The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, our salvation and our hope, when Jeremiah heard You calling him, he tried to evade a response. Jeremiah did not make excuses as we often do. He simply did not remain focused on You. He looked to himself instead and saw himself inadequate for the task You placed before him. As Your word once shook Jeremiah from his self-centeredness, so now call the Members of Congress to look beyond self-interest and be prophetic leaders of this Nation who will do what needs to be done and say what needs to be said.

Strengthen them by Your commission: “Go to whatever people I send You and say whatever I tell You to say. Fear none of them for I am with You and will keep You safe. This is the very word of the Lord.”

May all of us be responsive now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Burgess) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. BURGESS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 380. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to reform the funding of benefits under the Civil Service Retirement System for employees of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission, vice the Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the following Senators as members of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission:

The Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett), vice the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin).

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. Campbell), vice the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Reid).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of Alan C. Lowe, of Tennessee, to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of Stephen Van Buren, of South Dakota, to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress, vice Elizabeth Scott, of South Dakota.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minutes on each side.

HONORING VETERANS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in Iraq today heroes are being made and freedoms won. Our soldiers in Iraq are joining a proud group of veterans who have fought to defend freedom and our country in the past.

This morning I would like to share a few words of Father Denis Edward O’Brien, chaplain of the United States Marine Corps, that honor our Nation’s veterans. He said, “It is the soldier, not the reporter, who has given us freedom of the press. It is the soldier, not the poet, who has given us freedom of speech. It is the soldier, not the campus organizer, who has given us freedom to demonstrate. It is the soldier who salutes the flag, who serves beneath the flag, and whose coffin is draped by the flag, who allows the protester to burn the flag.”

There is a time to fight for freedom. Today our Nation’s veterans are defending freedom and this Nation in Iraq. Two little words that would mean a lot to them are “thank you.”

THE FEDERAL DEBT AND TAX CUTS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives will vote to borrow $75 billion adding to our $6 trillion mountain of Federal debt. Maybe we would not have to borrow that money if we asked the wealthy people if we could cancel, ask them to contribute a little bit to this crisis, but we will not do that here. What are we going to spend the $75 billion on? $10 billion of foreign aid including $1 billion for Turkey, and remember how
helpful they have been, $1 billion for Turkey which their ambassador says is a unilateral act on the part of the United States of America. They have not asked for it and they do not want it, but we are going to give them that billion. We are going to borrow it, and give it to them.

Billions to rebuild Iraq including 6,000 schools. Universal health care is going to be implemented in Iraq. We already have a request for a proposal online from the United States Government for an American hospital in Iraq.

What about here at home? What about our schools? What about the 44 million Americans that do not have health care? Not a penny of emergency spending in this bill for them. And then finally we have of course port security, first responders. Where are the funds we need to defend our country and where is the money the airline workers have been waiting for? For 18 months we promised them they would get money next week, 18 months ago.

“PORKER OF THE WEEK” AWARD

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, Boston’s Big Dig and Virginia’s Mixing Bowl are characterized by cost overruns and boggled timelines. The Big Dig in Boston has turned one of our biggest boondoggles. The project which already costs more than twice as much as it did to build the Panama Canal was estimated in 1985 to cost $2.6 billion. Eighteen years later the project still is not completed and the costs are more than $14 billion and are expected to go to $18 billion. So also the cost projections for the Mixing Bowl have tripled with the latest estimate approaching $1 billion. Law oversight and consistently low estimates of cost and money have also hampered the completion date which was slated for 2007. That slipped.

These projects represent huge investments by State, local, and the Federal governments, and Americans have the right to expect Federal projects to be well managed and completed on time and on budget. Because the Federal Highway Administration has done little to stem the runaway spending on these two projects, it gets my “porker of the week” award.

TRIBUTE TO KAREN L. ROBINSON

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very good friend of mine and Costa Mesa’s mayor, Karen L. Robinson. Ms. Robinson was recently appointed as a judge of the Orange County Superior Court, making her the first black woman appointed to our county bench.

Robinson currently supervises five attorneys as the litigation counsel coordinator for the California State University System, and she also serves as a judge pro tempore, presiding over small-claims cases for the county’s municipal courts.

Robinson’s appointment as a judge is not the first time that she has made history. In 2000 she was named to the Costa Mesa City Council and in 2002 was named mayor. Both are firsts for an African American in that city in Orange County.

I would like to congratulate Robinson on her outstanding achievements and all of her contributions to our community, and I know that she will have even more successes in her career, and I wish her the best.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, seven carriers and air wings are deployed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I want to focus on a Carrier Reserve Squadron being assigned to Carrier Air Wing Eight aboard the USS Roosevelt. The Squadron is Strike Fighter 201, VFA-201, flying the F-18 Hornet. They are part of the 11th Carrier Air Wing, Carrier Air Wing Reserve 20, headquartered in Atlanta.

This is the first naval reserve F-18 squadron ever mobilized aboard a carrier with an active duty wing, and 201’s combat record demonstrates the capability of our reserve air crews. Since October VFA-201 mobilized over 100 Reservists transitioning to the F/A-18 Alpha Plus and deployed aboard USS Theodore Roosevelt in January.

Every aviator has crews and combat experience of over 1,000 flight hours, many logging more than 2,000 hours in type. Reservists of 201 provide leadership to the wing in strike planning, flight execution, and carrier operations. Their experience in operations around the world and in adversary tactics aid Air Wing readiness. This reserve squadron’s boarding rate and landing grades exceeded all other active duty Air Wing Eight squadrons.

Early in the morning of March 23, the “hunters” of VFA-201 made history carrying out our initial strikes and destroyed a communications complex south of Baghdad. The pilots, sailors, and jets are performing magnificently. Morale is high and they are continuing to operate Air Wing Eight in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Naval Reserve TACAIR is alive, underbudget, and on target. This success story is what our Naval Air Reserve squadrons bring to the table in time of war: experience, peacetime active duty support, and Reservists are our best and brightest. They form the backbone of a low-cost military insurance policy America needs.

ADDRESSING HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership today is bringing up a spending bill to pay for the war, and I certainly understand it and support it; but they have excluded the Democrats from adding and actually addressing in a better way the issue of homeland security. We know that after 9-11 we have to do a lot more to protect problems at home, whether it be water utilities or railroad opportunities or our ports and cargo coming into ports. And what the Democrats have been saying over and over again is that this bill that comes up today, and basically the Republican leadership in general are not doing enough to look at the problem of homeland security.

We were told that we could not bring up an amendment that would have added money to pay for these various functions here at home. They should have allowed us here to do this. It is not fair to not let the Democrats who are a minority, but not a minority by much, to have the opportunity to debate and bring up a bill that would put more money to address these problems whether it is tunnels, whether it is your local water supply, whether it is helping with grants for local firefighters or police so that they can better respond and understand what to do in case of a biological or chemical attack. This is what my constituents are telling me that they are very concerned about. Of course they are concerned about the war, and we have to finance the war operations against Iraq. But we also have to be concerned about what happened here. I saw what happened in the aftermath of the attack on the World Trade Center. We are not prepared. Let the Democrats bring up that amendment and address the problem of homeland security more effectively.

FISCAL YEAR 2003 SUPPLEMENTAL SPENDING BILL

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I have come before the American people today to express my deep concern over the situation affecting our domestic airlines. Today we will be voting to approve a supplemental spending bill within this budget there will be much needed, in fact, critical funding for our troops who are currently engaged in combat with Iraq. This funding bill will also include payments to our domestic airlines to help fund security measures in response to the September 11 attacks.

Mr. Speaker, I support both components of this supplemental spending
SECURITY FOR OUR PORTS

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Speaker, today, unfortunately, the Democrats will not be allowed to offer an amendment that would dramatically increase the security of this Nation from terrorist activities, and that is an amendment to provide for the nuclear detection of nuclear devices that might be put into containers in ports overseas. We have 6 million containers a year that come to the United States. The CIA has told us, the intelligence agencies have told us that this is one of the prime ways to deliver nuclear material by a terrorist. The Hart-Rudman Commission that warned us of 9-11 prior to 9-11 has warned us that this is the way a terrorist would have an opportunity to deliver a nuclear device. But what do we do? We wait until the containers get to the port of San Francisco, to the port of Oakland, to the port of New Jersey, to the port of Miami to then check them.

It is too late if they get inside of our ports.

If a nuclear device went off in one of our ports, it would not only devastate hundreds of thousands of lives, it would not only devastate the city, it would devastate the world economy.

The Democratic amendment should have been allowed so we can check these containers before they leave Asia, before they leave Europe, before they leave Africa. That is security for the Nation.

RECOGNIZING TEXAS WOMEN'S UNIVERSITY AND THE TEXAS WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME EXHIBIT IN HUBBARD HALL

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Texas Women's University and Chancellor Ann Stuart on the groundbreaking opening of the Texas Women's Hall of Fame exhibit in Hubbard Hall in Denton, Texas. The Texas Governor's Commission for Women created the Texas Women's Hall of Fame in 1984 to honor the State's most outstanding women. The Hall of Fame recognizes Texas women who have obtained significant personal or professional achievements, including former first ladies, teachers, athletes and astronauts.

There have been 114 women inducted into the Hall of Fame and this exhibit will honor these outstanding ladies and their extraordinary accomplishments. Photographs and biographies of the inductees line the walls of Texas Women's Hall of Fame for future generations in this prestigious group.

One of the original inductees is Dr. Mary Evelyn Blagg Huey, my former neighbor and former Texas Women's University president and the second woman to become president of a State university in Texas. This year's inductees were: Ann Williams, Texas Women's University regent and founder of the Dallas Black Dance Theater; Johnnie Marie Benson, a health care advocate; Karen Hughes, advisor to George W. Bush; and Sister Angela Murdaga.

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Ann Stuart and this year's inductees for their service to the community and to the fine State of Texas.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1559, EMERGENCY WAR-TIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 172 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 172

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, a Member may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for consideration of H.R. 1559, making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of the inclusion of the bill for the amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question, ordered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto, shall fall without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate.

Last night, the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule to H.R. 1559, the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2003. Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and open rule for a very important bill. It cannot get any better than that.

The rule allows any Member to offer any amendment to the bill as long as the amendment complies with the normal Rules of the House.

I am very pleased the House is trying to move H.R. 1559 quickly, because I know the importance of this bill to the men and women in our military. I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NOGALO), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for resisting most efforts to add extraneous provisions.

This bill is too important for our troops for it to get bogged down with nonappropriations issues.

I agree with the President that the United States has been at war since September 11, 2003. After our Nation was attacked, America made a decision: We will not wait for our enemies to strike before we act against them. We are not going to permit terrorists and terrorist states to plot and plan and grow in strength while we do nothing.

This emergency wartime supplemental appropriations provides the tools and the resources for our military to wage an aggressive war against Saddam Hussein while at the same time preparing our homeland.

Over the past 15 days we have seen the brutal and cruel nature of a dying regime. In areas still under its control, the regime continues its rule by terror. Prisoners of war have been brutalized and executed. Iraqi women who resist the regime are being murdered. Some in the Iraqi military have pretended to surrender and then opened fire on coalition forces that were willing to show them mercy.

We owe a great deal of gratitude and respect to our servicemen and women who are currently in harm's way. My thoughts and prayers are with them and their families during this time of war, and I want to thank them for their courage and bravery on the battlefield.

This war budget will meet America's needs directly arising from Operation Iraqi Freedom and our ongoing war.
against terror, including $63 billion for military operations. This funding will provide fuel for our ships, for our aircraft and tanks, supplies for our troops in the theater of operations, new high-tech munitions to replace the ones that we have. In this supplemental, the supplemental will also provide funds to assist in the reconstruction of Iraq. Mr. Speaker; $5 billion to help our brave coalition partners.

In order to protect the American homeland in this time of high alert, it also provides $4 billion for the Department of Justice and Homeland Security to address the immediate and emerging threats on American soil.

This legislation accomplishes this goal by providing $2.2 billion for grants to first responders. Within that amount, $1.5 billion is provided for the Office of Domestic Preparedness, their basic grant program to the States, and $700 million is provided to address the security requirements in high-threat, high-density urban areas with critical infrastructure like the city of Charlotte.

H.R. 1599 also allocates these funds for several other high priority activities: $488 million for border and port security, and $85 million for reimbursements to State and local law enforcement officers and National Guardsmen for increasing security measures at airports and other critical transportation sites.

Our Nation must give our military and our law enforcement officers the weapons that they need to meet future threats. If the war against terror means that we must find terror wherever it exists and pull it out by its roots and bring people to justice, then our military and our law enforcement officers must have the means to achieve it.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying bill. We need to boldly approve the core funding for the Pentagon so supplies continue to flow to our troops.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just listened to my friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), and she said oh, well, this is a great open rule.

Let us be very clear about what is happening here. This is not an open rule in the true sense. The Republicans waived all the Rules of the House that they could possibly waive: the Budget Act, every rule that they could waive for their own bill, for the committee bill, and then they refused to waive those same rules for the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), to bring up an amendment to the committee bill. So this is not an open rule.

Let us be very serious about what is going on here today.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, the brave men and women of the U.S. military are, once again, proving themselves to be the finest fighting force in history. On the ground, in the seas, and in the skies over Iraq, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are risking their lives to protect America and the world from the threat posed by Saddam Hussein's murderous regime.

Mr. Speaker, our troops have the strong bipartisan support of this Congress and of the American people. We are all deeply proud of the courage, skill, and professionalism they are displaying under very difficult conditions, not just our military personnel as well as Democrats, to ensuring that our troops have all the resources they need to complete their mission as quickly and as safely as possible.

So I am pleased that this emergency spending bill is on the House floor today. The Committee on Appropriations, chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each deserve credit for their strong leadership.

This bill supports our troops in the field, it protects the foreign policy prerogatives of the President, and it respects the Congress's constitutional duty to maintain responsibility for the tax dollars of the American people. Additionally, this emergency supplemental includes desperately needed assistance for the struggling airline industry.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. airlines are critical to the American economy, but they were hurt severely by the September 11 attacks and by subsequent security expenses. I know this first-hand because American Airlines, which employs thousands of hardworking people in my north Texas district, has been struggling mightily, and I want to congratulate the employee unions at American for voluntarily agreeing to benefit reductions to help keep the company out of bankruptcy. But they, like all of the airline industry, need additional relief from the government. So I am glad that this bill provides it, and I urge the President to support it.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I expect to support this bill.

But make no mistake: This bill as it is currently written still leaves America unnecessarily vulnerable to another terrorist attack. That is because Republicans continue to block critical homeland security needs for key targets like ports and nuclear facilities. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot understand why Republicans refuse to address so many vital homeland defense needs. After all, there is no disputing the importance of these unmet homeland security requirements.

The Coast Guard reports that it needs $1 billion this year alone to secure America's ports. The U.S. Fire Service found that between one-third and one-half of the 9/11 critical pieces of basic emergency equipment. And each of the armed services has submitted detailed lists of military construction projects required to ensure the security of American troops at bases here in the United States.

But while Republicans ignore these vital homeland security needs, they have proven time and again that they are willing to spend money on their priorities. Unfortunately, those priorities too often turn out to be tax breaks for those who need them the least.

Just last month, House Republicans voted to spend nearly $800 billion on tax breaks, but they refused to spend less than one-half of one percent of that amount, $250 million, for a critical program to protect our ports against terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have repeatedly tried to force Republicans to address America's homeland defense. In the Committee on Rules last night, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offered an amendment to provide $2.5 billion for homeland security requirements that Republicans have refused to address.

But Republicans on the Committee on Rules blocked the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The Republican leadership is tempted, as we have already heard, to tell us that they did not block the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). They may be tempted to say again that this is an open rule, but the problem is that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin violates the House rules.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Republican leadership does not make that argument again because that argument is dangerously disingenuous. After all, Republican leaders routinely waive the House rules for their priorities. Just last month, they were willing to waive the Budget Act to provide hundreds of millions of dollars in tax breaks to special interests. In this very rule, the same one that refuses to provide the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) with waivers, Republicans have waived the rules for the underlying bill.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leaders have waived the House rules on 14 of 15 rules this year. In other words, Republicans are happy to waive the House rules for special interest tax breaks and other Republican priorities, but Republican priorities do not seem to include additional money for homeland defense.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just unfair and undemocratic, it is an arrogant abuse of power. Most importantly, it is an abuse of this open rule, by depriving Americans more vulnerable to terrorist attacks here at home.

For that reason, Members of the House have only one way to pass the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) today, by defeating the previous question on this rule. Let me be clear: by voting “no” on the previous question, Members will simply be voting to allow the House to
Mr. Speaker, protecting America's homeland should not be a bipartisan issue. I hope my Republican friends will join Democrats in opposing the previous question so we can strengthen our defenses here at home while we provide for our troops in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for me personally. Thirty-four years ago today, I was sworn in as a new Member of this House. I was inspired by the idea that this institution was supposed to represent. This institution is supposed to be the people's House. This institution, more than any other, is supposed to reflect the public will. This institution has been known through the years as the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think the rule that is bringing this crucial piece of legislation to the floor today represents a fundamental corruption of the democratic processes of this House and this country. I want to explain why.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a $70 billion bill to try to pay for the cost of a war which, it is hoped, will bring "democracy" to Iraq. Yet, democracy is being fundamentally denied on this House floor this morning.

Now, we hear all of this meaningless blather about how this is an open rule and we are bringing "yes" or "no" amendments that are within the rules, but that obscures the truth. The truth is that this bill has been brought to the floor under a rule which allows this bill to avoid the rules of the House, and it does so in three fundamental ways. That enables the majority to bring a bill to the House floor which, among other things, will supplement the process by which our government intends to provide basic health care to 25 million Iraqis; our commitment to plans to provide for the modernization of 6,000 schools in Iraq; and it plans to rebuild 100 hospitals in Iraq.

I begrudge the President none of that in his efforts to win the hearts and minds of the world community. However, this rule blocks our effort to provide $2.5 billion in additional homeland security protection by protecting our ports, giving our first responders more assistance, and doing a variety of other things to keep this country safe from terrorist attack.

The way it does that is that it allows the bill itself, brought by the Republican majority, to obliterate the normal rules of the House under which bills are considered; but then it requires us to abide by the very rules that the majority party ignores in constructing its bill.

I call that democracy; I call it a sham. I call it a shameful sham. I do not for a moment understand why we are even having this disagreement. On a subject like homeland security there should be no "Ds" behind our name, there should be no "Rs" behind our name; there should only be an "A" after our name. In discussing a bill like this, we should not be Democrats or Republicans, we should be Americans.

I would ask every Member of this House whether or not anything that we are trying to propose in this amendment is not worthy of support. We are being denied today the opportunity to install equipment in nine ports around the world so that for at least 50 percent of the cargo which comes into this country we will know what we are hit with if we are hit by a chemical attack. We are being denied $70 million to protect Federal dams and waterways from terrorist attacks. We are being denied $75 million so that we can conduct vulnerability assessments for chemical plants in this country. We are being denied millions of dollars in additional help that we want to provide to our local first responders, our police, and our firemen.

Additionally, we are being denied any effort to provide additional funds to our Guard and Reserve forces so that they can detect what we are hit with if we are hit by a chemical attack. We are being denied any opportunity to install equipment in nine ports around the world so that for at least 50 percent of the cargo which comes into our country we will know what we are hit with if we are hit by a nuclear attack.

Mr. Speaker, today the airline industry will get billions more dollars in Federal aid without a full debate on the financial problems still plaguing that critical industry, even after this Congress gave them over $15 billion in aid in 2001.

Now, tourism in Nevada is the number one industry for us, and I work hard every day to see that there is no disruption of the economic reforms that are enacted to benefit the hardworking Nevadans who rely on a healthy travel and tourism industry. However, I strongly disagree that an emergency supplemental spending package intended to fund our Nation's Armed Forces and provide necessary humanitarian aid to the Iraqi people suffering under Saddam Hussein's regime of tyranny is the proper vehicle for another Federal funding crutch for the airline industry without a full debate on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, while I will vote "yes" to support the overall bill, I want to register my strong opposition to the process which creates any delay in the expedient delivery of necessary funding to our Nation's brave servicemen and servicewomen fighting for freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, rise in support of the gentleman from Montana (Mr. Gibbons).

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule but in opposition to a legislative process which has resulted in a critical wartime supplemental appropriation package to become a vehicle for billions of dollars in nonrelated war spending.

As a veteran of both Vietnam and the Persian Gulf wars, I know all too well how imperative adequate funding is to the success of any modern military campaign. I do not flinch in offering my sincere support on this issue. I believe great that price may be. Our brave men and women in uniform are making great sacrifices in the deserts of the Middle East every day and they deserve our support and the funding to help them achieve their mission and a victory.

However, when I learn of last-minute deals between Members of Congress and certain special interests which bog down this crucial defense spending package with non-war related gifts at the expense of our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, I cannot help but question the entire process.

Today the airline industry will get billions more dollars in Federal aid without a full debate on the financial problems still plaguing that critical industry, even after this Congress gave them over $15 billion in aid in 2001. Now, tourism in Nevada is the number one industry for us, and I work hard every day to see that there is no disruption of the economic reforms that are enacted to benefit the hardworking Nevadans who rely on a healthy travel and tourism industry. However, I strongly disagree that an emergency supplemental spending package intended to fund our Nation's Armed Forces and provide necessary humanitarian aid to the Iraqi people suffering under Saddam Hussein's regime of tyranny is the proper vehicle for another Federal funding crutch for the airline industry without a full debate on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, while I will vote "yes" to support the overall bill, I want to register my strong opposition to the process which creates any delay in the expedient delivery of necessary funding to our Nation's brave servicemen and servicewomen fighting for freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, rise in support of the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Hoyer).

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to this rule.
Mr. Speaker, there is a pattern in this rule. That pattern is to gag approximately 140 million Americans, to not allow their Representatives to offer amendments which the majority has made in order for themselves, but not for those 140 million Americans represented by the minority.

There appears to be no shame in that. It appears to be the arrogant exercise of pure political power. They can laugh if they will; but the American public will, over time, recognize that half of America is being shut out.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) seeks to offer an amendment. That amendment is to invest in homeland security, the safety of our cities, the safety of our ports, the safety of our railroads, the continuing safety of our airlines, and the safety of our neighborhoods.

What this rule says is, we will have points of order. That is esoteric. What does that mean? The American public does not know, essentially, what it means is we will allow ourselves, we Republicans who are in charge, the ability to offer an amendment like the gentleman from Wisconsin’s (Mr. OBEY).

