raúl Rivero who is usually referred to as the dean of independent journalists in Cuba. Very well-known peaceful pro-democracy activists have been part of this round-up. Their homes have been burst into, their belongings confiscated, and the thugs of the dictatorship called the Rapid Action Brigades. They have burst into the homes, ransacked the homes, stolen property and terrorized the families of the pro-democracy activists, as well as the pro-democracy activists themselves. The indictment and trial have been ongoing systematically in the last 2 weeks in Cuba.

As I stated before, very well-known activists such as Hector Palacios and Martha Beatriz Roque are among the many, the 80 that we know of. Certainly there are many more that we do not know of, but 80 we know of.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the Record the list of the 80 imprisoned journalists and activists that we know of.

INDEPENDENT JOURNALISTS
Alejandro González Raga, Normando Hernández, Juan Carlos Herrera Acosta, José Ubaldo Izquierdo, Héctor Maseda, Mario Enrique Mayo, Jorge Olivera, Pablo Achache Avila, Fabio Prieto Llorente, José Gabriel Ramón Castillo, Raúl Rivero Castañeda, Omar Rodríguez Saludres, Omar Ruiz Hernández, and Manuel Vázquez Portal.

PRO-DEMOCRACY ACTIVISTS


Mr. Speaker, without any doubt, Martha Beatriz Roque, of the pro-democracy activists who have been rounded up in this Stalinist crackdown in the last 2 weeks, she is the best known, an economist by trade and a very erudite intellectual. Martha Beatriz Roque was thrown into the dungeon along with these 80 other pro-democracy activists, and today her summary trial began. Apparently it is set to end tomorrow.

The Castro regime's prosecutors are requiring these horror sentences for this heroic woman, this economist who simply writes and speaks on behalf of freedom and democracy and analyzes economic conditions, and engages in that kind of work. The indictment does not contradict the fact that her work is peaceful, and her trial is a travesty. Clearly, if this is really a farce. It would be laughable if we were not dealing with the tragic situation of a people who have had to be subjected to 44 years of totalitarianism led by a Stalinist dictator.

The indictment charges Marta Beatriz Roque with possessing a computer, accessing her computer, utilizing a server for her Web page in the United States of America. By way of the Web page, the indictment continues, Marta Beatriz Roque established links with entities in the United States. The accused, Marta Beatriz Roque, numerous times spoke on Radio Marti. The accused, Marta Beatriz Roque, published an article in a dissident magazine known as "Enquiento." The accused, Marta Beatriz Roque, was visited in her resiliency by the ambassador of the United States. The indictment continues, Marta Beatriz Roque, possessed in her residence, the indictment continues, a Cannon copier and a Panasonic fax machine. The accused, Marta Beatriz Roque, had communications with a well-known gentlemanwoman from Florida (Ms. Ros-Lehtinen) and Lincoln Diaz-Balart. The accused must be sentenced pursuant to this indictment, pursuant to the request of the prosecution in the totalitarian state to life imprisonment for what she had of.

That is what the Cuban people are subjected to, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, we see that the international community is beginning despite the fact that, naturally so, the attention has been on the liberation of Iraq, despite the fact that the dictator chose this moment to act, to attempt to wipe out an entire generation of leaders that will be the leaders of democratic Cuba. The international community must react. The European Union that had recently declared that it would accept the Cuban dictatorship in its international aid agreement, its foreign aid agreement, has now said that it will continue to do so until the dictator in Cuba has no sway. The Washington Post, I read today, was called in for an explanation by the Foreign Ministry in London, Publications, editorial boards, and I think it is just, it is only just and fair and appropriate to admit that publications, editorial boards with which I, for example, have had profound differences on many issues over the past, a number of them have come around and have seen that this totalitarian crackdown cannot be treated as business as usual; and thus be dealt with as usual. I am pleased to take place now with that dictatorship.

For example, the Los Angeles Times last week talking about the crackdown even before these sentences were reached; for this 44-year sentence for a woman, this economist who simply writes and speaks on behalf of freedom and democracy and analyzes economic conditions, and engages in that kind of work. The indictment does not contradict the fact that her work is peaceful, and her trial is a travesty. Clearly, if this is really a farce. It would be laughable if we were not dealing with the tragic situation of a people who have had to be subjected to 44 years of totalitarianism led by a Stalinist dictator.