Now, somebody on the Committee on Rules is shaking their heads. It is their bill that I refer to. It is their bill that is not consistent with the rules. In the rule, they say it does not matter for them, they can exercise the power to jam it; but we will not give to Democrats the ability to offer an amendment to adequately fund the security of New York City; of Baltimore, Maryland; of each and every community in our country.

I regret that. It is a bad rule, and I join the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in urging Members to vote against the previous question so that we can provide a rule which will allow for fair and full consideration, and let that proposal, if it is deemed by those in the majority to be unwarranted, go down with the security of the American public, vote against it; but at least have the courage, have the courage and good sense and consideration for the 140 million people represented by this side of the aisle to allow them to be heard. Allow them to have an amendment to be considered on this floor. That is democracy. That is what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) seeks.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as may occur.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this bill was reported out of the committee 59 to zero. I also wanted to make the point that between 1999 and 2002, States and localities have been awarded over $452 million in domestic preparedness funding.

And only a third of those funds have been spent. New York was awarded $25.7 million and there is still $25.7 million in the pipeline that has not been spent, so there is money there currently.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I understand the gentlewoman’s argument. It may be a good argument. Why does your rule not allow us to debate that on the floor?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule that allows anybody to offer an amendment that is within the rules of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman’s bill is not within the rules. The gentleman waived the rules.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a canard. The charge has been made by the Republicans for the last 3 days that there are $19 billion in unspent homeland security funds. Let me tell you how they get to that ridiculous statement.

They count all of the money that is proposed for that program for the next fiscal year. We have not even passed that bill out of the Congress yet. That is 34 percent of that so-called $19 billion in unspent money. This supplemental is another 10 percent. You cannot spend money in localities the Congress has not yet appropriated.

That accounts for another 10 percent. Then the omnibus appropriations bill that was passed in February of this year, that accounts for the other 30 percent of that so-called $19 billion in unspent money. Only 2 weeks ago, the agency made available to States the ability to apply for that money. The application period has not even been closed. That is 26 percent left; and of that 26 percent left, only 4 percent has been unobligated. So let us keep the facts straight.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The simple fact is the rule waives House rules for the majority’s bill, but it does not allow for Democratic amendments, and what we are saying is that is unfair. It is just that simple.

Mr. Speaker, today’s debate is as much about context as it is about content. It is as much about politics as it is about patriotism. In September 2002, I introduced a resolution calling on the President to transmit to Congress a comprehensive plan for the long-term cultural, economic, and political stabilization in a free Iraq. Now, 7 months later and only after the war has begun, has the President presented a war supplemental, albeit still missing a long-term plan and definite end to the conflict.

Repeatedly when asked how long it expects United States forces to remain in Iraq, the administration has answered with a glib, “Not one day longer than we have to.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, until the President can provide a plan on how this $78 billion, the largest supplemental in the history of our country, will be spent, my answer is “Not one dollar more than I have to.”

Now, I want to make it very clear, I along with 435 Members of this House of Representatives that can vote, support fully the troops. I supported them when I voted on March 21 for the resolution honoring them, and I will support them again today when I vote for this supplemental.

I have a new resolution, H. Con. Res. 121, that supports our warfighters, combat the casualties, looks towards trying to avoid the circumstances of POWS and MIAAs. And all of us support the troops. We are patriotic Americans, Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative. But patriotism means stand by your country. It does not mean, as Theodore Roosevelt said, that you must stand by your President.

Mr. Speaker, I stand proudly and patriotically for the American values that cause every one of us to support our troops. But let me make it very clear, I do not stand nor am I required to stand by our President and the misguided policies entrenched in this supplemental. Republican fiscal irresponsibility in the last Congress, the United States’ economy into a downward spiral of unemployment and homelessness as the number of uneducated and uninsured increase every day.

Today’s supplemental, while funding in part the war and homeland security, does nothing to fix the majority of the emergencies facing this Nation.

What pains me, Mr. Speaker, is that I have areas like South Glade, Sommerville, and Pahokee—where the unemployment rate is 17 percent and the poverty rate is 3 to 4 times greater than anywhere else in South Florida. Congress can’t find the money for rural development in the Glades, yet we have $2.5 billion to rebuild Iraq and another $5.5 billion in foreign assistance because the President’s diplomatic efforts to shore up support for this war failed.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire about the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FROST) has 10 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FROST) has 10 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FROST) has 10 1⁄2 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FROST) has 10 1⁄2 minutes remaining.
Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the issues of war in Iraq and homeland security are among the most important issues that Members of this Chamber have to deal with. They are incredibly important to our constituents and, indeed, have implications worldwide. It is vitally important that every Member of this House, Republican or Democrat, freshman and committee chair, have an opportunity to be heard and have an opportunity to play a constructive and positive role in this process.

It is of great frustration to me, for example, that we have not formally debated the war on Iraq since last October when Congress gave the President the authorization to go to war; this, notwithstanding the fact that American men and women are in harm's way and American citizens are paying for the war. I oppose the war and I still have great reservations about our policy, but the decision has been made and the brave men and women of our armed forces are now in the field of battle. They are grateful, our support. And whether you are for or against the war, these issues are too important not to be front and center in almost every discussion that we have in this Chamber today. We are debating a supplemental appropriations bill to provide support for our troops, some money for reconstruction in Iraq, money for the airline industry, and some money for homeland security. Now, the majority trumpets that this is an open rule and everybody should be happy; but as you have heard, there is a hitch. Things that are important to the Republicans have received protections from points of order from the Democratic amendments that were offered in the Committee on Rules last night were denied such protections.

The ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), presented a very thoughtful and well-considered amendment to protect ports, provide additional funds to first responders and help our veterans. The priorities he outlined are priorities for all Americans. Yet he was denied the opportunity to offer his amendment in consensus. It is our solemn duty to provide the first responders, I am sad to say that under this bill gives more aid to Colombia than 49 States of the Union receive for first responders.

In my city of Worcester, Massachusetts, 20 firefighters and 20 police officers are about to be laid off. So we can hold all the hearings we want about how important homeland security is, and we can pose for all the pictures with our first responders, but it is clear our hometown security is being short-changed.

I would say to the leadership on the other side of the aisle that this process should and can be much better. This bill should and can be much better. Because of your unwillingness to listen and debate and vote, it will not be.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, this rule is deceptive. It does not allow us to vote on important homeland security. So I would urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question in order to allow this House to vote on important and critical homeland security protections for the American people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Slaughter).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Frost) for yielding me time. I appreciate the time and a chance to speak this morning.

It is now our duty to make sure that we finance the war that presently is waging in Iraq. Many of our young soldiers, men and women, they are facing dangers every day. We have to finance the military operations of these men and the serious duty to the soldiers extends beyond the duration of the war in Iraq. Our duty requires us to increase funding to the Veterans Administration for there are veterans in the making right this very moment; and for the current veterans, we have let them down.

It is a terrible statistic to know that nationwide in the year 2002, almost 300,000 veterans were either placed on waiting lists or forced to wait for over 6 months in order to receive an appointment for necessary care. In New York State, 130,000 veterans could be denied the VA benefits or drop out of the system, including 30,000 veterans in western New York which I represent alone.

Now, as we have cut the budget already for the Veterans Administration, as we already have 300,000 veterans a year waiting just to get an appointment, what will happen when the veterans from Iraq come home? What will we say to them? "We really appreciate your service?" It was wonderful of you to go. I am sorry we have no way to give you medical treatment. Take a number and wait your turn.

We cannot as a Nation forget our obligation to these men and women and our promise always to care for them.

The rule passed by the Committee on Rules prohibits any amendments to increase funding for the Veterans Administration. In medical professional facilities, the war on Iraq has also greatly increased the threat of terrorism here at home. Our cities and towns must be prepared to act immediately should we have another terrorist threat or act. And our local police, firefighters, public health officials, medical personnel and volunteers will be the first to respond. But we have not included sufficient funding for the local governments, the States, and the first responders.

The war has greatly increased the financial burden on local and State governments during a period of economic troubles when local and State governments are challenged by a budget crisis. It is our solemn duty to provide the financial support that first responders require if we expect them to protect our constituents back home.

It is shameful that first responders and local governments have to beg for funding. The bill provides some funds for first responders but they need so much more than this bill provides, and the rule bars any amendment to increase the funding to the first responders.

Now, as I said, there is some money there, but not nearly enough to protect the ports that are critical to the United States economy and to provide the necessary level of security in our borders. We must increase the funding of activities at our northern borders. Our friends in Canada are not the threat, Mr. Speaker.

In summary, let me say that this rule leaves a great deal to be desired and certainly does not do very much for the people fighting this war today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Every once in a while you have to connect the dots around here or it gets a little confusing. Let us connect the dots right now.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) wants an amendment to add $2.5 billion for homeland security. The other side does not want to let the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) add $2.5 billion for homeland security.
It is fascinating when one majority controls a place for more than 4 decades, and indeed, now comes here to the floor and complains so rather effectively about our learning so much from them, during the years they controlled it with such an iron fist.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. My friend from California, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, who has overseen most of the very important work that is in this package, has really, I think, put it very well.

I listen to the speeches from the other side of the aisle. This is a bipartisan measure that we are moving forward. We know that it passed by a vote of 59 to zero on Appropriations. There is going to be strong support from both Democrats and Republicans in this House for this measure.

I do not know how anyone can describe our stating that this is an open rule as chicanery, but we have to live with the rules of this House. Yes, the Committee on Rules does, in fact, have a job of providing waivers, and we have protected the bipartisan, and I keep coming back to the distinction that the majority of this bill, the bipartisan 59 to zero package. We have, in fact, provided protection for that measure that has been reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

Democrats and Republicans alike realize that it is very important for us to provide the $74.7 billion to pay for this war and all of the issues that are surrounding that, and I believe that the Committee on Appropriations has done a terrific job on this.

I praise the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); I, of course, praise the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I followed the markup as it proceeded in the Committee on Appropriations, and when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) began talking about article 1, section 7 of the U.S. Constitution and the fact that we had the responsibility to make sure that funding goes forward effectively.

I cannot help, however, as I sit and listen to this discussion regarding open rules to share with my colleagues a conversation I had a moment ago with my colleague, the chairman, who was not really wringing his hands but he was saying to me, "I cannot help but remember a decade I spent in the minority in the Florida Senate. I cannot help but remember all the time I spent as a Member of the House." Some, not all, of 40 years in this House, but a very big hunk of time, when the other side controlled, the other side of the aisle. And indeed, they are constantly talking about open rules the way they saw them having a lot of exiles in the eyes of the gnuphile. Found this place.

I was reminded a moment ago of the gentleman from New York (Ms. Slaughter) in a parade that she participated in regularly, I understand, and sheBWICed open the roadway in that parade that day, and one of the fire fighters over here happened to flash up a sign that said "Louise, more open rules, please."

It is fascinating when one majority controls a place for more than 4 decades, and indeed, now comes here to the floor and complains so rather effectively about our learning so much from them, during the years they controlled it with such an iron fist.
Hearing said that, we know that Secretary of State Powell has been in Turkey over the last couple of days, and he has been in meetings; and we have just gotten word that has not yet been confirmed this morning that some equipment might be moving back into our operation in northern Iraq.

While I was disappointed at the decision that was made by the parliament, I do know that the leadership there, and I have met on several occasions with the Turkish ambassador here in the United States, and I know there has been a desire to try and establish a mechanism that would allow us to deal with our needs in Turkey.

I know some are looking at the prospect of offering an amendment that would cut the assistance that is very important to Turkey. I believe that would be wrong, Mr. Speaker. We need to do what we can to help Turkey stabilize itself economically; and we need to realize again that they have been a very, very important ally strongly supporting the interests of the United States of America around the world.

I would implore my colleagues as we do move ahead to oppose any attempts that would bring about a reduction there.

I will just say again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for her stellar leadership on the Committee on Rules, her leadership as chairman of the very important Republican Study Committee, and I will encourage Members to support her in her quest to pass this open rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSELLA). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad side effects of this unfair rule is that we will not be able to consider the Obey amendment to provide additional money for homeland security, and specifically, we will not be allowed to consider additional money for the protection of our sea ports of this Nation.

According to the CIA, it is more likely for a terrorist to sneak nuclear material into our ports than for a missile to reach our shores.

According to the prestigious task force headed by Senators Rudman and Hart, port security is a critical mandate which needs adequate funding.

And according to Steve Flynn, a highly respected security expert at the Council on Foreign Relations, an explosion from nuclear material smuggled into any American port would not only inflict devastating casualties, it would bring America to a grinding halt. Our economy would simply shut down.

We cannot check every container that comes to our ports every day, but it is much too much to do. The Obey amendment would have allowed us to start to put in place security provisions overseas before the containers come to the United States, before they present a risk to our citizens, before they present a risk to our national security. But we will not be allowed to consider that amendment because this closed rule would not allow a Democratic debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment will allow Members an opportunity to vote on a Homeland Security Amendment to the FY–03 supplemental. Yesterday, Republicans on the Committee on Rules blocked this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides desperately needed funding for the many overlooked underfunded areas that threaten our national security. The amendment would add $2.5 billion, an increase of about 3 percent to the bill. The money would be used for port security, for Coast Guard activities, for infrastructure security, for water and chemical plant security, and for rail tunnel security. It provides funding for State and local response activities, including civil defense, first responders, firefighters and military Guard and Reserves. It also addresses one of our gravest security risks, nuclear security.

My colleagues may remember that the President not only requested no funds for nuclear security but rejected legislation in August of 2002 that would have provided $260 million for that purpose. It is very disturbing that the Republican leadership of this House would deny Members an opportunity to vote on an amendment to protect this Nation from the risk of terrorism. This should not be a partisan issue, but they have made it that way.

Vote "no" on the previous question so we can have an opportunity to vote on the Obey amendment. A "no" vote will not prevent us from being in the supplemental, but it will allow us to vote to protect our Nation and our citizens here and abroad. A "yes" vote on the previous question will block critical homeland security resources.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the unfair rule for the FY–03 Supplemental Appropriations bill because it blocks members on my side from offering the Democratic Homeland Security Amendment to add $2.5 billion in needed, additional investment in homeland security to the supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, about half of the funds in the Democratic Homeland Security amendment go
to improving first response. This includes $300 million in additional funding for First Responders Grants. These funds would be used to pay for such important needs as training for police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel, as well as, purchasing protective gear. The Democratic amendment also includes $197 million to protect military facilities; $241 million for nuclear security; and $722 million for port and infrastructure security.

As a member of the Select Homeland Committee on Homeland Security, I am keenly aware of the deficiencies that exist in funding for First Responders Grants. Indeed, the bipartisan U.S. Conference of Mayors a week ago released a report which showed that cities would have to pay more than $21.4 million per week in additional security costs to close the $2 billion over 6 months during the increased security alert status brought on by the war with Iraq.

In my own area, the Virgin Islands, the local government frankly can’t afford to contribute any additional dollars to strengthen our security because local economy continues to spiral downward. Moreover, we have additional needs in port security defense, as well as, training and equipment for our police and firefighters.

I urge my colleagues to this unfair rule and give our local communities a chance to receive the first responder funding that they badly need.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and a description of the amendment immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

Previous Question Statement H.RES. 172—Rule for H.R. 1559 FY03 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause (b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution, which may be offered only by Representative Obey or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendment are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has consented to be printed in the consideration of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of debate the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows: In chapter 1 of title I, insert at the end the following:

**FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE**

For additional amount for “Food Safety and Inspection Service”, $13,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In chapter 3 of title I, under the heading “OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE”, in the item relating to “OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD” insert after the dollar amount the following: “increased by $160,200,000”.

SEC. 3. In chapter 3 of title I, under the heading “OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE”, insert at the end the following:

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION**

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, $17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In chapter 3 of title I, under the heading “OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE”, in the item relating to “OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE” insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by $160,200,000)”.

**DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR**

**BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**

**WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES**

For an additional amount for “Water and Related Resources” for safeguards and security activities, $24,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**DEPARTMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY**

**ENERGY PROGRAMS**

**SCIENCE**

For an additional amount for “Science” to support additional safeguards and security activities, $7,500,000, to remain available until expended.

**ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES**

**NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**

**WEAPONS ACTIVITIES**

For an additional amount for “Weapons Activities” to support additional safeguards and security activities, $68,200,000, to remain available until expended.**
first and second dollar amounts the following: "(increased by $300,000,000)."

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY," insert after the heading for "DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS" the following:

**FIREIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS**


**EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE**

For an additional amount for "Emergency Management Planning and Assistance" for grants for interoperable communications equipment, $350,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

**TRANSPORTATION SECURITY, ADMINISTRATION**

**MARITIME AND LAND SECURITY**

For an additional amount for "Maritime and Land Security", $250,000,000, for making grants for interoperable communications equipment, $350,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

**Hazardous Substances Superfund**

For an additional amount for "Hazardous Substances Superfund", $75,000,000, to remain available until expended, for carrying out homeland security activities authorized by law related to the agency's counter-terrorism programs including radiological, biological, and chemical attacks.

**Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements**

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements", $90,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

In chapter 6 of title I, in the item relating to "PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND", insert at the end the following:

**ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS**

For an additional amount for "Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund", for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to be used to improve Federal, State, and local preparedness against chemical terrorism, $75,000,000.

In chapter 8 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $92,579,300)."

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION", in the item relating to "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $92,579,300)."

In chapter 8 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION", in the item relating to "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $26,160,000)."

In chapter 8 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION", insert at the end the following:

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY**

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Navy", $65,340,000, to remain available until expended.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD**

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Air National Guard", $8,800,000, to remain available until expended.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE**

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army Reserve", $2,200,000, to remain available until expended.

In the Transportation and Treasury chapter of title I, insert after the chapter heading the following:

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION**

**NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION**

For necessary life safety capital improvements of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 24101(a), $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In the VA-HUD chapter of title I, insert after the heading for "DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS" the following:

**VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE**

For an additional amount for "Medical Care", $70,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

In the VA-HUD chapter of title I, insert at the end the following:

**INDEPENDENT AGENCIES**

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

For an additional amount for "Science and Technology", $100,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $25,000,000 is for water systems vulnerability analysis and $25,000,000 is for chemical plant vulnerability assessments.

**HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES SUPERFUND**

For an additional amount for "Hazardous Substances Superfund", $75,000,000, to remain available until expended, for carrying out homeland security activities authorized by law related to the agency's counter-terrorism programs including radiological, biological, and chemical attacks

**Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements**

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements", $90,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

In chapter 6 of title I, in the item relating to "PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND", insert at the end the following:

**ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS**

For an additional amount for "Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund", for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to be used to improve Federal, State, and local preparedness against chemical terrorism, $75,000,000.

In chapter 8 of title I, under the heading "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $92,579,300)."

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "Coast Guard", in the item relating to "OPERATION EXPERIENCE", insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by $100,000,000)."

In chapter 5 of title I, under the heading "COAST GUARD", insert at the end the following:

Democrats are strongly urged to vote "no" on the Previous Question on the Rule to allow the consideration of the Obey Amendment that would increase funding by $2.5 billion to Homeland Security programs.

These increases would include: $197 million to protect military facilities; $241 million for nuclear security (nuclear detection equipment, securing nuclear materials abroad and in the U.S.); $722 million for port and infrastructure security (Coast Guard personnel, port security grants, dams and bridge security, water and chemical plant security, rail tunnel security); and $1.2 billion for state and local first responders (state and local civil defense teams, first responder equipment, firefighter grants, state and local bio-chemical response, military guard and reserves).

Office of the Democratic Whip—Steny H. HOYER

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FOSST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution. The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 298

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 298.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 1559.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERY) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) to assume the chair temporarily.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the bill with a recorded vote and every Member in the Committee voted yes; number one, to bring the bill to the floor; number two, to show our complete support of our American Armed Forces. And I am very proud of that. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBRY), and I want to thank the members of both parties, on both sides of the political aisle on the Committee on Appropriations who worked together to produce this product that is very similar, Mr. Chairman, to what the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, asked us to do. The major part of the appropriations provided in this bill are for the Department of Defense, and the military services, to pay for much of the activities that have already taken place and to provide additional funding to complete this effort to rid the world of a regime as the one we have seen for the last 20 years headed by Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to reserve the balance of my time at this point because I want the subcommittee chairmen who worked so hard keeping this package together to use a considerable amount of the time to explain the part of the bill on which they worked.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the Record the following tabular and extraneous material:

I was paying tribute to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces for their tremendous dedication and their courage and their commitment and their valor and the tremendous way in which they are carrying out their mission. All Americans are proud of what these young Americans are doing.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the bill with a recorded vote and every Member in the Committee voted yes; number one, to bring the bill to the floor; number two, to show our complete support of our American Armed Forces. And I am very proud of that. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBRY), and I want to thank the members of both parties, on both sides of the political aisle on the Committee on Appropriations who worked together to produce this product that is very similar, Mr. Chairman, to what the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, asked us to do. The major part of the appropriations provided in this bill are for the Department of Defense, and the military services, to pay for much of the activities that have already taken place and to provide additional funding to complete this effort to rid the world of a regime as the one we have seen for the last 20 years headed by Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to reserve the balance of my time at this point because I want the subcommittee chairmen who worked so hard keeping this package together to use a considerable amount of the time to explain the part of the bill on which they worked.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the Record the following tabular and extraneous material:
EMERGENCY WAR TIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2003
BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2003 Request</th>
<th>Recommended in the Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 486 Title II Grants..................</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust...................</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Chapter 1................................</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>319,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations..................................</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(319,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CHAPTER 1
|--------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

| Salaries and expenses.......................... | --- | 5,000 | +5,000 |
| Counterterrorism fund............................ | 500,000 | 50,000 | +450,000 |
| Detention trustee.................................. | --- | 15,000 | +15,000 |
| Office of Inspector General....................... | --- | 2,500 | +2,500 |
| **Subtotal, General administration...............** | 500,000 | 72,500 | -427,500 |

| General Activities

| United States Marshals Service:
| Salaries and expenses.......................... | --- | 26,080 | +26,080 |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation
| Salaries and expenses.......................... | --- | 398,862 | +398,862 |
| **Total, Department of Justice...................** | 500,000 | 497,442 | -2,558 |

| THE JUDICIARY
| Supreme Court of the United States
| Salaries and expenses.......................... | --- | 1,535 | +1,535 |
| United States Court of Appeals
| for the Federal Circuit
| Salaries and expenses.......................... | --- | 973 | +973 |
| United States Court of International Trade
| Salaries and expenses.......................... | --- | 50 | +50 |
| **Total, The Judiciary.........................** | --- | 2,558 | +2,558 |

| DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY

| Administration of Foreign Affairs
| Diplomatic and consular programs.................. | 101,420 | 106,420 | +5,000 |
| Embassy security, construction, and maintenance... | 20,000 | -71,500 | +51,500 |
| Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service... | 65,708 | 65,708 | --- |
| **Subtotal, Administration of Foreign Affairs......** | 187,128 | 243,628 | +56,500 |

| RELATED AGENCY
| Broadcasting Board of Governors
| International Broadcasting Operations............. | 30,500 | 30,500 | --- |
| **Total, Department of State......................** | 217,628 | 274,128 | +56,500 |
| **Total, Chapter 2................................** | 717,628 | 774,128 | +56,500 |
| Appropriations.................................. | (717,628) | (774,128) | (+56,500) |
EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2003
BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2003 Request</th>
<th>Recommended in the Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CHAPTER 3**

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY**

**Operation and Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 2003 Request</th>
<th>Recommended in the Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense emergency response fund</td>
<td>59,863,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>-59,862,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>59,662,500 (+59,682,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Personnel:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(6,974,500) (+6,974,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel, Navy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,984,300) (+1,984,300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel, Marine Corps</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,204,900) (+1,204,900)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military personnel, Air Force</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,834,800) (+1,834,800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve personnel, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(3,000) (+3,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National guard personnel, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(93,000) (+93,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>12,094,500 (+12,094,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operation and Maintenance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(10,461,500) (+10,461,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance, Navy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(3,940,300) (+3,940,300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(1,383,700) (+1,383,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance, Air Force</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(3,668,200) (+3,668,200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(901,900) (+901,900)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(58,400) (+58,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Health Program</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(301,700) (+301,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>20,735,700 (+20,735,700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procurement:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft procurement, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(4,100) (+4,100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missile procurement, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(3,000) (+3,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of weapons and tracked</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(53,300) (+53,300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of ammunition, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(447,500) (+447,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other procurement, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(241,800) (+241,800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other procurement, Air Force</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(113,600) (+113,600)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, Defense-wide</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(451,000) (+451,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,314,400 (+2,314,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation:</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(11,500) (+11,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT&amp;E, Army</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(90,000) (+90,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>101,500 (+101,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combat, Stability Operations, and Force Reconstitution Costs:</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(25,436,400) (+25,436,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund:</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>(59,682,500) (+59,682,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Resources Risk Remediation Fund** | 489,300 | --- | -489,300 |

**Revolving and Management Funds**

**Defense Working Capital Funds** | 430,000 | 1,100,000 | +670,000 |

**Other Department of Defense Programs**

**Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense** | 34,000 | 34,000 | --- |

**Chapter 3 General Provisions**

**Additional transfer authority (Public Law 107-248, Sec. 8005) (Sec. 1306)** | (7,000,000) | (-500,000) | (-7,500,000) |
| **Defense Cooperation Account (Sec. 1310)** | 165,000 | 165,000 | --- |
| **Total, Chapter 3 Appropriations** | 62,409,500 | 62,409,500 | --- |
# BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Funds Appropriated to the President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Agency for International Development</th>
<th>FY 2003 Request</th>
<th>Recommended in the Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child survival and health programs fund</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International disaster assistance</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>+80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer to U.S. AID Office of Inspector General)</td>
<td>(-2,000)</td>
<td>(-2,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bilateral Economic Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Support Fund:
- Economic support fund: 2,442,000
- Loan Guarantees to Egypt: (Limitation on guaranteed loans) 2,000,000
- Loan Guarantees to Turkey: (Limitation on guaranteed loans) 8,500,000
- U.S. Emergency Fund for Complex Foreign Crises: 150,000
- Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund: 2,443,300
- (Transfer authority) 200,000
- Loan Guarantees to Israel: (Limitation on guaranteed loans) 9,000,000

### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of State</th>
<th>FY 2003 Request</th>
<th>Recommended in the Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International narcotics control and law enforcement...</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andean Counterdrug Initiative..........................</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>+30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Funds Appropriated to the President

<p>| Foreign Military Financing Program.................... | 2,059,100       | 2,059,100               | ---             |
| Peacekeeping operations............................... | 200,000         | 115,000                 | -85,000         |
| Total, Chapter 4........................................ | 7,573,400       | 7,389,400               | -184,000        |
| Appropriations......................................... | (7,573,400)     | (7,389,400)             | (-184,000)      |
| (Transfer authority)................................... | (200,000)       | (200,000)               | ---             |
| (Transfer out)......................................... | (-2,000)        | (-2,000)                | ---             |
| (By transfer).........................................   | (2,000)         | (2,000)                 | ---             |
| (Limitation on guarantee loans)........................ | (19,500,000)    | (19,500,000)            | ---             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 5: Department of Homeland Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counterterrorism fund</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizenship and Immigration Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Secret Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Border and Transportation Security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Coast Guard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Preparedness and Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Chapter 5 Appropriations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 6: Department of Health and Human Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disease control, research, and training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Secretary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Chapter 6 Appropriations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2003</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>+30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428,000</td>
<td>+428,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>+185,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>+390,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,178,300</td>
<td>+3,178,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>+2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>+200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>+230,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>+45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>6,699,300</td>
<td>+3,199,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>+16,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>+144,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>+160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 2003
**Budget Requests and Amounts Recommended in the Bill**

(Mounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>FY 2003 Request</th>
<th>Recommended in the Bill</th>
<th>Bill vs. Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### CHAPTER 7

**Legislative Branch**

**House of Representatives**

**Committee Employees**

- Standing Committees, Special and Select .................. --- $11,000 +$11,000
- Joint Items
  - Legislative Branch Emergency Response Fund ........... $125,000 --- $-125,000
  - Capitol Police
    - General expenses .................................... --- $37,758 +$37,758
    - Office of Compliance
      - Salaries and expenses .................................. --- $111 +$111
  - Architect of the Capitol
    - Capitol Police Buildings and Grounds
      - Salaries and expenses .................................. --- $63,868 +$63,868
    - Library of Congress
      - Salaries and expenses .................................. --- $5,500 +$5,500
      - Congressional Research Service, salaries and expenses --- $1,863 +$1,863
  - General Accounting Office
    - Salaries and expenses .................................. --- $4,900 +$4,900
  - Total, Chapter 7 ........................................... $125,000 $125,000 ---
  - Appropriations ............................................. (125,000) (125,000) ---

### CHAPTER 8

**Department of Defense**

- Military construction, Navy ................................. $48,100 $48,100 ---
- Military construction, Air Force ............................ $129,400 $5,100 $-124,300
- Family housing, Air Force:
  - Operation and maintenance ................................ $1,800 +$1,800
  - Total, Chapter 8 ........................................... $177,500 $55,000 $-122,500
  - Appropriations ............................................. (177,500) (55,000) (-122,500)

### CHAPTER 9

**Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President**

- Unanticipated needs:
  - Emergency Response Fund .................................. $250,000 --- $-250,000
  - Total, Chapter 9 ........................................... $250,000 --- $-250,000
  - Appropriations ............................................. (250,000) --- $(-250,000)

**Grand total:**

- New budget (obligational) authority ....................... $74,753,028 $77,931,328 $+3,178,300
- Appropriations ............................................. (74,753,028) (77,931,328) (+3,178,300)
- (Transfer authority) ........................................ $200,000 $200,000 ---
- (Transfer out) ................................................ $(-2,000) $(-2,000) ---
- (By transfer) ................................................ $2,000 $2,000 ---
- (Limitation on guarantee loans) ........................... $19,500,000 $19,500,000 ---
Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have by the previous vote unfortunately circuited the democratic process in this House, and we have prevented us from having any really meaningful debate on this resolution today. Under the rule, we are going to be free to talk about anything additional money for homeland security. We just are not going to be able to put any amendments before the House that in any substantial way enhance homeland security, and I find that unfortunate.

I think that there is much in this bill that is good, and I wanted to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the chairman of the committee, because he has done his constitutional duty and he has seen to it that the rule has not circuited the democratic process. I hope the committee to keep a tight leash on the public purse has been maintained, and I congratulate him for it. I know that there are a lot of people in this town who do not like that, but that was the responsibility of the committee's responsibility, and we lived up to it; and I think the House can be proud of that.

I also think, frankly, that there are a couple of other occasions when Members of Congress wanted to unfairly intervene in executive prerogatives in this bill, and the committee correctly resisted those as well. So on that score I have no problem whatsoever with this bill.

My problem is that I think it is a missed opportunity to provide additional protection for people at home. We are engaged in a war in Iraq. The idea of that war is to make the world safer for 200 years. It is to instill in the people the idea of democracies. And it would seem to me that if we are going to engage in a war against Iraq, we ought to be buttressing down the hatches to the fullest extent possible here at home to protect against terrorists. That was the committee's responsibility, and we have been denied the opportunity to offer our amendment to do so. And I want to walk through with the House what it is that they have rejected because I am going to try to offer it again anyway at a later point in the process.

Perhaps the greatest challenge we face in dealing with terrorism is to monitor the more than 20,000 shipping containers that enter the United States each day. In our amendment, which we will seek to offer even though the rules sought to deny us, we tried to put $135 million in this bill so that we can institute at nine major ports around the world a system which we have called the Rapid Contingent Operations Port Security, which would enable us to install equipment so that we know that none of the containers in the 10 major ports in the world contain radioactive material which could be used to set off a dirty bomb within the United States. We think the House ought to support that.

We also want to put $87 million in this bill to strengthen our ability to deal with nuclear material which is stored right here in the United States. We want to provide $150 million to strengthen the capacity of State laboratories and EPA laboratories to deal with the aftermath of a chemical attack. We are better equipped to deal with the threat of terrorism in the country at this point than we are to deal with a chemical attack.

We wanted to put sufficient funds into this bill so that we can take the vulnerability assessment that was done on Federal dams and waterways throughout the country and in fact act on that assessment and actually provide for the security upgrades that we need for those facilities. We need $108 million to do that.

Only weeks ago, the General Accounting Office completed a report indicating that there is a serious threat posed by the possibility of terrorists targeting U.S. chemical plants. We wanted to provide $75 million to initiate an assessment of that threat as recommended by the GAO. We have been denied the opportunity to do that. We also want to see to it that there is better coordination between the FDA and the USDA in determining what kinds of inspections have taken place and what inspections have not taken place with respect to a number of shipments of agricultural products and medical products that come into this country.

The Hart-Rudman report recommended the Federal Government provide funding to first responders to immediately clear the backlog of requests for protective gear for our local first responders. This legislation does not begin to lay a glove on the size of that problem.

We also have a problem in that the equipment used by our firemen and our policemen and our rescue workers at the local level are not interoperable, and so those groups cannot talk to each other.

Twenty years ago in this town when we had the Air Florida accident, we had rescue workers from Virginia, from Maryland, from the District of Columbia. They could not talk to each other on their emergency equipment because they were all on different wavelengths. That was 20 years ago. When we had that same problem at the Pentagon just about a year ago, we still had not improved the situation. It has taken 20 years. It is about time we fix it. We want to fix it in our amendment. We have been denied the opportunity.

We also wanted to provide $300 million in additional funding to the Office of Domestic Preparedness, which has been denied. We also wanted to provide sufficient funds to guarantee that every State in the Union has at least one National Guard Civil Support Team to back up first responders in case of terrorist attack emergencies. We have been denied the opportunity to do that. We wanted to provide $90 million to expand port and waterfront safety systems. Right now the port of Norfolk has a sophisticated system and the port of San Diego is going to get that system later in the year; but we still have ports like Boston, Charleston, Philadelphia, Jacksonville, Baltimore, Honolulu, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Corpus Christie, San Juan, and Washington, D.C. where we need that equipment, but do not have it.

The Coast Guard indicates that in addition to all of that we have at least $900 million in needs that we ought to be helping local port authorities with and over the next 10 years those needs are estimated to be about $4.4 billion. We wanted to add $250 million to the estimate and get it into this bill to deal with that problem, and we have been denied that opportunity.

And we also take note of the fact that the Pentagon has identified more than $1 billion of unfunded security needs there, such as providing additional protection for family housing by building perimeter fencing. Our amendment wanted to put at least $200 million in here for that purpose. We have been denied the right to do so.

We wanted to increase the intelligence budget for the Department of Energy so that they can have a better surveillance operation with respect to other countries like Iran and North Korea. We have been denied that opportunity. And we wanted to do a number of other things which I do not have time to discuss.

Let me simply say, despite the fact that the rule has denied us the opportunity to offer the amendment, I am going to attempt to offer that amendment anyway when we get to the 5-minute rule because I believe that this is so important for the security of this country. There is no reason for us to have a dispute on this issue. There is no reason to have a difference between Republicans and Democrats on a national security issue of this magnitude.

I cannot believe that we do not have bipartisan support for this money. We found enough room to give $3 billion and more to the airlines, but not enough to provide $2.5 billion for homeland security. We find enough room in this bill to provide $7 billion in foreign aid to other countries including some bribe money to countries that voted with us in the United Nations who are adding virtually nothing to our security effort; and yet we are being denied this opportunity to provide $1 billion on the homeland security front. For that matter we know that our government policy is, and this is in writing, to provide health care, basic universal health care was the term, for 25 million people in this country.

We Know that our government intends to repair 6,000 schools and 100 hospitals in Iraq. It would be nice if we could do the same thing here at home. We are not, obviously, being allowed to do that because of the majority party's lust for passing every tax cut known to man, but that is a debate for another day.
Today, as far as I am concerned, the critical hole in this bill is lack of sufficient funds for homeland security. We are going to try to do everything we can to fix that problem despite the lack of cooperation from the majority leadership. I do not want to, at the same time, thank the chairman of the committee for his personal cooperation in trying to make sure that this House at least met its constitutional responsibilities with respect to the power of the purse, and I congratulate him for that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I do so to again thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the cooperation that we enjoyed as we prepared this bill. And this is a clean bill, by the way. And I compliment the members of the House. A lot of Members came to us and asked for consideration to do something that they felt was important to do in this supplemental, and we explained that it was a war supplemental and explained why we were not going to be able to accept Member projects. There are no Member projects in this bill. This is a clean bill. It tracks what the President asked for, and I think the House can be very proud of that.

There are several major parts of the bill: the national defense part dealing with the war, the very important part of the bill dealing with homeland security, and another part of the bill that deals with support for our coalition partners. So we are going to explain those sections of the bill separately.

The largest part of the bill goes to the war, of course, and for national defense and for our troops to provide what they need to carry out their important mission.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Defense, who does a tremendous job in presenting and providing information that we need to put these bills together.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks by first expressing the deepest appreciation we have for the work that has been done between the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), seeing that this bill that really is a work in response to the needs of our military forces who are fighting for freedom overseas. The way in which the House is responding today is a reflection of the best work of the House, perhaps demonstrated best in recent days by our all coming together to celebrate the freedom now that is being experienced by Jessica Lynch, the prisoner of war, the young American, whose forces made every effort to identify by way of location and made sure that she once again has the opportunity to breathe free.

This bill would not be in the condition it is in if it were not for the magnificent work of staff on both sides of the aisle. The growing relationship between David Morrison and Kevin Roper, working with the Committee's staff is something magnificent to see, even though it is not a surprise to most who have observed often our committee work.

In turn, however, there are others who deserve credit today, such as our personal staff, the late John Zerilli, who spend endless hours to make sure that we get this work done in a timely fashion. The bill before us has some $74.5 billion in supplemental funding that is designed in large form to make sure we can carry forward the war in a timely fashion and make sure that our forces do not run out of funding at this critical moment in our history. Of that $74.5 billion, approximately $62.5 goes to national defense. Within that package of funding, there is approximately one-half of it, a little over $30 billion, which really goes to money that has already been obligated and essentially spent; that is, the money that is required by the forces to mobilize the National Guard and Reserve, to train and equip for battle those men and women who are the backbone of our successful effort in Iraq. From there, there is little doubt that the坐在 this chair, we will be called upon time and time again to make sure that the pipeline does not run dry, and that is the work of our committee. Working very closely with Members on both sides of the aisle, it has been my experience that this House is most responsive when our forces need them most.

So having said that, Mr. Chairman, the defense portion of this bill, which does spend as much money as I indicated, is going to be the most controversial of this bill. We will probably spend much of the day talking about other relatively smaller elements that are before us today. That piece of the bill that involves homeland defense will lead to a lot of discussion. And I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the challenges that we face as they relate to homeland defense are challenges that really have come to our attention because of $311. They are primary in our mind.

But I would remind us also that this is not the last bill of the year. We are going to have more than one opportunity in the appropriations process to respond to the needs of protecting our homeland, and the committee will come together again when those items are before us, and I am sure respond in a bipartisan way.

There will be a good deal of discussion on these issues, but, indeed, those too can be handled through regular order.

In the months and the years ahead, we will be making decisions regarding the way we relate to those allies who are not nearly as responsive as we might have expected as we went about attempting to fashion legislation for freedom for the people of Iraq.

I am most pleased with the fact that this body today will give dramatic illustration that we can come together in time of need, in a nonpartisan way, on behalf of the men and women who are fighting for freedom in Iraq. In the final analysis, our purpose is to make certain that the children of Iraq have the same chance for opportunity and freedom that so many of us experience in this country because, by the grace of God, we happen to have been born here.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

I would like to take a moment to address two different sections of the Supplemental—foreign assistance and support for first responders.

The Foreign Operations section provides $7.3 billion of the $7.5 billion requested. I think it is generally a good product, and I appreciate Chairman Kolbe's willingness to work with me on it.

As many of my colleagues know, I consider foreign aid to be an indispensable arm of our national security strategy. No place is this role more evident than in today's bill, which will help strengthen many of our allies in the coalition in this war. I particularly support the funding for Israel, a key ally in the war on terrorism and a force for stability in the Middle East, as well as the assistance for Jordan, a country which has supported our cause at great risk to its own stability.

I am also pleased that this bill takes important steps to secure the role of the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development in guiding spending for post-war relief and reconstruction. It has been clear to us for quite some time that the Department of Defense would like to take over the management of those funds. While the President requested that all Iraq relief and reconstruction dollars be provided in a form that would have allowed him to transfer them to any government agency with no Congressional input, this bill wisely allows the flexibility to use them only at USAID, the Department of State, the Department of Health and Human Services—the four main agency implementers of our foreign assistance programs. The bill also makes clear the policy decisions regarding post-war relief and reconstruction should be made at the State Department—not anywhere else. Both of these provisions provide important precedents for similar situations that may arise in the future.

I do have a few concerns about the Foreign Operations section of the bill—primarily that
Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I do so to say that on September 11, 2001, America's world changed. As we entered the 21st century, everything changed. Our citizens came under attack. We lost lives, and too many who killed thousands of innocent, and I repeat, innocent civilians. That war against terrorism has been ongoing very effectively.

Early this year, I recommended to the Committee on Appropriations a re-organizational structure that would create a subcommittee which would have the responsibility of dealing specifically with the security of our homeland. I asked the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) if he would chair that subcommittee. He is one of the outstanding leaders of our Committee on Appropriations, and he agreed to do that. They are well under way with the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of that very important Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations who just spoke, for having the foresight and vision and leadership to have taken on this very difficult chore of reorganizing the House to deal with homeland security. It was his leadership that created the new subcommittee I just spoke for, having the foresight and vision and leadership to have taken on that. They are well under way with the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. We are fortunate to have him in the position that he is.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill has plenty of money for homeland security. Could we spend more money? Yes, of course, we could. Are there fire departments and police departments and EMT departments out there that could use more money? Absolutely. Is there a need for the Federal Government in helping them meet their expenses? Yes. What is that role? Our role is to assist them to train and to have equipment and the like to help protect the Nation from threats. But of course, their main responsibility is to protect the hometown and their home State and, of course, we cannot and should not pay their entire budget.

Yet some would have us do that. Some would have us turn the homeland security funding mechanisms into another revenue sharing, so that States and localities could get huge sums of money without any real policy connection to a Federal role, and we must guard against that.

But in this bill, Mr. Chairman, there is plenty of money for homeland security. There is plenty of money backed
up in previous years that has not yet been spent that localities can have access to. But in this bill, there is $2.2 billion that is destined for our States and localities when they apply for it, for monies to go to their first responders; to provide grants to different grant programs that they can apply to the Secretary for, and those monies will be granted to the States and localities; and 80 percent of the money has to go to the local departments and not be funneled off by the States. So it is a substantial sum of money that will satisfy the need for the moment. We may see the need in short order for something else, but for the moment we think this is sufficient.

There is also $1.5 billion for the Secretary to use on the Federal level for such things as cargo and portal radiation monitors. These are in our Nation’s seaports and our land ports to protect us from cargo containers that might be harboring biological or chemical weapons. There is $193 million for just that. There is $100 million for additional staffing along the northern border with our neighbors in Canada. There is $35 million more for counterterrorism initiatives so that we can keep track of, find and keep track of container cargo that might be damaging. There is $235 million in this bill to help our local airports modify their premises to accommodate the threat of radiation machines that are checking our baggage. There is $85 million to help reimburse our local law enforcement and State law enforcement officers and National Guardsmen who have been providing increased security at the airports and other critical transportation sites. Most of this money is going to our localities, as it should. There is $40 million for the Transportation Security Administration’s port security efforts, and there is $30 million for nonaviation surface transportation security initiatives. There is $185 million for the Immigration Service for overtime, and air and marine interdiction and detention and removal of people who should not be here.

Now, do the States and localities need more? Well, of course their budget needs more? Well, of course their budget.

Mr. OBIEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct the impression left by the previous speaker. The previous speaker said in committee earlier this week, and he has touched on it again today, he said that we had almost $19 billion in so-called "unspent" homeland security funds. The fact is, that is a fictional number. I want to show the Members why.

First, 34 percent of that number is found in a bill which we have not yet even enacted. We cannot expect localities to spend money we have not yet provided them.

Second, 10 percent of that so-called $19 billion in unspent money represents money in this supplemental which we have not yet passed. We cannot count money that we have not yet passed. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to show that part of the money localities have not yet spent.

Then, in the omnibus appropriation bill which we just passed in February, and we were supposed to pass it before March, but we did not get around to it until February. 30 percent of that so-called $19 billion in unspent money is in that omnibus bill.