The Washington Post today talks about the fear that obviously the dictator is demonstrating because, yes, he chose this moment; and then The Washington Post today calls on the Government to drop the ball, ease the pressure, or allow Cuba to pretend that the country's multiple problems are anything but self-inflicted. The Washington Post, I think that it is important and relevant to point this out and agree with it.

I appreciate my colleagues being here. We have 15 minutes remaining, and I know we will be back on Tuesday.
but I so much appreciate their being here also this evening, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART). Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for yielding to me in this special moment for the people of Cuba.

It is with a heavy heart that my colleagues from south Florida and I stand here today because, while we are filled with hope and satisfaction about the liberation of the Iraqi people from the repressive regime of Saddam Hussein, at the same time our hearts bleed and weep for our brothers and sisters enslaved and oppressed in Cuba because the brutal tyrannical regime of Fidel Castro has used the cover of military action in Iraq to launch, as my colleague from south Florida clearly pointed out, one of the most intense crackdowns against dissidents in recent years for possession of papers.

And these brave souls that are listed here also this evening, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), have been storming into homes across the island, confiscating typewriters, books, papers from dissidents' homes, and rounding up almost 300 pro-democracy activists and independent journalists. And what are they being called? Engaging in supposedly threatening activities such as possessing and lending books by such authors as Vaclav Havel, Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr.

Another arrested, Raúl Rivero, perhaps Cuba's most prominent independent journalist; Reformist Hector Paladines, labor leader Pedro Paez, Alvaro Ramos. And my colleague had entered into the Record all of their names, as far as we know; and the list is growing every day. And their sentences: Osvaldo Alfonso Valdes, life sentence; Pedro Paez, 15 years; Ricardo Gonzalez Alfonso, life sentence; Orlando Fundora Alvarez, 15 to 25 years. Life sentences, 15 years, 25 years for possession of papers.

And these brave souls that are listed in this list are just a few of the victims of the most recent wave of terrorism and repression. Many of the dissidents are being tortured. The summary sentences range from 15 years to execution, all in an attempt to intimidate by submission and silence those who oppose the regime's monarchical rule. However, as Claudia Marquez, the wife of jailed dissident Osvaldo Alfonso, has emphasized, she said: "Our voices and cries will not be silenced, even if our only weapon is our statements."

With every arrest the opposition is strengthened, not weakened. With each beating their mission becomes clear. They are unwilling to make the ultimate sacrifice if it means an end to tyranny, for they know that their blood and their tears fertilize the roots of democracy which are taking hold in our native Cuba.

They will not be deterred. Let us not ignore their cries, cries emanating just 90 miles off our shores. This crackdown is a direct challenge to the United States and to the international community.

The regime assumed that we were all too busy with Iraq to care about the suffering of the Cuban people. Well, the dictatorship made a grave mistake. The European Union issued a statement condemning the arrest and demanding that these prisoners of conscience be immediately released. Amnesty International urged Cuba to release all of its prisoners of conscience and reform the laws which make such detentions possible. Human Rights Watch, the Los Angeles Times, have all denounced the crackdowns; and newspapers, as pointed out by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), in the Los Angeles Times, they have published editorials saying, "After years of calling for liberalized relations with Cuba, this editorial page must now urge American policymakers to hit the brakes."

So rather than focusing on rewarding the Castro regime by loosening U.S. restrictions, all of us in the U.S. Congress should demand that Castro free all of the pro-democracy activists who have been arrested in the last few weeks, along with all prisoners of conscience.

We must demand respect for human rights and freedom for the Cuban people. We have done it before. We did it for the Haitian people. We did it for the iron grip, for the former Soviet Union. We did it for the people in Kosovo, for the people in Bosnia. We did it for the people of this country, for the people of the world.

One week ago, the President of the United States, despite the fact that he is leading as Commander in Chief Operation Iraqi Freedom, with all the complexities that that has entailed and the attention that that has required, the President of the United States, a week ago, wrote a letter to Dr. Biscet.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues.