It was only 2 weeks ago that the agency invited localities to apply for that money. The application time is not even closed yet. When we get down to the real, hard facts, only 26 percent of that $19 billion represents previously enacted money before February of this year. Of that 26 percent, only 4 percent is unobligated, and 22 percent of that is obligated.

Mr. Chairman, so much for the idea that there is "enough in the pipeline." There is not nearly enough in the pipeline. Ask the mayors, ask the firemen, ask the police chiefs, ask the Coast Guard, ask the Department of Defense. They know there is not enough money in the pipeline.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the defense part of this bill is the Congress’ version of shock and awe.

The President the other day complained that our troops have not been given enough money to fight in the war. The President the other day said, maybe it was larger in World War II, but the last supplemental I have ever known.

We have had hearings, we have discussed it with the agencies, and we did our best to make sure that those agencies are accountable to us, to the people that are elected to represent the people in this country.

It is a bipartisan bill. We sat down and we looked at what was done in 1991, we looked at how we handled things in the past, and we have tried to make sure that the public is protected and that this money is protected and they have accountability.

I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) in the work that he did; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBIEY). This is an accountable bill, but the defense portion takes care of the troops. That is what it is all about. We take care of the money that was spent already, and we take care of getting the troops back home. We hope they will be there as short a period as they could possibly be.

But we have to keep in mind, here we have a bill, $70-some billion in supplemental, which is bigger than almost every other bill that we have passed. In just a little over a week we have on it the floor, and within a few weeks we will have it passed. So all the grumbling that goes on from some of the folks outside the legislature have to realize that we have a responsibility, and we have accepted that responsibility. We have made darned sure this bill was something we can be proud of.

Obviously, I believe that in the end we are going to have to pass another supplemental, because of just the way things have gone. I am pleased that the troops are doing so well. Unfortunately, we will have casualties in any kind of a war like this. But one thing for sure, we have done everything we could do humanly possible in the legislative process to make sure that they had everything that they could possibly have and could get to the field. I am proud of this.

I would hope we would have large, bipartisan support for this supplemental, and it will pass overwhelmingly in as short a time as possible.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I just want to point out that under the strong leadership of President Bush, we have developed a good coalition to fight this war against the regime of Saddam Hussein. We actually have 49 active members of the coalition, which is a larger group of countries supporting this effort than we had in Desert Storm in 1991. We have the strong support of President Bush and the strong support that he has had from Prime Minister Blair, the Prime Minister of Spain, the Prime Minister of Australia, providing the strongest leadership, we have a good, strong coalition.

The next part of this bill has to do with financial support for some members of that coalition. But as I talk about the coalition, there is one group that has not had much, recognition and that is the small states. I hope that the big powers, the big powers, Poland, a new member to NATO, an emergent country after the Soviet Union went away, actually was involved in one of the very first combat
missions in this action of the Iraqi freedom. That mission was the oil platforms in the gulf. Actually, their combat team took control of and are managing and defending those platforms that were sabotaged, that were wired for fire. 

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, to discuss that part of the bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I want to publicly thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the work they have done to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KOLBE), the very distinguished chair for explosives.

The batting team took control of and are managing and defending those platforms. Actually, their combat team took control of and are managing and defending those platforms that were sabotaged, that were wired for fire.

The gentleman for yielding time to me. I want to publicly thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the work they have done to get this supplemental bill to the floor as expeditiously as possible, in as good shape as it is, and with as little controversy as we have seen. There is certainly some difference.

Mr. Chairman, the recommendations of the foreign operations chapter of this supplemental total $7.4 billion. That is 2 percent, $184 million, less than was requested by the President. We have the administration's funding request for Iraq and for the countries supporting the war on terrorism. Let me start by outlining where do concur with the President’s request.

The most urgent requirement in the foreign operations chapter is assistance for Iraq's people. One-third of the foreign operations chapter is for relief and reconstruction in Iraq. We have provided every penny the President requested, plus an additional $40 million. Therefore, we are asking the House to approve $2.5 billion for a new Iraq relief and reconstruction fund.

The Department of State, USAID, and the Treasury and Health and Human Resources Department could receive direct apportionments from the fund; but it does not go to the Department of Defense, which already, I think most of us would agree, has its hands full with winning the war and providing security in Iraq.

The immediate focus of the new fund would be provision of clean water, food, and care for displaced and vulnerable people. Soon thereafter, repairs of the degraded electricity and communications infrastructure, and education systems would get under way. We anticipate that other donors and international organizations would eventually take over much of that work.

The remaining funding in this chapter is to be provided for countries supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom, for the broader war against terrorism. The committee has provided all of the funding that was requested for Israel, Jordan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Colombia, and the rest of the 22 countries that are included in this supplemental. While I understand there are many amendments that today will be aimed at cutting funds to one or more of these countries, I would like to emphasize that the President requested these funds to help the United States fight this war in Iraq. He is our Commander in Chief, and I ask my colleagues not to remove the tools he needs to win this war. It includes funding for our diplomatic efforts as well as our military operations.

The foreign operations chapter includes $9 million for loan guarantees to Israel, which are to be issued over the next 3 years. This is very similar to the aid package that we provided to Israel in 1992. These guarantees will bolster the nation's credit rating and help Israel implement the critical budget and economic reforms. They may also support the renewed peace process after the end of the conflict in Iraq.

Additionally, the foreign operations chapter includes $2.3 billion for the economic support fund. This total provides $700 million for Jordan. Jordan is particularly dependent on Israeli oil. There is $300 million for Egypt which may be used for loan guarantees, not to exceed $2 billion, and $127 million is provided for Afghanistan to continue efforts to support security and economic recovery of that nation. Also, $100 million is provided for a new Islamic partnership and outreach program.

Additionally, there is permissive language that allows the President to use this fund to create a fund to subsidize some $8.5 billion of loan guarantees. The language of this bill requires the Secretary of State to assure Congress that Turkey is cooperating with the United States in Operation Iraqi Freedom, including facilitation of humanitarian assistance to Iraq, before authorizing the loan guarantees.

There is going to be a lot of discussion about this issue today, so let me just say now that Turkey is a long-term ally. It is a key ally. It is a key front-line state in the war on terrorism. It is a democratic Muslim nation that is part of most of the Middle East and southern Europe. Obviously, it is a nation that has been significantly impacted by the conflict in Iraq. And it had significant economic problems before the conflict.

As Deputy Secretary Armitage said in testimony before our subcommittee, “It would be the greatest of ironies if we spend a billion dollars in Iraq, and the war turns to a war of conventional weapons which have worked so effectively in degrading the military capabilities of the Iraqis. We have seen this in the last few days with the collapse of the Medina and Baghdad divisions of the Republican Guard. This is an enormously important bill because we have to replenish these smart weapons that we have used, because 10,000 smart weapons, precision weapons, have been used. We have flown over 21,000 sorties.

The thing that is wrong with this bill is we have not done enough for homeland security. I completely concur with the gentleman from Wisconsin...
They can not continue to not provide the resources necessary for homeland security. Maybe we will not correct it here today, but I guarantee you once the American people understand that we are not providing the necessary resources, they will make certain that we correct it and hopefully in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KOLLENBERG), the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act which, as has been mentioned, passed on a unanimous vote of 59 to 0 in the committee.

I would like to bring the attention of the House to two important provisions in this supplemental bill. The first is the additional funding for the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, which will receive some 428 million. This will allow our men and women in the Armed Forces, along with our allies, to prevail in Iraq and remove Saddam Hussein and his regime. This supplemental will ensure that they have the resources they need to finish that job. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act which, as has been mentioned, passed on a unanimous vote of 59 to 0 in the committee.

Mr. KOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act which, as has been mentioned, passed on a unanimous vote of 59 to 0 in the committee.

I would like to bring the attention of the House to two important provisions in this supplemental bill. The first is the additional funding for the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, which will receive some 428 million. This will allow our men and women in the Armed Forces, along with our allies, to prevail in Iraq and remove Saddam Hussein and his regime. This supplemental will ensure that they have the resources they need to finish that job. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. OBEY, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

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

I rise in strong support of this essential bill for military operations, homeland security, and foreign assistance, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for their hard work, especially on the gentleman from Wisconsin's anniversary of service in this Congress today. After three decades of service, we need that intelligence, especially now in this critical time in world history.

I want to focus my remarks particularly on TRICARE care for those who are putting their lives on the line in America's cause as we stand here to provide the resources for them to do that, and that is especially those in our Guard and Reserve. Those in the Guard and Reserve are not tangential to this operation. In many units they comprise over half of these on the ground. I think we have to recognize the change in our force structure that we have to provide the kind of benefits to these Guard and Reserve forces that they deserve.

I rise in strong support of this supplement appropriations to pay for Operation Iraqi Freedom and to advance and expand homeland security.

As those of us who have seen war, know, freedom is not free. It is paid by the sacrifices of those who serve literally on the ground now in Iraq and Afghanistan as we speak and debate here on the floor today. Their courage is an inspiration. We wish them Godspeed, swift victory, and a safe return.

Now that we are liberating the Iraqi people and better protecting the safety of the American people, Congress is acting decisively today to ensure that our soldiers, sailors, and airmen and women, that they have the resources they need to win the war against the regime of Saddam Hussein.

This bill essentially contains over $62 million to support our military, to pay for the troop deployment that they are
I rise today to support H.R. 1559, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for FY2003. As a member of the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I am proud of the work that the committee was able to produce and thank Chairman Young and Ranking Member Obey, and the Appropriations Chairman, Member Lowery of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations for their continued leadership.

Our nation is in a time of unparalleled needs. We are waging a war against Saddam Hussein and his regime, we are fighting a war on terrorism, while at the same time needing to respond to the needs to protect our homeland. This supplemental reflects what is at stake.

The supplemental includes $62.5 billion for military operations in Iraq and the war on terrorism. As an appropriator and a member of the United States Congress, let me say that I am committed to doing everything I can to make sure that our troops are provided with the equipment and resources necessary that they need to do their important missions, to mount an effective opposition in Iraq, that will ensure a successful and hopefully an expeditious end to military action. Let me state the utmost respect and admiration I have for our men and women in uniform and that my thoughts are with them and their families during their difficult times.

I am also proud that this bill does not reflect the blanket check that the Administration originally sought, that would have created new accounts and provided the Administration with the ability to spend and misappropriate funds as if we were at war. I am happy that Members on both sides of the aisle were able to work together to ensure that Members retain congressional oversight during these important times.

While I support this important supplemental, it is not without certain reservations. First, this bill does not go far enough in providing the sufficient funds needed to protect our homeland. We have vital, unmet needs that need to be responded to effectively. We had a chance to do right, but the Republicans, unfortunately, have blocked an amendment by Congressman Obey that would have provided for $2.5 billion in additional funds for our homeland security needs.

These additional funds would have allowed us to address important issues, such as: increasing port security; protecting federal dams and waterways from terrorist attacks; protecting important food and medical equipment; strengthening the security of nuclear materials at home and abroad; and strengthening U.S. laboratories’ ability to cope with a chemical attack. I represent the 13th District of Michigan, which contains the largest international commercial border in the nation, with $1.5 billion in goods crossing into our country every day. The city of Detroit has also been named as one of 10 cities likely to be targeted for a terrorist attack. Mr. Speaker, our security needs are immense here at home and we need to act responsibly. Refusing to allow Members a vote here on the House floor to increase funding for homeland security is an act of irresponsibility that could have adverse consequences.

These additional funds would have allowed government agencies to respond to the unmet needs that our nation’s safety requires. Refusing to allow a vote here on the House floor to increase funding for homeland security is an act of irresponsibility and we are shortchanging, plain and simple.

Mr. Chairman, the American people look to us to lead the job of the Congress to protect and safeguard our homeland. It is time that our words and intentions are reflected in the amount of funds that we appropriate in the name of homeland security.

Finally, I also question the amount of funding we are providing for reconstruction and humanitarian needs in Iraq—$2.48 billion. With the war that presumably could last for weeks, maybe longer, the humanitarian needs and reconstruction needs will be great.

Mr. Young of Florida, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Latham.

Mr. Latham. Mr. Chairman, if I could engage the chairman in a collegial discussion, I will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Senate version of the supplemental contains funding for further construction activity for the National Animal Disease Center facilities in Ames, Iowa. This initiative is one that the Agriculture Department has been planning for some time. After 9/11 and with the potential threats to our food supply, the urgency of this modernization initiative has become more pronounced. In fact, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service was put into the Department of Homeland Security because of such threats.

We are working closely with the USDA budget office to ensure a timely and cost-effective construction schedule, including a usable first phase that includes the biocontainment level 3 lab. This national animal disease facility is important for the prevention and diagnostic research for animal-related disease threats, when we talk about the potential for contamination of our food supply.

The longer we delay this project, the more expensive it becomes, and the further out the full project completion date. Without appropriate funding, we are shortchanging construction costs by tens of millions of dollars. Will the Chairman agree to work with me on this National Animal Disease Center lab modernization initiative so as to complete the full project as soon as practical and with minimum cost increase?

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

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

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman’s discerning analysis of the situation, and I guarantee him that I would work as closely with him as I possibly can to accomplish what he wishes to accomplish.
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The National Animal Disease Center modernization project is an important initiative, both for updating these facilities and particularly in light of the threats of agro- and bioterrorism. And I thank the gentleman for calling this to our attention today.

Mr. Latham. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have just a brief closing statement. I reserve my time until the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) yields back his time.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) has 5 1/2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. Edwards. Mr. Chairman, I salute the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) and others who put this package together. It funds the war in Iraq, and I strongly support that. And I want some important homeland defense measures, and I support that. But I think this bill does not go far enough in protecting our homeland security and we have a responsibility to do something about that today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) presented it in the full committee. It was a close vote. This is something that worries me deeply.

I think we do a great job in Iraq and in Afghanistan, but we are not doing the job we need to do right here at home to protect the United States of America; and it is not right, and we have got to do something better than that. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I could not say it better myself.

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

Mr. Young of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I want to say, to the Members of the House, today my colleagues are exercising one of the most basic requirements of the Constitution, and that is to provide for the defense of our Nation. We will appropriate the funds today to do just that.

The situation is serious. Our young Americans are at risk on the battlefield. It is important that we provide everything that they need to conclude their mission and to replace whatever munitions have been used.

Mr. Chairman, I would just ask all Americans to join in a prayer asking God's blessing on all of those men and women who are performing that mission today, wherever they might be in this world, and also to ask God's blessings on the President of the United States, President Bush, the Commander in Chief, as he leads our Nation through these very difficult times.

Mr. Hastert. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this War Time Supplemental, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

The Congress has certain responsibilities in a time of war. We have the responsibility to authorize the use of force. We did this in the last Congress.

And we have the responsibility to pay for the war. This supplemental is our contribution to that.

Any one who has any doubts about the justice of our cause should read the story of Jessica Lynch, and how a bunch of Saddam's henchmen mistreated her. They should read...
the story of how the citizens of Najaf have welcomed our troops as liberators from the Hussein regime.

Our troops need our help. They need our support. They need the bullets, the MRE’s, the cruise missiles, the jet fuel, which we provide in this supplemental. There are a lot of arm-chair quarterbacks out there, people who think they know better how to conduct this war. In my view, our President and his team have been doing a very good job, there are exceeding any realistic expectations. And we can be proud of our soldiers, sailors, and Marines. They are performing as well as any group of warriors has ever performed.

Mr. Chairman, our cause is just. Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator who has based his regime on torture and terror. He has supported terrorists and he has tried to produce weapons of mass destruction. His days are numbered, and for that, the world should be grateful.

This supplemental also contains important resources to secure our homeland. Our cities and states need help in this battle against terrorists.

We want to make certain that what happened on September 11, 2001 never happens again. We want to prevent terrorists before they strike. And we want to be prepared if they do succeed in launching an attack.

We don’t know where they will target. This is a big country, and the possible targets are as vast as the deranged imagination of an Al Qaeda terrorist.

This bill achieves a critical balance. We don’t want to federalize every police and civil service function. But we do want to help these localities prepare. And that is what this bill does.

Finally, let me say a word about the airline provisions of this bill.

Some say we have done too much for the airlines industry. Some say we have done way too little. I think we have the right balance to help airlines deal with the increased security costs brought on by war and terrorism.

This is a simple proposal. It will help the airlines immediately, it will help them fairly, and it will help them effectively.

Let me conclude by saying that I urge my colleagues to support this important war supplemental. The American people want us to support our troops and defend the Homeland in this time of war.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this wartime supplemental appropriations bill which provides needed resources for our troops who are fighting so valiantly in Iraq. With a price tag of almost $78 billion, this bill represents the largest supplemental bill ever considered by Congress.

This bill strikes the necessary balance between providing the Defense Department the flexibility to get resources to our troops in a timely manner and retaining Congress’ constitutional authority over the nation’s spending. While this bill addresses our military needs abroad during this time of war, we must remember that we’re also fighting a war against terrorism on our homefront. To do so effectively requires significant resources for the security of our ports and borders, our counterterrorism initiatives and our first responders on the front lines of this war. Yet only 5 percent of the funding in this bill is dedicated to homeland security.

Mr. Chairman, throughout this country, our states and localities are strapped for cash. They simply do not have the resources to take on the financial burden of homeland security. Without Federal help, there is no way we can implement a coordinated and comprehensive effort to defend our cities and states from attacks.

Without doubt, the domestic and military needs of this country are great. And in times of need, the American people have a proud history of banding together and sacrificing for the betterment of the nation as a whole.

It is in this spirit of sacrifice that we must put the needs of the country ahead of any personal desire for a tax cut. Our increasing budget deficits alone show that we can’t afford it. And there’s little evidence to suggest that this second tax cut would do any better than the first at stimulating the economy.

As we consider this supplemental bill and other budget and tax measures, I urge my colleagues to remember the true needs of this nation by providing adequate funding for homeland security. This is a fiscally irresponsible tax cut proposal that will inevitably be paid for on the backs of future generations.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, the issue of homeland security affects us all, and the need for the security funding must be a priority for Congress.

Perhaps no set of installations is more important to the economic well-being of the nation than our nation’s ports—and perhaps none is more vulnerable to the threat of a terrorist attack.

In California, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach comprise the largest port complex in the nation, handling over 6 million cargo containers each year—over 15,000 each and every day. These containers represented more than $100 billion in goods entering the U.S. economy last year.

The threat of a terrorist device entering the port through one of those 6 million containers is very real, and the impact of such an attack at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach would have far-reaching and devastating effects on our nation’s economy.

For example, during the 10-day lock-out in July of last year by the Pacific Maritime Association, the nation’s economy lost an estimated $1 billion per day because container cargo was not moved. Container ships were anchored outside the breakwater at the port for several days, creating a backlog in ships waiting to berth and unload. Because of just 10 days of inactivity, container throughputs for the year were down nearly 10%.

The Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach move cargo that is destined for businesses across the United States that have just-in-time inventory systems. These businesses, as far away as Michigan and Ohio, were affected by the port lock-out and slow-down. Some manufacturing lines cut back and furloughed employees during that port slow-down; some were forced to shut down.

A catastrophic terrorist event that shuts down the port for a significant period of time would have a disastrous impact on the U.S. economy.

The City of Los Angeles has responded aggressively to this threat. Following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, Los Angeles Mayor James Hahn assembled an 18-member Seaport Security Task Force that included the U.S. Coast Guard and federal, state and local law enforcement officials, to devise a plan to assess the port’s vulnerabilities and upgrade the port’s security in case of terrorist attack.

Since that time, the port has invested more than $2 million to upgrade its security infrastructure. It would need to acquire the necessary equipment to provide the required security at the container and cruise ship terminals and berths.

However, the port’s importance is clearly national in scope, and the federal government should contribute its fair share for the increased security needs at the port.

How great is the port’s need?

During the first round of Seaport Security Grants, the Port of Los Angeles identified $48 million in priority security improvements. Chief among these was the construction of a high-risk container inspection facility that would permit immediate inspections to take place on-site. Under current procedures, questionable containers must be transported along city streets and regional highways to the current inspection site located 15 miles north of the port.

Unfortunately, the Port of Los Angeles was awarded only $750,000 in federal money towards construction of a container inspection facility. The port has applied for $1 million in the second round of Seaport Security Grants. The security needs of the Port of Los Angeles and ports across the nation remain great. Until we make these needed security improvements, the Port of Los Angeles will remain just as vulnerable to a terrorist attack as on September 11.

I am pleased that H.R. 1559, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, contains funding for port security. But I would contend that the $35 million for container security provided in the bill is inadequate for the nation’s needs in light of the fact that the Port of Los Angeles alone has identified $48 million in necessary security improvements, and the Coast Guard has indicated that $1 billion is probably a more realistic figure for what would be required to provide adequate port security across the U.S. this year.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee that considered this bill earlier in the week, I supported the Obey Amendment to add $250 million in port security funding. Had Congressman Obey been permitted to offer his amendment today, I would have voted for it on the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this bill today to provide our military leaders and our service men and women the tools they need to complete the job that has been given to them. Our military is strong, we support our military, and our military will prevail in the war in Iraq.

While making sure our forces are secure abroad, we must also work to protect our people at home. The funding in this bill for port security is inadequate for the demonstrated need, and I will continue to fight with my Democratic colleagues for the necessary resources so our people, our commerce, and our economy will continue to be safe.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this defense supplemental without hesitation, but with regrets and concerns.
To begin with, I regret that we have to be voting on this bill now. I thought the President’s decision to begin military action in Iraq was premature. I thought it would have been better to allow more time for other measures, including coercive inspections, to be tried, and I thought it gave the President too much discretion about the timing of that action. But the resolution was enacted. And, now that military action has begun, it is necessary for Congress to consider the Administration’s requests for funds to pay for it and for related purposes.

Our troops are in the field, actively engaged in operations that Congress has authorized. Under those circumstances, I cannot make them the victims of my regrets by failing to support this bill to provide them what they need to carry out those operations.

So I support this bill. I also have strong concerns about some things that are in this bill and some things that were left out.

The bill does have many good features. For example, I am glad that the Appropriations Committee placed some important limits on the President’s request before bringing the bill to the floor.

Among other things, the bill bars the Pentagon from controlling over $2.5 billion it provides for humanitarian relief and reconstruction and instead designates the money for the State Department and other non-military agencies. The bill also reduces the President’s request for non-string-attached Pentagon funding from $63 billion to $25 billion by putting the rest of the funds into appropriate spending categories. Though the $25 billion still amounts to a signed check with the payee line left blank, it’s an improvement over the request. Regardless of the Administration’s preference, it remains the right and duty of Congress—not the White House—to decide how much money is allocated for what purpose.

On the other hand, I am concerned that the bill does not do enough in other areas. In particular, I voted against ordering the previous question on the rule, and against the rule itself, because it did not allow a straightforward vote on the Obey amendment to add more funding for homeland security.

The bill does include $4.25 billion for this purpose—slightly less than the President’s request—but I think that is not nearly enough to meet the country’s needs. Although many of our Republican colleagues would have you believe that localities are sitting on millions of dollars of unspent funds for first responders, my conversations with Colorado police chiefs, fire departments, and other first responders have convinced me that is not the case. Every time the Department of Homeland Security challenges an official color-coded threat level, Colorado and the other Southwest and localities are required to spend more money that they don’t have. We are asking them to provide top-dollar security for our nation on a dime’s worth of resources.

So, I am very concerned that the Republican leadership denied us the opportunity to vote to correct the bill’s deficiencies. The Obey amendment would have provided $2.5 billion in additional funds for our local first responders, for port security grants, for protection for our waterways and nuclear plants, for our National Guard and Reserves to provide assistance with chemical and biological weapons attacks, and for other homeland security needs.

The measure would have also given $2.5 billion to vote to correct the bill’s deficiencies. The administration did not know how many of our colleagues would have joined me in supporting this amendment—and I will never know, because the Republican rule didn’t permit a vote—but I know Colorado’s first responders would have wanted it to be a majority. That’s because homeland security is for Americans—it is not just for communities. At a time when states and cities are suffering economically and crying out for federal assistance to meet their new and stepped-up homeland security obligations, I believe we must do more than we’ve done in this bill.

Nonetheless, as I said, I am voting for this bill without hesitation because its prompt passage is needed—not just to support our men and women in uniform as they fight, but also to lay the foundation for the harder mission of winning the peace after they have won the war.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, this $77.9 billion supplemental appropriations bill is the largest ever considered by Congress. Yet, it still fails to address our most critical need of “homeland” security. The lack of adequate funding to protect our hometowns exposes the United States to greater risks than those posed by Saddam Hussein.

This bill provides less than half of an estimated $9 billion need for the safety of our ports, transportation systems, water supplies, and facilities. And it provides too little of what the administration requested for homeland security. Nationwide, cities are spending $70 million a week to protect and prepare themselves from potential attacks at a time when state and local governments are already crippled by economic conditions.

In the last two weeks since the war in Iraq began, my hometown of Portland, Oregon has spent nearly a million dollars to respond to the heightened security alert. As the State of Oregon struggles to keep schools open and to provide health care for the needy people of our state, it is incomprehensible that we are not fulfilling our responsibility at the federal level to help fund critical homeland security needs.

A Democratic amendment that would have added $5.5 billion for homeland security and $300 million specifically for metropolitan security needs, would have provided Oregon an additional $4 million to secure, protect, and prepare our ports, our hospitals, and our first responders against potential terrorist attacks. Appalling, the Republican leadership blocked this and other Democratic amendments from even being considered.

There is no reason to rush this resolution through to fund the war on Iraq. It would appear to the casual observer as an attempt to hide the true cost of the war by breaking it up into pieces. There are already discussions that any more surpluses are not necessary before the end of the year. The 2004 budget resolution, which was just debated two weeks ago, failed completely to deal with the expanded costs of this war.

I do not support this resolution, because it is not needed at this moment, the process by which it was brought to the floor is unreasonable, and it fails to fund protection for our communities.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, at a time of war Congress has no more important duty than to make sure that our military force have all the resources they need. However, Congress also has a duty to not use the war as cover for unnecessary and unconstitutional spending. This is especially true when war coincides with a period of economic downturn and growing federal deficits.

Unfortunately, Congress today is derelict in its duty to the United States taxpayer. Instead of simply ensuring that our military has the necessary resources to accomplish its mission in Iraq, a mission that may very well be over before this money reaches the Pentagon, Congress has loaded this bill up with unconstitutional wasteful foreign aid and corporate welfare spending.

For example, this bill provides a hidden subsidy to vaccine manufacturers by transferring liability for injuries caused by the smallpox vaccine from the companies to the United States taxpayer. It also provides $3.2 billion dollars for yet another government bailout of the airline industry. One way of having a land security that Congress did not understand is its own security; this bill provides the full amount requested to ensure the security of the Congress. Still, one could reasonably conclude from reading this bill that the security of Turkey, Pakistan, and Jordan are more important to Congress that the security of Houston, New York and other major American cities.

On foreign spending, this bill actually provides one billion dollars in foreign aid to Turkey—even though that country refused the U.S. request for cooperation in the war on Iraq. One billion dollars to a country that thumbed its nose at an American request for assistance? How is this possibly an appropriate expenditure of taxpayer money? Additionally, “war surpluses” have provided cover for more of the same unconstitutional foreign aid spending. It provides 2.5 billion dollars for Iraqi reconstruction when Americans have been told repeatedly that reconstruction costs will be funded out of Iraqi oil revenues. And Afghanistan—above and beyond the money that we already send them each year.

Incredibly, this bill sends 175 million dollars in aid to Pakistan even though that country refused the U.S. request for cooperation in the war on Iraq. One billion dollars to a country that thumbed its nose at an American request for assistance? How is this possibly an appropriate expenditure of taxpayer money? Additionally, “war surpluses” have provided cover for more of the same unconstitutional foreign aid spending. It provides 2.5 billion dollars for Iraqi reconstruction when Americans have been told repeatedly that reconstruction costs will be funded out of Iraqi oil revenues. And Afghanistan—above and beyond the money that we already send them each year.
in April that Pakistan purchased ballistic mis-
siles from North Korea. Furthermore, it is dif-
cult to understand how $100 million to Co-
lombia, $50 million to the Gaza Strip, and $200 million for “Muslim outreach” has any-
thing to do with the current war in Iraq. Also, this bill appears to be an attempt to get our federal government into the television broadcasting business in the Middle East. With private American news networks like CNN available virtually everywhere on the globe, is there any justification to spend taxpayer money to create and fund competing state-run networks? Aren’t state-run networks one of the traits that closed societies have been most critical of in the past?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1559 en-
dangers America’s economy by engaging in pork-barrel spending and corporate welfare un-
related to national security. This bill endan-
gers America’s economic health by adding al-
most $80 billion to the already bloated federal deficit. Additions to the deficit endanger our fi-
ancial independence because America will have to increase its reliance on foreign bor-
rowers to pay off the debt. H.R. 1559 also shortchanges Americans by giving lower prior-
ity to funding homeland security than to fund-
ning unreliable allies and projects, like the Mid-
dle Eastern TV Network, that will do noth-
ing to enhance America’s security. Therefore, I must oppose this bill.

Ms. LEE, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, knowing full well that it will pass today. Like many of you here in Congress and like millions of Americans across the country, my hope is that we will not have to use our troops. I want to see them safe at home as soon as pos-
sible. I deeply admire their courage, mourn their losses, and honor their sacrifice and commitment.

I cannot, however, endorse the decision to send our troops into harm’s way by launching a first strike against Iraq. I fear we are wit-
nessing the first chapter of the Doctrine of Preemption. This Doctrine of Preemption is taking us more deeply into uncharted waters. No one knows where this will end.

There is no end in sight to the costs of war and to the price we will pay here at home in the America we will not be able to build. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. taught us, “In the wasteland of war, the expenditure of re-
sources knows no restraints.”

Thus, I cannot support the $75 billion down 
payment on this war that makes up the bulk of this supplemental while under-funding homeland security by $4 billion. With those facts, in mind, I must oppose this appropria-
tions bill.

Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. Chairman, I am aware that many of my constituents hope that I vote “no” on this supplemental appropriations bill. Many of my constituents are passionate in their opposition to the Iraqi invasion. Last fall, I voted against the resolution that authorized the invasion because I believed the invasion was a mistake for our country. But that fact is this: The resolution passed the Congress. Whether or not one agreed with the actions that led up to today, America’s troops are now in the field and the bills need to be paid. Ac-
cordingly, I will vote “aye” on this bill.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, two years ago, I don’t think there would be any doubt that most Americans would have felt a sense of safety, but in today’s world that is not the case. Indeed, in today’s world of opting to spend an estimated $9 million on security for the Super Bowl, Americans are looking for a greater feeling of safety and security in their daily lives, whether in their homes, on the street, or in their workplace.

While tensions are very troubling, we can’t overlook or underfund our own homeland security.

There is a bipartisan consensus that pro-
tecting the security of our communities re-
tains that the world will be a safer place for first responders, who form our first line of re-
pose to any terrorist attacks. These first re-
ponders need additional funding to match mandates and goals, particularly to address the need for new communications equipment.

Fire fighters need to be able to communicate with police officers, and police officers need to be able to communicate with emergency medical personnel in order to effectively protect our communities.

Recently, a group of over 80 police, fire and emer-
gencies, we hear constant reports that new attacks on American soil are being planned. Members of President Bush’s administration have publicly stated that they believe another attack on American soil is nearly inevitable.

In our own backyards, at the borders with Canada and Mexico, the ports on our coast, indeed even in our own communities, I will fight to ensure that we have the proper resources or organization to prevent terrorist attacks.

In the midst of this mass of resources and or-
geographic, we hear constant reports that new attacks on American soil are being planned. Members of President Bush’s administration have publicly stated that they believe another attack on American soil is nearly inevitable.

During a time of tension, seems its most vulnerable and under its greatest threat, we have the responsibility to ensure that ev-
eyday Americans are safe and secure. We must protect and defend our cities at home during these troubling times by investing in our new Department of Homeland Security, by providing local law enforcement and first re-
ponders with adequate resources to prevent or respond to any future attacks.

I am disappointed that this legislation in-
cludes less spending on homeland security than was requested by the President, and I am disappointed that the rule was structured in such a way to prevent amendments in-
increasing homeland security spending.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the McGovern Amendment. The war on drugs in Colombia should not re-
vieve that the Bush policy of preemptive war is not the right path. When I refer to the phrase “meaningful steps toward peace,” I have three very specific goals in mind. First, I deeply be-
lieve that the Bush policy of preemptive war has not been well thought through 

Secondly, I believe that we must take imme-
diate responsibility for rebuilding strong trust-
relationships with the international commu-
nity because too many of these relationships have been strained by the invasion of Iraq, this is an incredibly painful and difficult time. Many of our constituents are feeling angry and frustrated, powerless and hurt, wor-
ried and disappointed. We’ve been searching for ways to take meaningful steps toward peace, having failed to convince this Presi-

dent, a majority of this Congress and a major-

While never perfect, we were admired for our con-
structiveness rather than destructiveness.

We should be builders rather than destroyers.

A vote against this bill would do nothing to stop this war. If a “no” vote would stop the war, that is how I would vote. Rather, I urge Members and citizens to join me in the effort to become constructive as a nation, once again, to become builders, once again. This measure does contain resources to begin the 

We must rebuild and restore our relation-
ships with our allies and our friends around the world. Our long term security rests in 

We must also rebuild Iraq. We can’t back 
away now. American compassion, generosity and respect in Iraq are the essential first step in restoring trust between the United States and the Islamic world.

I said that we must construct and we must build rather than destroy. But, I make one ex-
ception to that statement. We must destroy
the doctrine of preemption. In fact the policy of preemption must be buried deep beneath the Iraqi desert, never to appear again. It is illegal and wrong and it harms American security far more than it helps. Beyond preemption lies the American way—democracy, diplomacy, cooperation, and common sense. Mr. Chairman, peace is not simply the absence of war. The seeds of peace must be planted and nurtured. A peaceful world must be tended. It is my hope that it is the rebirth of our true vision of America, in which we reject the “got-it-alone” mentality, reject preemption and钅sponsored it to rebuild and form their country into a democracy. And when the war is over and the casino is in their infrastructure. And when the war is over we will ask them to rebuild and form their country into a democracy. Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this Supplemental Appropriations bill. I must admit that I opposed the war that this bill is funding. This war is the result of failed diplomacy. This war cost us valuable allies, and now it is costing us our lives. It will also cost us—the American taxpayer—billions of dollars. The noble effort currently underway to liberate Iraq. It provides $2.4 billion for “Relief and Reconstruction”. The sum is woefully inadequate to meet the needs of the Iraqi people. We, the United States, are in the process of bombing their country, destroying their infrastructure. And when the war is over (which I hope will be soon), we will ask them to rebuild and form their country into a democracy. This bill provides more money for another airline bail-out than it does to provide the foundations of an Iraqi democracy. Moreover, the money for reconstruction in Iraq—which is supposed to cover a huge range of activities including health, education, transportation, rule of law, agriculture—comes with no apparent structure or oversight. The post-conflict reconstruction of Iraq can provide the U.S. an opportunity to rebuild its frayed alliances and to strengthen its credibility, credibility that was undermined by the unilateral approach the Administration has taken previously towards Iraq. This bill shows no vision of an ongoing reconstruction in post-conflict Iraq, one that will be crucial to winning the peace. This task, as has been demonstrated in Afghanistan, could be far more difficult than a successful war campaign. Mr. Chairman, I support our men and women in uniform and pray for their quick and safe return. We must give them everything they need to accomplish their mission. I just hope that later on, this Congress will remember what it gave for Turkey’s economy when the United States was going to provide extended benefits to the many still unemployed right here at home. With this in mind, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations bill. Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1559, the 2003 Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act. I applaud the swift bipartisan effort that has brought this vital legislation to the floor so quickly. I also congratulate my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their hard work of building and growing a peaceful world.

My opposition to the war, however, is not the principal reason for my opposition to this bill today. I oppose the bill for two reasons: First, because it leaves our first responders at home—our “troops” on the homefront—without adequate protection. Second, I don’t believe this bill addresses another emergency—repairing U.S. relations with the international community and its representative organizations, such as the United Nations and NATO. The Emergency that this bill supposedly addresses is American security. While we must remain concerned with the impact of international affairs on American security, first and foremost, American security begins at home. Our attention as Congress, must therefore be focused on protecting the territory of the United States. That was the intent of the gentleman we faced on September 11th. That is the apparent reason that we intervened in Afghanistan and now Iraq, and in other countries across the globe. This bill inadequately addresses the security needs of the United States. We are spending $62.5 billion for military activities in this bill, and only $4.25 billion for “Homeland Security”. Our troops overseas should be secure in the knowledge that their loved ones here are safe from any form of domestic terrorism. In the budget that I voted to strike this aid, since it makes no sense to provide a billion dollars to a nation that did not even allow our troops access to their soil for this operation. Unfortunately, the amendment was defeated. Further, as I support this measure, I would hope that Congress is equally generous when addressing the challenges that we face right here on the home front. For instance, our economy is in worse shape than Turkey’s, having steadily declined for the last two years without any defensive support or protection and across the nation continuing to mount. But somehow we have no funds to provide extended unemployment benefits for the 1 million in our country who have been out of work for more than 39 weeks. Additionally, seniors need a prescription drug benefit for Medicare, and families have contacted me to ask what can be done about skyrocketing healthcare costs. We also must ensure that federal commitments in education and healthcare are met, and that our homeland security is strong and our first responders equipped and prepared. Here at home we also need have needs that also could use this additional funding that we have provided to other nations through this legislation. Mr. Chairman, I support our men and women in uniform and pray for their quick and safe return. We must give them everything they need to accomplish their mission. I just hope that later on, this Congress will remember what it gave for Turkey’s economy when the United States was going to provide extended benefits to the many still unemployed right here at home. With this in mind, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations bill. The noble effort currently underway to liberate Iraq from a tyrant. However, the true front in the global war on terrorism is but one front in the global war on terrorism. The Department of Homeland Security has elevated the national threat level to “High” because of its belief that there is a high risk of terrorist attacks against U.S. targets as a consequence of the war in Iraq. Despite this level of alarm, the bill being considered by the House today does not provide adequate resources to secure our own communities.
against the very real threats the government has told us we face.

H.R. 1559 does not provide the tools and resources needed by the brave men and women on the front lines in the event of a terrorist attack against our local cities and towns. We should ensure that state and local civil defense teams are established and equipped to meet the needs of our communities in the event of such a tragedy. We should provide all the necessary resources so that the firefighters, police officers and emergency medical personnel can effectively respond to any and all threats to the peace and security of our citizens.

H.R. 1559 does not provide sufficient resources to secure our nation's ports and infrastructure. In virtually every one of our towns across this country is a water-treatment facility that ensures that each of us has safe drinking water. Virtually all of these water-treatment facilities are vulnerable to terrorist attack and so our most basic necessity of life—water—is not adequately secured. Despite this, the Administration has sought this and this bill does not provide one penny to better secure our water-treatment facilities.

In addition, our nation's ports are vulnerable, as are dams, bridges and tunnels throughout the country. Even so, this bill does not provide the resources needed to secure our country's critical infrastructure.

In a time during which the threat of the horrific use of weapons of mass destruction is very real, we have to step up and ensure that our state and local governments have the tools and resources to respond effectively to chemical or biological terrorism. We must ensure that our front-line defenders have adequate training and are properly equipped to secure the safety of our friends and family at home.

While H.R. 1559 is a thoughtful, measured response to the needs of our armed forces on the field in Iraq, it does not provide tools that are critical to adequately secure our local communities—the places where Americans live and work, where we raise our children and care for our families.

I support H.R. 1559 as a first step, but I believe that we have a solemn obligation to do more. The preamble to the Constitution spells it out as well as one could: We are obliged to "insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H.R. 1559 in full and complete support of the brave men and women of our armed services in harm's way so far as Mr. Speaker, I also urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do more—to vote to secure our cities and communities against the very real threats that they face every day during these uncertain times. Mr. Speaker, we must "secure the Blessings of Liberty" here at home with the same vigor and with the same measure of devotion that we have shown to bringing freedom to the people of Iraq.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1559, the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2003. While I believe that it is a tragedy that the Republican Leadership in the House did not allow the Democrats to offer an amendment to include funding to support critical first responder and other homeland security needs, we have no choice to vote for this bill to support our brave men and women now engaged in hostilities in Iraq. My support for this bill does not mean, however, that I will not continue my fight with my like-minded colleagues to procure adequate funds to enhance the security of Americans at home. We urgently need to address vulnerabilities in our ports, borders, transportation system and other critical infrastructure, and we need to augment our first-response by way of training, equipment and command and control. With this additional funding, in reinforce counter-terrorism and other capabilities.

As Ranking Member on the Committee on House Administration, I am pleased that this bill includes funds to address the needs of several Legislative Branch agencies under my Committee's jurisdiction. There is over $37 million for general expenses of the Capitol Police, mostly for additional equipment to improve the physical security of the Capitol, the treff of all bill, it is imporxi thousands of American and foreign tourists visit each year. The bill provides $63.9 million for acquisition of a larger headquarters for the Capitol Police. Our police force has grown considerably since the 1998 shootings and 9/11, and there is a need for more I feed for more consistent and efficient procedures and improve operational efficiency.

Also under our jurisdiction, the bill funds security-related work in the Library of Congress and the Congressional Research Service. The bill funds the newly constituted House Select Committee on Homeland Security, which will be under the able leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TURNER], oversee our newest department and its enormous job of making our people as safe as we can be made from terrorism. I am particularly pleased that this bill includes $110,000,000 to support the operations at the Capitol Office of Compliance. While this amount of money is very small in the context of the overall bill, it is important for the transparency and the ability to ensure the fairness of the Congressional Accountability Act complaint process by allowing the Office to employ outside, independent mediators. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. NEY], and Ranking Minority Member of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee, respectively, for recognizing the importance of this program and for providing the funding needed for it to continue.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY], Chairman of the House Administration Committee, our Committee colleagues, and members of the Appropriations Committee on these and a number of matters in coming months to ensure the security and other needs of the first branch of government are properly met.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to urgently act on providing additional resources to help meet the homeland security needs that this bill fails to address. In the meantime, however, I rise in support of this bill to provide short-term funding for our troops and security needs of the Congress and would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it. Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this supplemental—funding to provide for our troops and homeland security.

This supplemental will support the men and women of our Armed Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom and help provide humanitarian relief for the people of Iraq.

The brutality of Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime continues to be revealed through the brave efforts of the men and women of our Armed Forces. Saddam’s death squads—his execution go into citizens so that the people do not rise up against him. They execute civilians. They go door-to-door, take children from their homes, and hold them hostage under the threat of massacre. Saddam Hussein’s regime has a documented record of gassing, torturing, raping and executing its own people.

While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from this Iraqi regime stands alone—because, as President Bush has said, it gathers the most serious dangers of our age against the very real threats the government needs, what concerns me the most is that it provides short-term funding for our troops and security needs of the Congress and would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it. Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this supplemental—funding to provide for our troops and homeland security.

While I'm glad we are addressing some homeland security needs, what concerns me is a lack of proper funding for our nation's first responders, the first line of defense for us here in the United States. I was surprised the committee is recommending even less for homeland security than the president requested.
Sept. 11—and the anthrax attack the following month—taught us that we are vulnerable here in the United States. We must employ the lessons we learned from those attacks and ensure these men and women are adequately funded.

I am disappointed the committee did not adopt Mr. Obeys amendment that would have vastly under-funded our first responders. Does not need to be the case, but to date we will be a retaliatory attack here in the U.S., adequately funded.

ploy the lessons we learned from those at-least here in the United States. We must em-
daught us that we are vulnerable for post-war "mopping up" and phasing period of combat operations"; $12 billion is allo-
ning our vulnerable infrastructure and active commercial ports. We need those addi-
we need to be doing better.

Our border stations need more money for the infrastructure to accurately and completely use biometrics in the entry-exit system of our tracking programs . . . to follow both those who aren't citizens and cargo originating outside the country. All the money in the bill appears to be for the Canadian border. While it was the Canadian border that the Sept. 11 hijackers crossed, the cost of increased security level along the Mexican border is being ig-

I am pleased to see money for Coast Guard operations. But our Coast Guard needs more funding for both infrastructure and operations. They are living up to their missions heroically, but their mission to protect every single mile of shoreline in the nation.