One week ago, the President of the United States, despite the fact that he is leading as Commander in Chief Operation Iraqi Freedom, with all the complexities that that has entailed and the attention that that has required, the President of the United States, a week ago, wrote a letter to Dr. Biscet.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), talk about the sentences, these horrendous, long prison sentences to these human beings. Why are they going to prison? It sounds like a cruel joke. They are going to prison because they own a fax machine. They are going to prison because they own a computer. They are going to prison because they own a copier. They are going to prison because they own a printer. They are going to prison because they own a fax machine and because they have the audacity to own a printer, a copier, or to have a Web page.

The world will not sit quietly. The world will not pretend this is not happening. We must all now speak up with one voice. We must all speak up against permitting this insanity by this insane human being just 90 miles away from our shores from taking away people's freedoms, putting them in prison because they own a fax machine and because they have the audacity to own a printer, a copier, or to have a Web page.

The world will not sit quietly. The world will not pretend this is not happening. We must all now speak up with one voice. We must all speak up against permitting this insanity by this insane human being just 90 miles away from our shores from taking away people's freedoms.

One week ago, the President of the United States, a week ago, wrote a letter to Dr. Biscet.

Dear Dr. Biscet: Congratulations on your recognition by the International Republican Institute with its first Democracy's People Award.

The work, and your example are the embodiment of democratic values, including self-determination, free expression, and liberty. I applaud your courageous and dignified struggle for
human rights and to bring freedom to all Cubans.

Laura and I continue to pray for your health and that of the many political prisoners held unjustly in your country.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McINNIS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of surgery.

SPECIAL ORDERS-grANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-aneous material:)
Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today and April 7.
Mr. OXLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BONNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
(extend their remarks and include extra-aneous material:)
Mr. CONyers, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 7, 2003, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour de-bates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1661. A letter from the Deputy Associate Attorney General and White House Liaison, Department of J ustice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

1662. A letter from the Deputy Associate Attorney General and White House Liaison, Department of J ustice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, to the Committee on Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 760. A bill to prohibit the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion, and for other purposes.

Mr. Bonner, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONyers, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. M ARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GUELLY, Mr. ROSEN, Mr. WEAVER of Colorado, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI of Florida, Mr. PORTZ, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PROMOYER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COLE, Mr. BRICE, and Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri):

H.R. 1580. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for national standardized payment amounts for inpatient hospital services furnished under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOLENBERG (for himself, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for certain compensation received by members of the Armed Forces serving in South Korea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mr. STU-PAK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SASSI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. RENZI, Mr. DICKS, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. BERERUER, Mr. MCNINNIS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. PROMOYER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. DeJESSER, Mr. MCARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, and Mr. BEAUPREZ):

H.R. 1582. A bill to equitably distribute universal service support throughout rural America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BALLenger, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KELLer, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. ISAKSON):

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for adjudicative improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. RANZELL):

H.R. 1584. A bill to implement effective measures to stop trade in conflict diamonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ADERHOLD (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EVERTT, Mr. BIRLAKIS, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FILER, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. McHugh):

H.R. 1585. A bill to establish an office to oversee research compliance and assurance within the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Labor, and the Department of the Interior to participate in projects within the San Diego Creek Watershed, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself and Mr. PSAKI):

H.R. 1586. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in projects within the San Diego Creek Watershed, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Mr. SOUDE):

H.R. 1589. A bill to amend the Recreational Water Quality Act of 1984, to establish an Office of Recreational Water Quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 1590. A bill to provide for the fair and efficient judicial consideration of personal injury and wrongful death claims arising out of asbestos exposure, to ensure that individuals who suffer impairment, now or in the future, from illnesses caused by exposure to asbestos receive compensation for their injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ROICE, Mr. RHORRABACHER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. L. WOLF, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WILSON of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. BLUNT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 1591. A bill to further cooperation and support among Federal, State, and local health departments in designated gateway communities where the results of such cooperation and support are likely to be mutually beneficial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GEHRARDT, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 1592. A bill to extend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to classify qualified rental office furniture as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX:

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in projects within the St. Croix National Heritage Area in St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. Genthner for himself and Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1595. A bill to provide for an alternative fuel vehicle program for Federal entities; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 1595. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, to provide for a transfer of funds to the Treasury with respect to the Office of Federal Credit Reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLENS:

H.R. 1597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of life annuity transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 1599. A bill to require Federal agencies to provide for a fair and efficient judicial consideration of personal injury and wrongful death claims arising out of asbestos exposure, to ensure that individuals who suffer impairment, now or in the future, from illnesses caused by exposure to asbestos receive compensation for their injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLINN (for himself, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 1600. A bill to amend the National Drug Control Policy Act of 1986 to provide funds for special training, technical assistance, and professional development to eligible entities implementing the Zero Tolerance Program and the staff of such programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. J. O. ANN DAyS of Virginia:

H.R. 1601. A bill to provide for reauthorization of the National Institute of Standards and Technology for the fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. BOWEN (for himself, Mr. BOHNER, Mr. WILDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. W.E. LAMBERT of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MAST of South Carolina, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CASSEL, and Mr. McKEAG of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1602. A bill to establish an independent commission to study and make recommendations regarding the March 2003 attack on the United States Capitol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAyS of Virginia (for herself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 1603. A bill to provide for the reauthorization of the National Institute of Standards and Technology for the fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAyS of Virginia:

H.R. 1604. A bill to provide for the reauthorization of the National Institute of Standards and Technology for the fiscal year 2003; to the Committee on Science and Technology.
By Mr. DOOLITTLE:
H.R. 1604. A bill to amend Public Law 105-295 to increase the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for construction of temperature control devices; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GILCHRIST (for himself, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GOEHLERT, Mr. MARKLEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Ms. SOLIS):
H.R. 1605. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require phased increases in the fuel economy standards applicable to light trucks; to require fuel economy standards for automobiles up to 30,000 pounds gross vehicle weight, to increase the fuel economy of the Federal fleet of vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODE:
H.R. 1606. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to impose a limitation on the wage that the Secretary of Labor may require an employer to pay an alien who is an H-2A nonimmigrant agricultural worker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for contributions of real property interests for conservation purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. HESPE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):
H.R. 1608. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow credits for contributions of real property interests for conservation purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):
H.R. 1609. A bill to redesignate the facility of the Postal Service located at 201 West Boston Street in Brookfield, Missouri, as the "Admiral Donald Davis Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HULSOP, Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. GEPHARDT):
H.R. 1610. A bill to redesignate the facility of the Postal Service located at 201 West Boston Street in Brookfield, Missouri, as the "Admiral Donald Davis Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HULSOP, Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. GEPHARDT):
H.R. 1611. A bill to authorize grants to local educational agencies for teacher mentoring programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SANDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRANE, Mr. COX, Mr. HALL, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOODE, Mr. NERHCUTT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, Mr. MICA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SWEENEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KUOLES, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LINK, Mr. NEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CANON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-VAITE of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MYRICK, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MANZANETTI, Mr. SENSORS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. FEENEY):
H.R. 1612. A bill to make permanent the tax benefits enacted by the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1613. A bill to establish a demonstration incentive program within the Department of Education to promote installation of fire suppression or prevention technologies, in qualified student housing and dormitories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEACH (for himself, Mr. WATT, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Ms. HARISIADIS):
H.R. 1614. A bill to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing and to provide financial assistance under such program for main street revitalization or redevelopment projects in smaller communities to support the development of affordable housing for low-income families in connection with such projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CAPPS):
H.R. 1615. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to allow charter to the Ukrainian American Veterans, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1616. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands within the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site for lands owned by the United States in Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.
H.R. 1624. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the enforcement and compliance programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL: A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 Main Avenue in Clifton, New Jersey, as the "Robert P. Hammer Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PETRONE of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ROS- LON EDWARDS of California, Mr. LINCOLN Diaz-BALART of Florida, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain electronic service television broadcast stations by providing cable carriage rights for qualified Class A television stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1627. A bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1999, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself and Mr. HAYworth):

H.R. 1630. A bill to revise the boundary of the Petrified Forest National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. GINNY Brown-Waite of Florida, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MIGUEL HALEY of North Carolina, Mr. McKEON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. D RAPER of Alabama, Mr. HARRISON of Texas, Mr. ISAAKSON of Georgia, Mr. MCCulloCH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. STEWART of Alabama, Mr. TUCKER of South Carolina, and MRS. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 1634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain leasehold improvements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. JACK- LEE of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. DELAURA, Mr. FROST, and Mr. FRANK of Massachu- setts):

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act for a 5-year period to reduce Medicare beneficiary copayment for hospital services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BASS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. BOND, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BIL- RAKIS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. Deal of Georgia, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. DEGETTE, Mr. DEN of Oregon, Mr. HARMAN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. SHADEGO):