We must provide complete containment security at every port in the nation. South Texas is home to 2 deep seaports—making us a vul-

The city of San Juan in Puerto Rico has one of the most important ports of any U.S. Jurisdiction—it is one of the most popular stops for Caribbean cruise liners and one of the most active commercial ports. The Democratic substitute provides additional funding for the protection of our ports and infrastructure, state/local first responders, and extremely vulner-

Regardless of the speed of our success in Iraq, regardless of how we personally feel about our role in Iraq, we must recognize that our Homeland needs to be our first priority for defense. We must provide appropriate funding to our first responders and our preventative Homeland defense. The Democratic substitute recognizes our pressing needs. The Demo-

One must conclude, therefore, that this sup-

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of the Democratic amend-
ment to the Republican Supplemental for Homeland Security. I strongly urge my col-
leagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the democratic substitute.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Food Safety and Inspection Service", $13,000,000, to re-
mained available until expended, for activities authorized under section 332 of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Prepared-

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of the Democratic amend-
ment to the Republican Supplemental for Homeland Security. I strongly urge my col-
leagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the democratic substitute.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

As amended, the Chair may accord pri-

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of the Democratic amend-
ment to the Republican Supplemental for Homeland Security. I strongly urge my col-
leagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the democratic substitute.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance", $6,000,000, to remain avail-
able until expended.

In chapter 1 of title I, after the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE", insert the following:

Provided, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, namely:

T I T L E I — W AR- R E L AT E D A P P R O P R I AT I O N S

C H A P T E R 1

D E P A R T M E N T O F A G R I C U L T U R E

P U B L I C L A W 4 8 0 T I T L E I I G R A N T S

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480 Title II Grants", $250,000,000, to remain available until expended.

B I L L E M O N S H U M A N I T A R I A N T R U S T

The Secretary of Agriculture shall utilize the funds and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase different commodities for use in administering the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust in an amount equal to the quantity utilized by the Corporation pursuant to the release of March 20, 2003, relating to the use of commodities for assistance in Iraq: Provided, That not-withstanding any other provision of law, monetization of stocks in the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust to purchase different commodities for humanitarian aid to Iraq is prohibited.

A M E N D M E N T O F E R R E D B Y M R . O B E Y

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance", $17,000,000, to remain avail-
able until expended.

In chapter 1 of title I, after the heading "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE", insert the following:

F O O D S A F E T Y A N D I N S P E C T I O N S E R V I C E

W A T E R A N D R E L A T E D R E S O U R C E S

S E R V I C E S

T A B L E S

F A R M N E T W O R K A N D S T A T E S

E X P E N D I T U R E S

P U B L I C L A W 4 8 0 T I T L E I I G R A N T S

T H E C L I R K R E A D A S F O L L O W S:

H.R. 1559

It be enacted by the Senate and House of Rep-

Representatives of the United States of America in
For an additional amount for "Science" to support additional safeguards and security activities, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Weapons Activities" to support additional safeguards and security activities, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" for various domestic and international nonproliferation activities, $175,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management" to support additional safeguards and security activities, $70,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Other Defense Activities" to support increased Office of Intelligence missions requirements resulting from the conflict in Iraq, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING

SEC. 1351. (a) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, “sensitive material” means nuclear material, radioactive materials, and related technology and sources that pose a risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(b) INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy may expand the International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting Program outside the Russian Federation, and the independent states of the former Soviet Union. The program may include, but is not limited to, assisting countries by—

1. reduce the risk of theft of sensitive material or of diversion of sensitive material to terrorists or terrorist organizations;
2. store securely sensitive material;
3. establish procedures, such as inspections, audits, and systematic background checks, to improve the security of the use, transportation, and storage of sensitive material; and
4. improve their domestic export control and border security programs for sensitive material.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall only apply with respect to amounts appropriated by this Act and any previous appropriations Act enacted before the date of enactment of this Act.

In title I, after chapter 4, insert the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 4A

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $18,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", $1,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Other Defense Activities" to support additional safeguards and security activities, $7,500,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Weapons Activities" to support additional safeguards and security activities, $90,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" for various domestic and international nonproliferation activities, $175,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management" to support additional safeguards and security activities, $70,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHERDEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Other Defense Activities" to support increased Office of Intelligence missions requirements resulting from the conflict in Iraq, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING

SEC. 1351. (a) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, “sensitive material” means nuclear weapons or components thereof, nuclear materials, radioactive materials, and related technology and sources that pose a risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(b) INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Energy may expand the International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting Program outside the Russian Federation, and the independent states of the former Soviet Union. The program may include, but is not limited to, assisting countries by—

1. reduce the risk of theft of sensitive material or of diversion of sensitive material to terrorists or terrorist organizations;
2. store securely sensitive material;
3. establish procedures, such as inspections, audits, and systematic background checks, to improve the security of the use, transportation, and storage of sensitive material; and
4. improve their domestic export control and border security programs for sensitive material.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall only apply with respect to amounts appropriated by this Act and any previous appropriations Act enacted before the date of enactment of this Act.

In title I, after chapter 4, insert the following new chapter:

CHAPTER 4A

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $18,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", $10,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army Reserve", $2,200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army Reserve", $2,200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In the Transportation and Treasury chapter of title I, insert after the chapter heading the following:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

For necessary lifeline capital improvements of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 24104(a), $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

In the VA-HUD chapter of title I, insert after the heading for "DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS" the following:

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical Care", for enhancement of emergency preparedness, $70,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

In the VA-HUD chapter of title I, insert at the end the following:

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For an additional amount for "Science and Technology", $100,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $25,000,000 is for water systems vulnerability analysis and $75,000,000 is for chemical plant vulnerability assessments.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES SUPERFUND (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Hazardous Substances Superfund", $75,000,000, to remain available until expended, for carrying out homeland security activities authorized by law related to the agency's counter-terrorism programs including radiological, biological, and chemical attacks: Provided, That these activities include, but are not limited to, (1) support of State and local responders to plan for emergencies, (2) coordination with federal partners, (3) training of first responders, and (4) providing resources, including emergency response personnel, in the event of any attack: Provided further, That the Administrator may transfer such portion of these funds and deemed appropriate to the agencies of the Federal Government with expertise in radiological, biological, chemical attack related counter-terrorism programs: Provided further, That the Administrator is authorized to make grants to states for radiological, biological, and chemical attack related to counter-terrorism.

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obe) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to add $2.5 billion in funding for homeland security. It seems to me that if we can undertake an effort that will provide basic health
care for Iraqis, 25 million Iraqis, if we can provide for the reconstruction of 6,000 schools in Iraq and 100 hospitals in Iraq, it seems to me that we can at least do the minimum necessary to baton down the hatches here at home and protect our ports, our first responders, our schools and our other citizens from potential terrorist attacks.

This amendment seeks to add $135 million to increase the sophistication of our anti-nuclear detection equipment at our ports. We are concerned about the world that ship over 50 percent of the shipping containers into the United States. We are incredibly vulnerable to the use of a dirty nuclear device in our ports, and this would be a major step forward in correcting that vulnerability.

We also want to spend $87 million to provide additional oversight of nuclear materials stored here in the United States so it is not reachable by terrorists.

We want to provide $150 million to upgrade the State public health departments and environmental laboratories in order to strengthen our ability to respond to chemical weapons attacks.

We provide additional funding to follow up on the site-by-site analyses of our vulnerability or of the vulnerability of our Federal dams and waterways across the country.

We want to provide $75 million to initiate the interagency coordination of the vulnerability of the U.S. chemical plants in the country.

We want to provide an additional $300 million for first responders and $150 million of that specifically for firefighter grants to raise that program up to its authorized level of $900 million.

We want to provide additional funding to our National Guard civil support teams so that every State in the Union can have a qualified National Guard back in operation to supplement the actions of our first responders in case of terrorist attacks in our localities.

We want to see to it that the Coast Guard is expanded by at least 2,000 personnel beginning in October, rather than waiting until next April. The Coast Guard is stretched to the breaking point at this point.

We want to see to it that many of the other ports in the United States that have the same detection equipment that is now available in Norfolk and will soon be available in San Diego.

We want to respond to the fact that the Coast Guard has estimated that we need $4.5 billion in additional funding for our local port authorities over the next 10 years. We want to provide an additional $2.2 billion.

We want to deal with the fact that today, if there were an attack on our tunnels, our Amtrak tunnels, in a number of cities across the country, that, in fact, the 90 days to evacuate people from those tunnels right now is extremely and dangerously limited. And I would point out that the size of this amendment is smaller than the amendment that is contained in the bill to provide aid to airlines. It is very much smaller, about a third the size of the foreign assistance that is contained in this bill for other countries.

This is the minimum that we ought to be providing as the committee committed a list that would come up to almost $8 billion in what we regard as essential security, home front security operations that need to be undertaken. None of these ideas originate with us. They all originate with the agencies that have the responsibility of protecting the security of the United States at home.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that the Members of this House not lodge an objection to this amendment so that we can, in fact, at least have a debate on this issue. We are in the minority. We understand that we cannot expect to win on many votes around here, but at least in the people's House, we ought to be able to debate these issues. You threaten to have more than we have on this side of the aisle. You will most assuredly win; but at least take the gag off, and let us have the opportunity to have an up or down vote on something that ought to be a totally bipartisan.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The committee, as I said before in general debate, provided $3.5 billion for the Department of Homeland Security activities related to the war effort. This amendment would add another substantial amount of money to that figure, which at this moment in time is not necessary.

This bill, supplemental bill we are talking about is only for a 3-month period of time. We will have plenty of time after that to look to the future, but for this 3-month window of time, I say to the Members, this money is adequate. Could we spend more? Of course, I can imagine ways that we could spend more, but we have tried to be reasonable and somewhat restrained in what we throw out the window here at this point in time. This is a 3-month expenditure we are talking about.

Taking some of the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) specifics, for the Office of Domestic Preparedness, this is money for our local responders. We provide $2.2 billion. His amendment would add another 300, but I would point out to the Members that there is already almost $1 billion of money presently allocated that is unspent, laying there waiting for our communities to ask for that money.

And, number two, the 2004 budget request includes another $3.6 billion that likely will be appropriated and will be available beginning this October 1.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve a point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Kentucky, let me simply say that the Coast Guard has told us very clearly that if we provide this money now, they can get
It is frightening when one realizes the reality that a Coke can-size full of highly enriched uranium, put into a bomb, placed into one of 11 million ship containers that end up in major U.S. ports, God forbid if that were to happen and the bomb to be exploded in a major American port, 2 to 3 million American citizens could be killed instantly. Surely, surely, we would all agree in this House that we should do everything we can humanly do to prevent that sort of catastrophe from happening. President Bush has said protecting our homeland against nuclear terrorism should be of the highest national priority.

I think the Oney amendment does something about that potential threat of nuclear terrorism. By providing a little over $100 million, we can actually put in place at 10 megaports nuclear protection devices. So that if a terrorist were to try to put a nuclear bomb into a ship container, and keep it at sea, 99 percent of the ship containers are ever inspected before they come into major American ports, but these nuclear detection devices, funded by the Oney amendment, a technology developed by our Department of Energy, could be put in place in the next year. Starting now, in the 10 major megaports that could protect our major American cities and the millions of people that live in them from the threat of a nuclear bomb being exploded in the hold of a cargo ship parked in New York harbor or New Orleans harbor or outside of Los Angeles or the city of Houston.

If we can spend $100 billion to fight a war in Iraq, which I support, and if we can have proposed a $374 billion dividend tax cut, which I do not support, certainly we could afford to spend another $135 million in this bill today to try to protect major American cities from nuclear terrorism. I urge support for this important amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1559. Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2003, including $62.5 billion for military operations in Iraq and the war on terrorism.

In the months and years ahead, questions will persist as to whether alternatives to a U.S. military invasion might have succeeded in removing the threat posed by Iraq's weapons program. And there are important debates still to come about the postwar program for rebuilding Iraq, the multilateral cooperation we must secure to our transition to democracy, and the efforts our nation must resume to bring Israelis and Palestinians back to the negotiating table. This Congress must hold the President and our country to these critical objectives.

But today, our task is more straightforward: we are here to give our courageous men and women in uniform the support and the resources they need to carry out their mission swiftly, effectively, and decisively. I have no doubt that that support, in the form of this supplemental appropriations bill, will be provided with near unanimity later today.

This bill also must address the protection of our citizens here at home. This Administration has made a total supplemental appropriation request of $74.7 billion. Homeland Security accounts for less than 6 percent, or only $4.2 billion, of this total. The Republican leadership of the Appropriations Committee has made significant improvements in the Administration's request and has courageously refused to allow Congressional spending to be the discretion of the President or Secretary of Defense on any other executive officer. But the bill still falls short of our minimal homeland security needs, and unfortunately, the leadership of this body has refused to do so. It is a cause for concern. These efforts from our side of the aisle to improve it.

Let me give two examples: port security and support for first responders. Although Congress and the Bush administration have taken important steps to improve airline safety, very little has been done to secure the 361 seaports around our nation that receive nearly 21,000 containers a day from hundreds of overseas ports. Maritime shipping moves 95 percent of non-North American U.S. trade.

Testifying before Congress last August, Robert Bonner, Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, said, "There is virtually no security for what is the primary system to transport global trade . . . The impact (of an attack) on global trade and the global economy could be immediate and devastating—all shipping could be slowed and key role seaports play in linking America to the world, both economically and militarily, port vulnerability studies for the nation's 50 largest ports are not scheduled to be completed for five more years. The Coast Guard estimates the 10-year cost for port security improvements at $4.4 billion, and $963 million for the first year alone. In this time of crisis, we cannot afford to delay this effort. Despite no request from the Administration, Congress has appropriated $400 million for grants to critical ports to conduct vulnerability assessments and make needed security improvements. The Democratic amendment provides $250 million more to better meet the security requirements of our ports.

Our first responders are our first line of defense—the ones who intercept terrorist activities and are first on the scene in the event of disaster, putting their life-saving skills to work. I have traveled throughout my district meeting with local leaders and first responders. They tell me that they need equipment, training, and funding to meet the demands of their new responsibilities. Yet, they still have not received the funding that they have been promised; in fact, they are facing funding cuts in the President's 2004 budget.

The Democratic amendment provides critical supplemental funding for first, in securing interoperable communications equipment. Incompatible communications equipment hinders the ability of our first responders to adequately respond to disasters and costs lives. Only 40 percent of fire departments can communicate with police or EMS personnel. The technology to obtain interoperable communications equipment exists now. DHS is developing national guidelines.

The Democratic amendment provides $350 million to be directed immediately through grants to this effort in our effort to correct a universally accepted need.

First responder grants are authorized at a level of $900 million for Fiscal Year 2003, but funded $150 million below its authorized level. The Democratic proposal makes up this shortfall.
by providing the additional $150 million to the grant program. This additional money would make up shortages in basic needs such as portable radios, self-contained breathing devices, and map coordinate systems.

Not only major metropolitan areas but also smaller and rural communities located near critical infrastructure are faced with an increased burden of security as a result of the ongoing high threat level. The Domestic Proposals program provides $300 million through the Office of Domestic Preparedness to help these communities fund the heightened security requirements they must now meet. This additional $300 million would provide a total of $3.5 billion to ODP for Fiscal Year 2003, which is equal to the Administrations original Fiscal Year 2003 budget request.

Mr. Chairman, members of this House understand the importance of providing our troops with the resources they need. We stand united behind them today, and we remain steadfast in our faith in them and our support of their mission.

However, it is also our duty protect all of our citizens and to provide funding to ensure homeland safety and security. It is in that respect that the bill before us falls short. Having been denied the opportunity to strengthen this bill today, we on the Democratic side will perceive change existing law.''

An amendment to a general appropriation bill to waive against provisions in the bill does not, under the precedents, permit amendments adding further legislation. The purpose of order is, therefore, sustained and the amendment is not in order.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were 217, noes 195, not voting 22, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES—217</th>
<th>NOES—195</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>King (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>King (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehlers</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson</td>
<td>Kline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Knox (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Kolkotka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferey</td>
<td>Lahoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Latham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkle</td>
<td>LaTourette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley</td>
<td>Leach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosselfa</td>
<td>Lewis (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank's (AZ)</td>
<td>Lewis (KY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazhynsueg</td>
<td>LoBiondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallegly</td>
<td>Loford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett (NJ)</td>
<td>Logan  (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>McGovern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilchrist</td>
<td>McKeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giora</td>
<td>Miller (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodie</td>
<td>Miller (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodallie</td>
<td>Miller (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelby</td>
<td>Moran (KS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krager</td>
<td>Moroney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (WI)</td>
<td>Myrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutnicht</td>
<td>Nethercutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Ney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Northup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings (WA)</td>
<td>Nunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>Nussle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayworth</td>
<td>Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hensharing</td>
<td>Otter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herger</td>
<td>Oxley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson</td>
<td>Pearce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoestler</td>
<td>Pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulskof</td>
<td>Pennsylvania (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>Petri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaa</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istoek</td>
<td>Pitts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan (CA)</td>
<td>Platts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkings</td>
<td>Plowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (CT)</td>
<td>Pomeroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson (NJ)</td>
<td>Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Sam</td>
<td>Pryce (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellar</td>
<td>Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy (MN)</td>
<td>Radanovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy (ND)</td>
<td>Regula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokota</td>
<td>Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennard</td>
<td>Reno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating</td>
<td>Renzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (CT)</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (PA)</td>
<td>Rogers (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (KY)</td>
<td>Rogers (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (MI)</td>
<td>Rolinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (IL)</td>
<td>Ros-Lehtinen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (RI)</td>
<td>Ryan (RI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (KS)</td>
<td>Ryan (KS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (VA)</td>
<td>Saxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TX)</td>
<td>Schrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (CT)</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (IN)</td>
<td>Shadegg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (MD)</td>
<td>Shays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NH)</td>
<td>Shewert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NJ)</td>
<td>Shimkus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (IL)</td>
<td>Shuster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (WI)</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (WV)</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (SC)</td>
<td>Smith (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TN)</td>
<td>Smith (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TX)</td>
<td>Smith (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (PA)</td>
<td>Souder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (DC)</td>
<td>Stearns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (VA)</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (MD)</td>
<td>Sweeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (CA)</td>
<td>Táraxco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (VA)</td>
<td>Taub (DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (IN)</td>
<td>Taylor (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TX)</td>
<td>Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NC)</td>
<td>Thomas (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (OH)</td>
<td>Thornberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NY)</td>
<td>Tipton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TX)</td>
<td>Toomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TX)</td>
<td>Turner (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NY)</td>
<td>Upchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (PA)</td>
<td>Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (OH)</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (WV)</td>
<td>Wamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (FL)</td>
<td>Weldon (FL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TX)</td>
<td>Weldon (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (CA)</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (TX)</td>
<td>Whitley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NJ)</td>
<td>Wicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NJ)</td>
<td>Wilson (NM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NC)</td>
<td>Wilson (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NY)</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (IN)</td>
<td>Young (AK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keating (NJ)</td>
<td>Young (FL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Chairman, let me state what I understand the parliamentary situation to be. My understanding is that the rule under which we are operating waives section 302(c), 302(f) and section 311 of the Budget Act against the bill today, we on the Democratic side will perceive changing existing law.''

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to offer a total of $3.5 billion to ODP for Fiscal Year 2003, which is equal to the Administrations original Fiscal Year 2003 budget request.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote was taken; and the question was taken; and the answer is: The motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair to the discretion of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other Member wishes to be heard on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair understood the point of order offered by the gentleman from Florida to be related to clause 2 of rule XXI. The Chair finds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) includes new language impacting direction, as for example, section 311 in the proposed amendment. The amendment, therefore, does constitute legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The fact that points of order under clause 2 of rule XXI were waived means that while the rights of the minority to be heard on the point of order is, therefore, sustained and the amendment is not in order.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were 217, noes 195, not voting 22, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES—217</th>
<th>NOES—195</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Akerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adson</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. ROSS, Mr. WYNN and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE J. JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and our ranking member. I think they have done the best job they possibly could have done, and I commend them for making sure the supplemental appropriation is not simply a slush fund giving the administration and Secretary Rumsfeld the ability to spend this money in any way that they wish to spend it. However, no matter how hard they have worked, this bill is not what it is made out to be.

This bill provides almost $78 billion in supplemental funds, some of which are not related to either the war in Iraq or homeland security. In addition to some funds for the war in Iraq, this bill includes money for Turkey, Israel, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Slovakia, Romania, Slovenia, Lithuania, and Bulgaria. In addition to the millions of dollars for all of those Eastern European countries, this bill includes generous sums of money for health care, rehabilitation, and the construction of new schools, housing, and transportation systems in Iraq and Afghanistan. Yet many communities right here in the United States of America are continuing to suffer from the effects of prolonged economic recession and depression, including job losses and a lack of investment in our cities and our rural communities.

Later on today I will be offering an amendment to encourage investment in our cities and in our rural communities as a form of investment. I will also offer an amendment to encourage the Inter-American Development Bank to release money for Haiti, one of the poorest countries in the world right here in our own hemisphere. Mr. Chairman, I do not begrudge them assistance in rebuilding, but I do resent attempts to define this bill as simply support for our soldiers.

This bill includes political money that simply rewards countries for voting with us in the United Nations. It includes money to subsidize the airlines. It includes money to the CDC and other funding that has nothing to do with the war in Iraq that it is supposed to be used for.

I can tell the Members what is not in this bill. There is not money for homeland security or money for our own aging and broken education and health systems.

I will support this bill, but I will also speak up for the citizens of this country. Mr. Chairman, charity begins at home and spreads abroad. If I had my way, I would not only include in this language that would have forced the Inter-American Development Bank to be passed on to Haiti that should have been done years ago, not only would I have an amendment for $5 billion that would deal with our allaying infrastructure systems right here in our own communities, urban communities and rural communities. I think I would even put $28 billion in here that the President is cutting from our veterans. Do not forget, those soldiers who are in Iraq today will be veterans some day, and they will need to have funds to cover all of these services that we are now cutting.

Mr. Chairman, the young lady who was just rescued, who was captured and was a prisoner of war found in the hospital, simply went into the service because she could not afford to pay for her education. She went into the service in order to be able to pay for her education; and now that she has been shot, now that she has been captured and rescued, when she gets home she has a semester’s worth of Courses. She should have had a scholarship before she ever signed up, but that is what is wrong with our education system. It does not provide for all of those young people who wish to be educated.

Again, I respect the work that has been done; but I want this bill to include support for homeland security, support for our allaying communities, and language for Haiti.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me speak to the gentlewoman that just spoke. There are ways in which I think we can come together. One of the areas, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has an amendment coming up that gives preference to the United States in the rebuilding process over those nations that fought against us. Mr. Chairman, I do believe that simply rewarding countries for voting with us in the United Nations is not something that is American jobs, American construction. In California with our constituents, I think the gentlewoman and the caucus could support that.