H.R. 1636. A bill to protect an enhance consumer privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANNER: H.R. 1637. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, for the purpose of realigning and upgrading United States Highway 79 from a 2-lane highway to a 4-lane highway; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCLINTRE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SIM- MONS, Mr. KANORSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MCKEE):

H.R. 1638. A bill to amend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to re-
of Texas, Mr. Honda, Ms. Solis, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Stark, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Farr, Ms. Lee, Ms. McCollum, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Allen, Mr. Case, Mr. Geopol, Miller of California, Ms. Berkley, and Ms. Lofgren. 

H. Res. 174. A resolution recognizing the unique effects that proposals to reform Social Security may have on women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. Gonzalez.

H. Res. 175. A resolution recognizing the United States Air Force's Air Force News Agency on the occasion of its 29th anniversary and honoring the Air Force personnel who have served the Nation while assigned to that agency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. Gonzalez (for himself and Mr. Rodriguez).

H. Res. 176. A resolution honoring the San Fernando Cathedral and the city of San Antonio on the occasion of the completion of the cathedral's renovation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. Green of Wisconsin.

H. Res. 177. A resolution commending the people of the Republic of Kenya for conducting free and fair elections, for the peaceful and orderly transfer of power in their government, and for the continued success of democracy in their nation since that transition; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. Gwendolyn of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Greenwood, Mr. Pitts, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Hart, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Shuster, Mr. Platts, Mr. Hefley, Mr. Sherwood, Mr. Gerlach, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Fattah, Mr. English, Mr. Holden, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Kanjorski, and Mr. Murtha).

H. Res. 178. A resolution honoring the life and work of former Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives Matthew J. Ryan and offering the deepest condolences of the House of Representatives to his wife and family on his death; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to a joint resolution memorializing the United States Congress to recognize the mobilization and deployment of the Fourth Infantry Division Rear Operations Center of the Wyoming Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to a joint resolution memorializing the United States Congress to recognize the mobilization and deployment of the 104th Engineer Company of the Wyoming Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. Cooper, Mrs. Israel, Ms. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Dingell, and Mr. Peterson of Minnesota.

H.R. 25: Mr. Hefley.

H.R. 33: Mr. Acevedo-Vila and Mr. Pomroy.
H.R. 1196: Mr. Rangel, Mr. Sabo, Mr. Baird, and Mr. Van Hollen.

H.R. 1211: Mrs. Lowey, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Crowley, and Mr. Rangel.

H.R. 1213: Mr. Murphy, Mr. Wicker, Mr. McInnis, and Mr. Pomroy.

H.R. 1224: Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Israel, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Payne, Mr. Pomroy, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Bachus, and Mr. Duncan.

H.R. 1225: Ms. Granger, Mr. Souder, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Schiff, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Allen, Mr. Miller of North Carolina, Mr. George Miller of California, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wexler, Mr. Moran of Virginia, and Mr. Doyle.

H.R. 1235: Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Bartlett of Maryland, Mr. Bishop of Utah, and Mr. Cole.

H.R. 1236: Mr. Terry.

H.R. 1258: Mr. Waxman, Mr. Engel, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Stark, and Mr. Hoeffel.

H.R. 1264: Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Ross, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Scott of Georgia, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Moore, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Lucas of Kentucky, Mr. Berry, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Hill, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Harman, and Mr. Taylor of Mississippi.

H.R. 1265: Ms. McCrery, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Michaud, Mr. Gonzalez, and Ms. Waters.

H.R. 1306: Mr. Goode, Mr. Pickering, Mr. Payne, Mr. Carson of Oklahoma, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Frost, and Mr. Cardoz.

H.R. 1307: Mr. Berman.

H.R. 1308: Mr. Kildee.

H.R. 1400: Mr. Murtha, Mr. Sandlin, Mr. Payne, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Boyd, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Baird, Ms. Delauro, Mr. Sanders, and Mr. Stupak.


H.R. 1415: Mr. Stark, Mr. Allen, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Norton, Mr. Gillmor, Mr. Carson of Indiana, and Mr. Matheson.

H.R. 1422: Mr. Cooper and Mr. Pickering.

H.R. 1425: Mr. Tierney.

H.R. 1429: Mr. Baca and Ms. Slaughter.