The second thing, I think it is even more important, as one that opposed going into Haiti, as one that opposed going into Somalia after Add. And I would tell the gentlewoman if she has been to Haiti, if the Halie Selassie High school, one can drive a truck in a pot-hole. It is terrible. Many of the conditions have not been improved, and even though I opposed going in there, the dollars that were already appropriated for that should be released to help, and personally believe, that a child that qualifies, that works hard should not be denied a college education or a general education as a result of their economic status, and they should be provided that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to talk about this bill that will provide much-needed support for our men and women in the armed services who find themselves in harm’s way. That aspect of this bill is very good. As a matter of fact, I see this bill in three parts. First, the war. We are doing the right thing. We are supporting our men and women in the armed services during the post-war. Provisions are made in this bill, I believe, to the tune of $8 billion that would provide for the reconstruction of Iraq or the beginning of the reconstruction of Iraq after the war as well as assistance to the country.

But then there is the third part, homeland security. And here I must say, Mr. Chairman, I am greatly distressed. We are not adequately supporting our homeland security needs. In this bill we have not put enough money to help the local firemen, policemen, public safety personnel, emergency medical technicians, the people
on the front lines to keep our communities safe. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Erey) has tried to put in an additional $2.8 billion. That has not been accepted. That money goes into our communities to provide the same kinds of protections in our hometowns that we would want to see in communities abroad in Iraq after the war is over.

Let me give an example of what I am speaking about. Here in the Capitol we have all sorts of protections. We have barriers, we have the complex. We have an emergency communication system. We have got special equipment in the case of a chemical or biological attack for ourselves but also for other Federal employees working in this complex. But when these same employees go home to their districts in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., and specifically to my district in Prince George’s and Montgomery County, they do not have these same kinds of protections.

For example, Prince George's County, Maryland, just outside of the Capitol where many of our employees live and where evacuation procedures may take place, we still need funding to purchase 800 megahertz radios to seamlessly communicate with surrounding jurisdictions as we try to facilitate traffic and respond to emergency situations.

Montgomery County, Maryland, again in the Washington, D.C., suburbs where many of our employees live, needs gas masks and monitoring equipment for first responders and schools. These counties and many others all across our country are working tirelessly to respond to the orange alerts and the red alerts and all the other kinds of exigencies connected with war on terrorism and what we anticipate may be increased problems as a result of the war in Iraq. But yet when it comes to funding them, we cannot find the additional $2 billion that we need to provide resources that they need.

We should include more money for homeland security in this bill. It is a true tragedy that we have not. So I urge my colleagues, as we consider this bill and as amendments come to the floor, to take this opportunity to do more than just wave the flag or pay lip service, but that we will actually put some money, more money where it belongs, and that is in the protection of our local communities.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other Members seeking recognition, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER 2
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
For an additional amount for ‘‘General Administration, Salaries and Expenses’, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND
For an additional amount for ‘‘Counterterrorism Fund’, $50,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003: Provided, That funds provided under this paragraph shall be available only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of Division B of Public Law 108-7.

DETFON TRUSTEE
For an additional amount for ‘‘Detention Trustee’’ for the detention of Federal prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service, $15,000,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
For an additional amount for ‘‘Office of Inspector General’’, $2,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE
For an additional amount for ‘‘Salaries and Expenses, United States Marshals Service’’ for necessary expenses, $26,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
For an additional amount for ‘‘Federal Bureau of Investigations, Salaries and Expenses’’, $396,662,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

THE JUDICIARY
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
For an additional amount for ‘‘Supreme Court of the United States, Salaries and Expenses’’ for police enhancements, $1,535,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
For an additional amount for ‘‘United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, Salaries and Expenses’’ for court security officer expenses, $973,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
For an additional amount for ‘‘United States Court of International Trade, Salaries and Expenses’’ to enhance security, $50,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
For an additional amount for ‘‘Department of State, Salaries and Expenses’’ to enhance security, $50,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS
For an additional amount for ‘‘Diplomatic and Consular Programs’’, $106,420,000, to remain available until December 31, 2003.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE
For an additional amount for ‘‘Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance’, $71,500,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE
For an additional amount for ‘‘Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service’’, $65,708,000, to remain available until expended.

RELATED AGENCY
BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS
INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS
For an additional amount for ‘‘International Broadcasting Operations’’ for activities related to the Middle East Television Network broadcasting to the Middle East, $2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER
SEC. 1201. Funds appropriated under this Chapter for the Broadcasting Board of Governors and the Department of State may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended.

CHAPTER 3
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE
For an additional amount for ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’, $1,400,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004, which may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for payments to reimburse Pakistan, Jordan, and other key cooperating nations, for logistical and military support provided, or to be provided, to United States military operations in connection with military action in Iraq and the global war on terrorism: Provided, That such payments shall not exceed such amounts as the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of State and in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may determine, in his discretion, and such determination is final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the United States: Provided further, That unless expressly provided for in an appropriations act enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds other than those additional amounts provided herein shall be made available for any payments intended to fulfill the purposes specified in this paragraph and similar reimbursements to authorities expressly provided in section 304 of Public Law 107-117 and within the ‘‘Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide’’ appropriation account enacted in Public Law 108-36: Provided further, That the committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate shall be notified in writing at least seven days prior to the obligation of funds for payments to Pakistan, Jordan, or other key cooperating nations: Provided further, That not later than 30 days following enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report in writing to the committees on Appropriations that includes a financial plan for the obligation and expenditure of such funds: Provided further, That if such report is not submitted to the committees on Appropriations by the date specified in the previous proviso, un obligated balances of funds in this account that are available from the amount provided in this paragraph shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States: Provided further, That, beginning not later than June 30, 2003, and ending on September 30, 2004, the Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.
Senate on the uses of funds made available for payments to Pakistan, Jordan, and other key cooperating nations for logistical and military support provided to United States military forces in connection with military action in and around Iraq and the global war on terrorism.

Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund

[INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS]

For incremental costs of the Department of Defense associated with the global war on terrorism and operations in and around Iraq as part of operations currently known as Operation Iraqi Freedom: $59,682,500,000 is appropriated to the "Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund", which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States. Funds appropriated or transferred to the "Operation Iraqi Freedom Response Fund" shall remain available until expended.

Amendments offered by Mr. Kucinich

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and I ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc. The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 9, line 8, after the dollar amount inserted "(reduced by $19,386,500,000)"

Page 10, line 2, after the dollar amount inserted "(reduced by $19,386,500,000)

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be agreed to, that we will have an understanding that I will not object to his request; I have no problem with that, but that we have an agreement that I would then ask unanimous consent to limit debate on this amendment, that no Members would get up in the fulsome that Members would get up in the fulsome discussion, this amendment, these amendments, to 15 minutes, 7½ minutes on each side.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's request.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and any amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in the interchange that we were having, I was momentarily distracted. The agreement that we had worked out earlier I understood was 15 minutes. I thought it was 15 minutes a side, instead of 7½ minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thought we had amended that. But that is okay with me; if the gentleman wants to do it 15 and 15, I have no problem with that either.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if that would be acceptable to him.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would restate my unanimous consent request that it be 15 minutes on each side rather than 7½ minutes on each side.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) will be recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 15 minutes on the amendments.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

We all stand here today hoping that no more American soldiers will be killed in Iraq. My amendment will do the most to prevent more American fatalities.

This amendment would bring the troops home immediately and safely. It will end this unjust and illegal war now.

The administration has spent $30.3 billion already on current military operations. This amendment will give the Pentagon another $10 billion to ensure the troops can be safely brought back home to their families. Out of the $50.6 billion for military operations, my amendment will leave $40.3 billion to pay for the war to date and to get the troops back home now. This amendment will save taxpayers $19.3 billion. The savings from the adventure in Iraq can be used for increased homeland security, education, health care, or veterans funds.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this war is not about defending the United States and we should not be engaged in the war. This war is not about the U.S. trying to save or liberate the Iraqi people, this war is not about an Iraqi nuclear threat. Iraq has no weapons of mass destruction that have been able to be detected by the U.N., and it would be most unfortunate if it was for our troops to find those weapons in combat, by stepping back and letting the U.N. inspectors return, we could avoid that kind of confrontation and cataclysm.

None of us in this Chamber holds any troubled heart. I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to support our troops. No one wants to hurt the troops. No one wants to hurt the troops. We want to get the troops there out, and we do not want to send any more troops.

That was our good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Hefley). Again, another quote: "Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with a troubled heart. I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to support our troops. Support them by bringing the 150 home. Bring them home now before we get into a mess like I personally had to live through 30 years ago."

That was my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Norwood).

I believe that a "no" vote on this supplemental is patriotic, because this war is not about defending the United
States from a threat of Iraq. Iraq had nothing to do with 9-11. There has never been a link demonstrated of any credibility connecting Iraq to al Qaeda's work on 9-11. Iraq had nothing to do with the anthrax attack upon this country.

Iraq did not attack this country. Iraq does not have the military capability to attack this country. The United Nations had not been able to establish before their inspectors were withdrawn that Iraq in fact had weapons of mass destruction. Iraq was not acquiring nuclear material, as had been advanced by some in the administration.

This war is not about the U.S. trying to liberate the people of Iraq. It is not about an Iraqi nuclear threat. Ending this war now and resuming weapons inspections could salvage world opinion of the United States, which has been deteriorating since even the talk of war began. After all, the greatest threat to the United States at this time is terrorism. This war will breed terrorism.

I agree with those in this Congress who today have taken this floor to express concern about meeting the challenge of terrorism here at home. Every dime that we spend to advance aggressive war in Iraq, or anywhere else in that region, for that matter, will require later on spending two dimes or $2 to secure our own Nation. I believe that now is the time for America to take a new direction, to turn away from aggressive war.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told that it is Iraq's possible possession of weapons of mass destruction which brings us into their borders and causes our troops to go throughout their cities. This country needs to confront the reality that there are many countries which possess or are pursuing or are capable of acquiring nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons or missile delivery systems.

As of 2000, there were 17 such nations with respect to nuclear weapons, 26 such nations with respect to chemical weapons, 20 with biological weapons, 17 with missile systems. The administration's claim that Iraq was not acquiring nuclear material from Niger, as had been advanced by some in the administration, together would put us against confrontation with many nations of the world. Now is the time for us to reassess that.

This downpayment on this war, which is represented by this supplemental, is not simply a way of supporting the war; it is a way of supporting a policy which can only lead this Nation to disaster around the world. Now is the time to step back.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis), the Chairman of the Sub-committee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague yielding me this time. I must say that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Kucinich), I know, is very sincerely serious about his position on this matter. I respect his position greatly.

I must say that I was one of those who believed deep in my heart that we would solve this problem by way of peace talks. But that is not the case. Now it is open for us to change the regime in Iraq, and at the same time do so without having to find ourselves in war.

That opportunity for peace closed. The door closed entirely with fridays and all allies. But allies were not alone took a different position. When France decided to take the position they did, when Germany decided to take the position they did, there was no opportunity to find a peaceful solution.

In the meantime, this bill before us is designed to make sure that our troops will be fully supported as they go forward attempting to ensure the opportunity of freedom for the people of Iraq. It is absolutely certain by the time we get through this process before us that they will have an opportunity they have not had during all of the history of this brutal regime.

Indeed, it is difficult for me to understand my colleague's position. I happen to have risen in part to support his right to express that position. That is what this debate is all about.

I hope at another day, another time, we will find a peaceful solution for dealing with people like Saddam Hussein. I just do not see that time in the near future.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obe), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have been around this institution long enough to know what an amendment looks like when it does cut off and end the war because we voted that way to end the Vietnam War. I voted for that resolution, or for that amendment.

I also voted to require the President to come back to the Congress for a second vote before he went to war if the Security Council did not agree with his decision to go to war, so I think my position is clear. I think there are going to be very bad, long-term results from this war.

But having said that, I think it is incorrect for the gentleman to say that this amendment will, in effect, bring the troops home. It does not such thing. All it does is to say that we will not reimburse the Pentagon for money which has already largely been spent. It simply does not replenish those accounts.

I do not think that that is a rational thing to do.

Secondly, I would point out one of my problems with this bill is that this bill already, in my view, substantially underestimates the job we have to do. Therefore, substantially hides from public view, the full cost of this war. It is going to cost a lot more than the $70 billion in this bill today.
The effect of offering this amendment, in my view, would be to further mask the real cost of that war. I do not think that is a healthy thing to do. I think we are getting into some long-term costs associated with this war far in excess of the Pentagon, the State Department, or the White House are admitting. I think this amendment simply further would play into that game.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not going to pass because, frankly, it does not do what it purports to do. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do; he is trying to find some way to express his views on the war, so in a sense this is a symbolic act. I respect him for that.

The fact is, Members need to be assured they understand exactly what it does and what it does not do. One thing it does not do, it does not bring the troops home.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt my friend's concern for the troops. I think that is genuine. However, I do debate the gentleman's point on the war. It will be specific.

First of all, there is no doubt, no doubt whatsoever that Saddam Hussein has contacts and is utilizing al Qaeda within Iraq. I just attend some of the intelligence briefings.

Second, as a combat veteran, the troops, sure, when we flew in Vietnam, we wanted to come home; but we also wanted to do our job. If we talk to the embedded reporters and listen to our men and women overseas, they want to finish this job, I would tell the gentlemen.

Secondly, on the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman's amendment does not bring the troops home. We are already spending fourth-quarter dollars. What the gentleman wants to do is not able to even replenish those, which would weaken the state of national security in the long run.

I would tell the gentleman that Saddam Hussein today pays $5,000 to a 15-year-old child and blow themselves up in Israel. We have lost American citizens in that. I do not think we want to let that go.

If we listen to Saddam Hussein, he says he will attack us in the air, the sea, and the land. I would ask the gentleman to project Saddam Hussein, if we pull our troops back, project someone like this 5 years from now with a nuclear weapon. It would be devastating, and we would lose American souls, many thousands.

A lot of people say, what about Korea? Korea is a threat; but I want to tell the Members, they are not working every single day through Mujahedin, Hamas, Hezbollah, and al Qaeda to damage the United States. We need to finish this job, whether the gentleman agrees with it or not. We need to protect American citizens and those abroad for whom we want to have to find weapons of mass destruction on the battlefield in combat used against them. It is much more appropriate to have inspectors determine whether or not such weapons exist, and if they do, to move to destroy them.

I will add that we want to reintegrate nations like Iraq and the others, which are hostile to this country at this point, back into the world community. We need to find a way to catch what I believe is an advancing tide of human unity which we see expressed all around the world with friends of ours who have stated their concern about the American position of aggressive war against Iraq.

This is a turning point in this country's history, and it is an important moment for us to ask questions about the direction we are going in. Because we are not only talking about Iraq here. We are not just talking about a down payment on a war. We are not just talking about the safety of our troops today. We are talking about the safety and security of the world. America's role in the world, our ability to keep America safe and secure in a climate with an administration that is determining that aggressive war is the way to achieve that.

I maintain that is always open to debate, and I want to thank the gentleman for providing me with this opportunity to raise this question on this floor.

We are all patriots. We all love our country. But one of the glories of this country is its first amendment, which provides not only for freedom of speech, but which provides for a national discussion on issues that are of urgent importance.

And I want to thank both the ranking member and the chair for ensuring that this happens on this issue, and I acknowledge that. And when it is appropriate, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment out of respect for the heartfelt concerns expressed by my colleagues.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the tenor of the gentleman's debate. I think this debate has been great all day long, and at a very high level.

For a closing statement in opposition to the amendment, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding me this time and rise simply to say that I very much empathize with the position of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Kucinich).

We happen to rather intensely disagree as to what role America is going to be playing in the world in the years certainly understands America's concern, but to get that same world community which has shown sympathy for America in the past to join with us in once again going back to Iraq with U.N. inspectors instead of our troops, if we would not want to have to find weapons of mass destruction on the battlefield in combat used against them. It is much more appropriate to have inspectors determine whether or not such weapons exist, and if they do, to move to destroy them.
and months, perhaps decades, ahead. Our country remains, whether we like it or not, as the only remaining superpower in the world. We now spend dollars at a level, 380-plus billions of dollars to make sure that we are the strongest country in the Middle East, in the world. It is in the interest of those dollars we spend because we are the force for peace. If there is a country that, long term, is going to maintain the peace in the world, it is America. And it is the men and women of the very troops serving in Iraq today, men and women who reflect the best of the best, who are of course for peace.

This bill is designed to make sure that they can carry forward their job at this moment to its completion and do it well. Indeed, no force is more capable than these men and women. Their purpose, though, is to ensure that freedom becomes available to the people, the men and women, the mothers, the children of Iraq. Without their presence in Iraq, we will have to take us down the pathway towards appeasement. He would be the voice that says "we ought to stand still for whatever time is necessary for me to rebuild my position of strength." He will say, "I will find any another way to win one more time." This is not a plan of peace.

America is the voice for peace in the world. We need to recognize that. And because we need to recognize that, we must reject this amendment.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, out of respect for the troops and the concern that all of our Members have for them, whatever their position is on this war, I respectfully withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. The amendment is withdrawn. Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in support of the wartime supplemental, H.R. 1599, and I rise today to thank the House Committee on Appropriations for recognizing the damage caused by Super typhoon Pongsona to our military assets on Guam and for taking action to fund the repair of these damaged aircraft hangars.

Currently only one of three aircraft hangers at Andersen Air Force Base on December 8, 2002 for 9 long hours, with sustained winds of 180 miles per hour. Much damage was done to the family housing units at our base where our brave servicemen and women work around the clock to ensure our safety and security, and especially during this time of war when our bases should be in top order.

On behalf of those servicemen and women and their families, I would like to thank the House Committee on Appropriations chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) and ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey). Because of their hard work, this bill provides $1.8 million to repair family housing and air conditioning units damaged by Supertyphoon Pongsona.

It also identifies the need for new aircraft hangars. Bombs, surveillance and fighter aircraft. Currently only one of three hangars at Andersen Air Force Base is fully operational. The new reinforced concrete high-bay aircraft hangars will be typhoon proof. The state-of-the-art climate control in the hangars will ensure that the bombers will be able to use the hangars for repairs and maintenance.

I hope that in conference on this bill, funds will be identified to begin the hangars' construction. And once again, I want to thank the leadership for recognizing the emergency damage caused by Super typhoon Pongsona to our military assets on Guam and for taking action to fund the repair of these damaged aircraft hangars.

Mr. Chairman, because of increased military activity, the Iraq war, and the impending dangers in North Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment related to Turkey be considered at this point in the reading of the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object merely to inquire of the gentleman if he would be interested in reaching some agreement on a time limit, because this amendment has the potential to be very time consuming. And it is a very important amendment, but I would like to say to the gentleman that I do not want to put in a time limit and we will desire to speak, but we need to finish this bill tonight. We have to have the weekend to prepare for the conference with the other body. So, would the gentleman be interested in discussing the possibility of a time limit?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to my friend and my chairman that we have several speakers that are very passionate on this issue. To me, the debate of this issue is as important as its passage, and once those individuals do get allowed to speak, and I would encourage them not to take the 5 minutes, if the chairman would redress the issue then I would not object.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to considering the amendment at this point in the bill?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: In chapter 4 of title I, in the item relating to "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND"—

(1) after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $1,000,000,000);"

(2) strike paragraph (3) relating to financial assistance to Turkey; and

(3) redesignate paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will choose to strike the last word at the end to close, and I would allow the Members who wish to speak on this issue and I would go to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) yield to the gentleman from California? Yes, the gentleman is going to strike the last word. I will strike the last word at the end so I will have time to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized now for 5 minutes on his amendment. If the gentleman wants to be recognized again later, the gentleman will have to ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Okay. Then I will be recognized for the 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I truly believe that the United States needs the support of all allies. That includes Turkey. That includes France. That includes Germany. And as I stated before, the debate on this issue is just as important as the passage of the amendment. There needs to be some message sent to any country that chooses to put in harm's way American and allied soldiers that there will be a penalty. The message should be, "Do not tread on me."

Now, that does not mean that we do not want them as allies in the future. I would state, and I do not have to demonstrate that same goal for Turkey by making this point, but merely to make a point, if my own daughters intentionally did something egregious, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, not going to raise their allowance. I love them, I want their love in the future, and the same goes for Turkey.

Secretary Colin Powell at this very moment is negotiating with Turkey, and he has made some great strides. I
think all the Members in this House respect Secretary Powell. But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that current negotiations and even positive steps do not forgive what has happened in the past with Turkey denying our troops access.

Turkey never asked for this money. The United States is asking to give them $1 billion. The United States is giving Turkey a ton of money in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from California is a valued member of our subcommittee, and on almost all defense issues we agree. Unfortunately, today, I must rise in opposition to this amendment.

As everyone here knows, yesterday Secretary of State Colin Powell met with the leadership of Turkey. Immediately following that meeting, the border was opened and supplies and trucks were flowing into northern Iraq for the United States forces that are there. These are supplies, not ammunition or weapons; but it is a significant step forward.

Also, we were able to use the air space of Turkey in order to bring in forces into northern Iraq by air lift. Bombers have flown into Iraq using Turkey's airspace.

So I think they have made a very significant contribution, and people sometimes forget that 90 percent of the people in Turkey are opposed to this war. They are on the border with Iraq. It was much different in 1991 when Saddam Hussein was invading another country like Kuwait, and therefore, they could join as a NATO ally and work with the United States to get Saddam out of Kuwait. This is a different circumstance.

I think they have done almost everything they could. If 90 percent of the people in the United States were opposed, we thought not to be there. I think we have to understand, this is a new government with a new parliament; and Turkey has been a reliable ally for many, many years.

This was in the President's budget request. Condoleezza Rice has written a letter to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) expressing the support of the administration for keeping this money in this bill.

We also have to look at the long term. Once we get through with this war, and I hope and pray it is over very quickly, we are going to have to rebuild our alliances, not only with NATO, but with all the countries that are part of the coalition. We have got to rebuild their faith at this point and supporting this $1 billion to help Turkey, who has serious financial problems that were caused by their participation in the original Gulf War in 1990 and 1991. They have been hurt economically by this because of humanitarian problems and economic problems that they are facing.

They desperately need this aid and assistance, and they are a democratic country like Kuwait, which serves the support of the United States. They have been involved with us in every military conflict since the Korean War and through Afghanistan; and on the floor of the House, to underplay what we reached out to them yesterday with Secretary Powell, I think, would be a terrible mistake.

We should show Turkey that we understand their problem and we want them to do what they can economically and we want them to work with us through NATO to be a good ally and a good friend. Please vote against the Cunningham amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As the preceding speaker said, the gentleman who offers this amendment is somebody that I have the highest respect for. He is a true patriot, and no way would I impugn his motives. I just think the basis of this amendment is fundamentally wrong.

As I said the other day in the committee, this is one of those tough votes where I think we as Members have an obligation to not let our emotions run away with us but to do what is the right thing in order to prosecute the war and to carry out our national security and diplomatic objectives.

If I may I would like to provide a little bit of background. The bill language, as it is presented on the floor today, permits us to provide to Turkey, through permissive legislative language, $1 billion in economic support funds. Turkey was asked by Turkey in turn to buy down the cost of private sector loans, that is, the credit subsidy that would sustain about $8.5 billion of loan guarantees.

The committee recommends this bill language but requests that the Secretary of State determine and notify Congress that Turkey is cooperating with the United States in Operation Iraqi Freedom, including the facilitation of humanitarian assistance. So that they may not get the money until that certification is made by the President.

The President, the administration, and the committee support the assistance in this bill because a strong and economically viable and a democratic Turkey is a model in the Middle East, and it is essential to U.S. strategic interests.

Turkey has been an ally of ours for the last half century. During the Korean War, the Turks were with us and suffered the highest per capita casualties of any partner in the Korean war coalition. They were with us in Vietnam. They were with us in 1991 in the Gulf War. They have been with us in Afghanistan. They helped us in Bosnia. They have been very helpful in the war against terrorism.

They have hosted Operation Northern Watch. That is the enforcement of the no-fly zone in the northern part of Iraq. It is for the last 12 years. They are a member in good standing of the NATO alliance.

Turkey is also a democratic nation. It is one of the few Muslim nations that has built economic and military ties with Israel. Ankara has viewed this relationship as important, as does Israel. After the conflict with Iraq ends, we will clearly need Turkey to play an important role in the Middle East peace process.

Yes, the Turks have not done everything that we would have wished and may have been expected in Operation Iraqi Freedom; but we need to remember that they are a democracy,
and sometimes democracies can be messy, as we certainly know in our own body here.

The Turkish parliament did not support the executive by some three votes. They fell short of the absolute majority they hoped to have, but in fairness, 90 percent of the population has been opposed to this war, and so it was an act of some courage for this new parliament, 80 percent of whom were new at the time they voted, to cast the votes they did; and as The Washington Post recently pointed out, the United States contributed to part of the problem with its own diplomatic errors leading up to the vote that took place.

Foreign affairs is, in part I think, understanding about being sensitive to other nations' views. We need to remember that Turkey does border Iraq, as well as Syria and Iran. We need to understand that the Iraq conflict and Kurdish issues are extraordinarily important domestic issues in this multi-ethnic republic. The reforms in Turkey in 1991 tragically led to a wave of terrorism that resulted in 30,000 Turkish deaths, and we can be sure that was very much on the minds of these people at the time they cast the votes that they did.

While they did not allow U.S. combat troops to cross into Iraq from Turkish territory, they are now supporting us in a number of important ways with intelligence support, with overflights by combat aircraft, and sometimes by opening up the northern front, with emergency landings of U.S. combat aircraft, and with humanitarian assistance that is now flowing regularly across the border into Iraq.

We have been firmly opposed to having Turkish military intervention in Iraq. The assistance in the supplemental is an incentive for Turkish restraint. Should Turkey move into Iraq, the President would be able to withhold the funds in this bill.

Just yesterday, Secretary of State Powell completed talks in Turkey. He obtained formal Turkish agreement to allow overland supply of fuel, water and food to our forces in northern Iraq. The Secretary worked on repairing relations. He secured Turkish agreement on the flow of humanitarian supplies.

Mr. Chairman, for us to cast a positive vote on this amendment right now underscores not only the President's diplomatic efforts but, yes, sadly, undercuts our military forces in northern Iraq; and, Mr. Chairman, we should not do that. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, because she has laryngitis, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Lowey] may be permitted to insert a statement in the Record at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

There is no question that Turkey's initial refusal to allow the use of its territory had made prosecution of the war more difficult for us. We have long argued that the vote of the Turkish Parliament as unfortunate and misguided, it happened. Sometimes we find the result of democratic deliberations inconvenient, but this was, in fact, the result. Despite that vote, the administration has requested $1 billion for Turkey. The justification proffered by the executive branch, or is, primarily, economic. Turkey is in dire straits at the moment.

This is partly due to the war, and partly due to past economic policies. But regardless of the reason, the Turkish economy is faltering. They owe the IMF over $17 billion at the moment, and are financing most of their cash needs in short-term, high-interest debt. They have started down the path of economic reform, but they have a long way to go.

Now that the war is on, and Turkey has finally agreed to allow the positioning of supplies for our troops on its soil, the worst thing we could do is send a signal that we do not support Turkey. The circumstances surrounding this request may not be ideal, but our men and women in uniform are well into Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Turkey's continued cooperation will help them.

Economic collapse of Turkey, coupled with a further breach in United States-Turkish relations which would result from passage of this amendment, would be absolutely disastrous to the way that the war is fought and to the peace effort that will come after. Turkey remains one of the few stable, democratic countries in the region, surrounded by unstable, authoritarian states. As a moderate Muslim state, strategically situated at the gateway to the Middle East, we simply cannot allow it to fall.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from California's amendment. I join many of my colleagues that feel anger and frustration over the Turkish refusal to allow some 62,000 American troops to be based on their soil in order to open up the northern front against Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Powell recently went to Ankara to meet with Turkish officials, and press reports on his mission indicate that Turkey has made some concessions allowing limited U.S. military and humanitarian resupply operations via its territory. These concessions are obviously vital to the safety of the Americans that are on the ground right now in northern Iraq and the overall success of the Iraq mission.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Powell recently went to Ankara to meet with Turkish officials, and press reports on his mission indicate that Turkey has made some concessions allowing limited U.S. military and humanitarian resupply operations via its territory. These concessions are obviously vital to the safety of the Americans that are on the ground right now in northern Iraq and the overall success of the Iraq mission.

The supplemental bill addresses some of my concerns on the use of the $1 billion in aid to Turkey. There are legitimate restrictions on use of our aid. The Secretary of State is required to determine that Turkey has met certain obligations such as certain economic responsibilities that the Turkish Government must meet and Turkey's cooperation in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I would like to see the report to Congress to address more than these issues, though, and to set benchmarks for what the Secretary can determine as Turkey's cooperation in order to allow unfettered U.S. and international humanitarian aid transiting through and/or being staged in Turkish territory in support of the northern Iraqi Kurds. Turkey must explicitly agree not to cross into northern Iraq, as demanded by President Bush.

Turkey must agree that it will provide only logistical support to the humanitarian effort in the northern, and Turkey must agree to economic and banking reforms identified by international lending institutions.

Finally, Turkey should agree to provide full minority rights to its citizens as stipulated in international and European conventions.

Turkey has been touted by some as a model of a Muslim, secular, democratic State; but it is often overlooked that Turkey's history of human rights abuses and aggression towards its neighbors is very long.

Turkey appears on every major U.S. and international human rights violator's lists every year. This is mainly due to their treatment of their minority citizens. The international community has repeatedly warned them that the special treatment of their Kurdish citizens and others jeopardizes their chances of entering the European Union.

Turkey also continues to join with Azerbaijan in illegally blockading Armenia. This is in direct violation of the U.S. Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act, which states the U.S. assistance may not be made available for any country whose government prohibits or otherwise restricts, directly or indirectly, the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance.

Turkey also continues to join with Azerbaijan in illegally blockading Armenia. This is in direct violation of the U.S. Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act, which states the U.S. assistance may not be made available for any country whose government prohibits or otherwise restricts, directly or indirectly, the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance.

Turkey has also flouted international law. U.S. criticism for 31 years, illegally occupying the northern third of Cyprus. And even though there was an effort in the last few weeks to try to come to a settlement, Turkey refused to be part of that settlement and there still is no settlement in Cyprus.

None of these issues have served as a wake-up call for many of us in the United States. We have seen the obvious contradictions I have spoken...
about and have real questions about how we can afford giving American tax dollars to a country like Turkey that does not share our strategic vision and is not willing to share the burdens of dealing with the Iraqi regime. I understand that this is a billion-dollar amendment on the Committee on Appropriations, but I do not think it goes far enough. I think at this time, unless we have more restrictions put on the aid, that it is wrong for us to go ahead with the billion-dollar amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the Cunningham amendment to cut the aid to Turkey unless Turkey shoulders its international responsibilities more correctly. And, more specifically, the American taxpayer should not be foot-
ing their loan bill or any other of their bills.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I, frankly, find it offensive when an

Mr. Chairman, I rise with hesitation to oppose the amendment of my very dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who, let me

The CHAIRMAN. Time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has expired.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey be granted an additional 30 seconds.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Objection.

Mr. STEARNS. Objection.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I come here to the House floor and I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment. I under-

stand my friend’s concern, but I do not think we need to exacerbate the situa-

tion. Turkey has been with us so many times, as the gentleman from Arizona has pointed out. So many times Tur-

ey has been with us, and would my colleagues have forgotten the situation, after Turkey has now agreed, as reported in The New York Times, to increase its cooperation with the American military campaign in Iraq by permitting use of its territory for the evacuation of American service personnel. Turkey has extended such help occasionally since the war began 2 weeks ago, but the new accord will make it more routine.

Most importantly, my colleagues, in a separate but important part of the agreement, Secretary Powell said that the United States and Turkey would work on a new accord to watch over northern Iraq to make sure no conditions arose that might compel Turkey to send its troops across the borders into Iraq. Turkey is a modern republic, a Muslim state. It is unique, as pointed out, in all the nations of the world. It is the only operating democracy in the Middle East. So it is essential that the United States realize and appreciate the burden, the special bur-

den Turkey has, and the fact that they are the only Muslim member of NATO.

Turkey remained steadfast with the United States and our allies through the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, NATO air strikes during the conflict in Kosovo, and in providing aid to Albanian refugees. This was Operation Northern Watch, which maintains the no-fly zone over northern Iraq. Turkey has been of enormous assistance in our global war on terrorism. And they should know. They have been fighting for it 30 years. Thirty thousand people have been killed by terrorists in Turkey.

We have a vested interest in Turkey, and Turkey is sacrificing its well-being just by supporting a lot of our policies.

This is a very much reduced package of aid to Turkey. We have a vested interest in Turkey, and Turkey is sacrificing its well-being just by supporting a lot of our policies. Turkey will open its airfields, as I pointed out earlier, to the American military planes. Is this everything we have asked for from this ally? No. But I would like to point out that Turkey does support our efforts, unlike other so-called allies who have opposed us at every turn.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an amendment that should be defeated. The administration, Secretary of State Colin Powell, is satisfied with Turkey’s response and their desire to go ahead with the foreign aid package. So why should we not? In the interest of main-

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from New Jersey be granted an additional 30 seconds?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Objection.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an amendment that should be defeated.
In Vietnam, while they did not have troops there, they did support us in that effort while the rest of the world heaped abuse upon us. During the Gulf War, a decade ago, even though it was dramatically against their economic interests, the Turks stood with us, and their assistance saved the lives of many and made that operation the success it was. We could not have done it without them.

Thus, we owe the Turks. Now, yes, they did not do what was right by us at this time, and I am living in a time of confusion in their history. They are paying for that mistake. But let us give them the credit that is due them for so many years of friendship, so many years of alliance, so many years when we could count on them. And let us look to the future. If we are going to have democracy develop in the Muslim world, Turkey will be an absolutely pivotal player. We will rely on them again to make this a safer and a better world. We will not simply deny the President's goal of bringing democracy to the Muslim world without the Turks there. They are giving us a good example. They are giving their fellow Muslims a good example. Let us stand by them.

Yes, we were disappointed, but let us not treat them in a way inconsistent with the way that they have treated us over these many decades, which is as a friend and ally.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the thoughtful comments just presented by my colleague from California and with comments made earlier in this debate by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Kolbe).

Turkey is a democracy, as our Secretary of Defense often points out approvingly, Turkey is a NATO ally, and Turkey is an important supporter of Israel. I too regret the recent action by Turkey's Parliament, but I am pleased to see that what has followed is more promising. And I applaud our Secretary of State for visiting Turkey these past days to mend relations.

This is a good debate to have, Mr. Chairman, and an important vote to make on this floor. In that spirit, I wish the rule had permitted us to have a good debate on the amendment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) had planned to offer, and a good vote on the proper level of homeland security funding for our first responders.

On that subject, I want to point out briefly that it is not just the level of responder funding, it is not just the top line that matters; it is the front line. It is as important that Federal funds are delivered quickly to local police and fire departments, public health officials and other first responders on the front lines of our hometowns. When earthquakes or other natural disaster strikes in California, first responders rush in to secure the scene, render medical assistance and provide a hot meal and a cot. FEMA has programs in place to reimburse communities promptly for the costs they incur.

The point is this: The FEMA system has been thoroughly tested. We know it works and it serves our communities well.

A similar kind of system should be in place in preparation for possible acts of domestic terrorism which can have the same or worse impacts than a natural disaster. It is up to the Federal Government to make sure emergency response is prepared, effective and efficient. After all, we are obligated by the Constitution to provide for the common defense, and part of the war theater is our hometowns.

Last week, Secretary Ridge put it this way in testimony before the Congress. "I would like to engage both Chambers in a bipartisan way to see whether or not I can convince you that the formula we have used in the past shouldn't be the formula we use in the future." He continued: "It doesn't take into consideration some of the special needs that certain communities have and certain States have that are substantially greater than others."

Secretary Ridge has it right and I commend him for his willingness to acknowledge the problem and offer to work with Congress to fix it. The Secretary is saying what many of us have known for some time. It is not enough for Congress simply to write the check. The check needs to be delivered and cashed. And as of today, the dollars are not flowing.

There is a better way to do this, and I think it is the FEMA way. Secretary Ridge can and should exercise his authority to streamline and expedite his Department's funding process the FEMA way.
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FEMA has long used emergency funds to support communities, individuals, and families in the face of a natural disaster. Under prior leadership, FEMA streamlined its assistance to individuals and families, cutting checks within 3 to 7 days of a disaster.

As a first step, Secretary Ridge should move the Department's Emergency Management Preparedness Grant program from the Office of Domestic Preparedness back to FEMA where experienced officials can process requests more quickly. Our emergency unpreparedness is a disaster waiting to happen, and we need to support our communities.

There are other steps to consider as well. All Federal first responder funds that have not yet been made available should be released, including $100 million available to Secretary Ridge for high-threat urban areas. He should determine where these areas are and get those funds out immediately. America's major metropolitan areas know their needs best, and steps to increase security now. We should not have to wait for a full-blown inter-agency process to tell us that a city like Los Angeles has critical infrastructure or a large population.

I not only represent that large urban area, but many small areas, where small amounts of dollars can make a big difference. And those dollars are needed now.

Wartime is not a time for business as usual. The war on terrorism is being fought on a number of fronts, including our hometowns. We would not send our troops to war in Iraq without the support, training, and equipment they deserve. We should do nothing less for those on the front lines here at home.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey), and any amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and myself as the opponent.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that arrangement as stated would provide that all of the time would be divided on the side of the aisle. Can we work it out so that some of it is assured to folks on this side of the aisle, regardless of which side of the question they are on?

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) as an opponent would share the 20 minutes. So the gentleman from Wisconsin would have 10 minutes and I would have 10 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, that is agreeable. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like an idea how many Members are waiting to speak on which side of the issue, and whether that is an adequate amount of time.

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have about six speakers for the amendment.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, on this side we have at least two or three.

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak on the amendment. I would just like to see us finish before 4 in the morning.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, maybe a little more time is required on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be interested in 25 minutes on each side? I think Members know how they are going to vote on this amendment right now, but we need to have the debate. I do not want to restrict the debate, but as the gentleman from Wisconsin stated, we would like to finish before we get accused of doing this in the wee hours of the night, and Members know that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the problem is the uncertainty who will get to speak or not get to speak. Can we proceed a little further and then see if we can get a unanimous consent request? Maybe 25 minutes a side.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent request that further debate on the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) be limited to 25 minutes on each side, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) as the proponent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of my 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'BEY) as an additional opponent to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) will control 25 minutes, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will control 12 1/2 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'BEY) will control 12 1/2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman of the committee for a fine job on a fine bill for the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the United States military.

I stand here as a friend of Turkey. I stand here as someone who looks to a strong relationship with Turkey in the years to come. I also stand here as a strong proponent of the Cunningham amendment.

I met Mr. Erdogan the weekend before he was to be elected. We talked to some of his top leaders and advisers, ministerial-level officials in the new government. We came to a conclusion when we were getting ready to leave that it was probably in the best interest, and maybe in the next 10 or 12 days there would be a vote and they would push for a vote, understanding the very clear consequence that if they did not do this vote, we believed, and we believe today there will be more American casualties on the battlefield and more Iraqi citizens killed.

Instead of standing up and showing leadership in those 10 days, they decided to ignore it and avoid that vote. They had their chance to make a difference in this debate. Leadership would have solved this problem, and I understand they are a new government. I understand they have challenges with their IMF requirements, and they have challenges they need to meet in reforming their economy, and I understand that they have a struggling economy like our own.

But it is a concern to me that this money is in this bill at this time. This is a wartime supplemental. Our chairman graciously stood up earlier and said let us keep these troops in our thoughts and our prayers, and I was humbled by that. This bill is for the military. It is for the soldier of America today, and by no means should we underestimate what the Turkish decision by a democracy, who are still friends, but let us not underestimate what that decision did; it cost us more money, more time, and more American lives.

I find it offensive that we would put this money in this bill today on this floor. This is not the time nor is it the place to be debating the Turkey financial future or IMF or economic reform, or the fact that they helped us 50 years ago. Let us send a message to this new government that we are their friends, but there are consequences to being a part of democracy.

I met with the Ambassador to Turkey yesterday who said this money “is not anything that they asked for,” quote/unquote; that the money has nothing to do with any of the previous arrangements made on humanitarian aid, supply, resupply or flyover, no bearing whatsoever. This has nothing, quote/unquote, to do with the war.

A State Department senior official said yesterday that Powell’s visit did not get any new agreements, it reinforced old agreements with Turkey. Let us not get confused by the things that we will hear on this floor or by the letters that we receive. This is about old agreements and old relationships that we should value as allies. This is not about new agreements, this is about $6.7 billion dollars at a time when we have soldiers dying on the battlefield as a result of their decision.

Let us remind our friends in Turkey that they are allies of ours and they will continue to be, and even democracies can have differences; but sometimes there is a cost and a consequence to a decision to turn your back at a very critical time. This is not about a trade agreement or a company that got its privileges taken away in a copyright. This decision cost American lives.

Let us stand up today and let them remember that. They are going to continue to be our friends, and I am going to continue to be a supporter from Turkey. But I want them to understand that we can never tie these issues together. Some of this money will be used to bring home our dead. The fact that we are allowing this money to be put in the bill is the reason Members to stand up today and support the Cunningham amendment and let us save Turkey economic development for another day.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I join the chorus of Members who have commended the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who is a patriot and is exactly right on so many national security issues, but I have to oppose this amendment. I believe it would be wrong to allow our short-term emotional feelings to affect the long-term security of this Nation and of the world.

The nation of Turkey has been an ally of the United States for more than 50 years. During World War II, 217 Turkish soldiers lost their lives fighting on our side, and more than 2,000 were wounded. After September 11, 2001, Turkey voted in NATO to invoke article 5 of the Defense Treaty and join the coalition to fight al Qaeda and the Taliban regime, allowing access to airspace and providing intelligence within 24 hours of that vote.

The U.S. is right now working with Turkish forces in the Balkans, the Middle East, and the Caucasus. Currently Turkey is allowing flyover rights, supporting our resupply lines, allowing humanitarian aid and the evacuation of our wounded to cross their borders.

Although Turkey’s Parliament did not vote as we wanted, we needed to remember that over 90 percent of their Parliament is brand new at this idea of governing. They were just newly elected, and more members of their Parliament voted in our favor than voted against us. It was only a parliamentary requirement that caused the issue to fail in Parliament.

I think the actions of the Turkish Parliament were irresponsible and wrong, but two wrongs do not make a right. If we compare Turkey with France and Germany on this issue, Turkey’s leadership has supported the United States throughout. It has not been Turkey who has gone globe trottling all over the world, rounding up Security Council votes against the United States’ position. It was not Turkey which did this.

Further, I think it is inaccurate to make the analogy that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) made with regard to what we do with our children. Turkey is not our child. Turkey is our ally, our partner in NATO. We can love them as a child and love them as an ally, but we must not
Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which cuts the President's $1 billion request for wartime aid to Turkey. I too join in the commendation to the sponsor of the amendment for his patriotism and to the goodwill for those Members that support it. But with all due respect, and I was with the gentleman from Michigan in Turkey 2 weeks ago, the suggestion that Turkey, in the exercise of her democracy, is somehow responsible for putting American soldiers in harm's way I believe is a misplaced and inaccurate argument.

We are not at war with Turkey. We are at war with Iraq. Do not transfer the atrocities of Iraq to the decisions of a longtime democratic ally. What is being discussed in the essence of this amendment, I would respectfully suggest, is a very short-term American memory; and if we really want to calculate what advantage the American men and women, the brave American men and women who are on the battlefield now have gotten or not gotten from Turkey, why are we not calculating the years where Turkey has provided the authority for American and British pilots to control northern Iraq and contain Saddam Hussein?

One of the principal reasons why the disparity of power is so great and so much in our favor in the fight right now is because Turkey allowed the United States at the beginning of the war, and has diminished the capacity of Saddam Hussein and diminished his atrocities; but there is no mention of that with respect to this amendment.

Following September 11, Turkey demonstrated again that it is a steadfast ally to aid the United States by leading the international security assistance force in Afghanistan. Let us not underestimate that. When we were attacked in New York, in Washington, in Pennsylvania, we saw it was our blood that was being spilled, and when our forces left Afghanistan, whom did we hand it over to? We handed it over to a willing Turkey, a country that is almost 100 percent made up of Muslim citizens; and they took our battle and they took it willingly. And to suggest that because they exercised their democracy, even though