H.R. 1443: Mr. Burton of Indiana.

H.R. 1452: Mr. Beauprez and Mr. Burgess.

H.R. 1459: Mr. Frost.

H.R. 1466: Mr. Conyers, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Doyle, Ms. Loretta Sanchez of California, Ms. Woolsey, and Mr. Pascrell.

H.R. 1472: Mr. Bartlett of Maryland and Mr. Smith of New Jersey.


H.R. 1478: Mr. Simmons and Mr. Hoeffel.

H.R. 1480: Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Sabo, and Mr. Conyers.

H.R. 1500: Mr. Larsen of Washington and Mr. Baird.

H.R. 1508: Mr. Ford, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Meeks of New York, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Ms. Acevedo-Vila, Ms. Watson, and Mr. Owens.

H.R. 1511: Mrs. Millar of Michigan, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Ballenger, Mr. Ney, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Green of Wisconsin, Mr. Brady of Texas, Mr. McCotter, Mr. Cole, Mr. Coble, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Porter, Mr. Saxton, Mr. Pickering, Mr. Fossella, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Burns, Mr. Castle, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Gillmor, and Mr. Tooney.

H.R. 1519: Mr. Franks of Arizona.

H.R. 1534: Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Mr. Cummings, and Mr. Kildee.

H.R. 1540: Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1552: Mr. Wicker, Mr. Lincoln Diaz-Balart of Florida, and Mr. Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida.

H.R. 1553: Mr. Tiahrt, Mr. Case, Mr. LaTourette, Mr. Miller of North Carolina, Mr. Ney of New York, Mrs. Tauscher, Ms. Berkley, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Pastor, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, and Mr. Lucas of Kentucky.

H.R. 1554: Mr. Evans and Mr. McGovern.

H.R. 1565: Ms. Carson of Indiana.

H.R. 1570: Mr. Tauzin.

H.R. 1571: Mr. LaMalfa.

H.R. 1572: Mr. McConkie.

H.R. 1575: Ms. Lewis of Georgia.

H.R. 1576: Mr. Lamborn.

H.R. 1577: Mr. Brown of Maryland.

H.R. 1578: Mr. Lewis of Georgia.

H.R. 1579: Mr. Markey.

H.R. 1580: Mr. Sanders, Mr. Filner, and Mr. Grijalva.

H.R. 1581: Mr. Waxman, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Hinchey, Ms. Delauro, Mr. Thompson of California, and Mr. Weiner.

H.R. 1586: Ms. Steve Israel, Mr. Hinchey, Mr. Doyle, and Ms. Kaptur.

H.R. 1587: Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Ford, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Hinchey, Mr. Doyle, and Ms. Kaptur.

H.R. 1588: Mr. Doolittle.

H.R. 1589: Ms. Ms. Lee, Mr. Dingell, Ms. Dunn, and Mr. Blumenauer.

H.R. 1590: Mr. Nethercutt.

H.R. 1591: Mr. Beauprez and Mr. Burgess.

H.R. 1592: Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Baker, Mr. Hinchey, Mr. Schrock, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Carano of California, and Mr. Wu.

H.R. 1593: Mr. Bartlett of Maryland, Mr. Goode, Mr. Tooney, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Aderholt, Mr. Boehner, Mr. Israel, and Mr. King of Iowa.


H.R. 1595: Mr. Rothman, Mr. Lampson, and Mr. Case.

H.R. 1596: Mr. Filner.

H.R. 1597: Ms. Carson of Indiana and Mr. Frank of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1598: Mr. Hastings of Florida, Mr. Davis of Alabama, Mr. Insole, and Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut.

H.R. 1599: Mr. Janklow, Mr. Simmons, and Mr. Osborne.

H.R. 1600: Mr. Frank of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1601: Mr. Lampson, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Becerra, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Acevedo-Vila, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Reyes, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Doggett, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Frost, Mr. Bell, Ms. Solis, Mr. Rodriguez, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Baca, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Pastor, Mrs. Napolitano, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Serrano, Ms. Linda T. Sanchez of California, and Mr. Gutiérrez.

H.R. 1604: Mr. McGovern.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1989: Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1306: Mr. Scott of Georgia.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 1. April 2, 2003, by Mr. Frost on S. 121, was signed by the following Members of Congress: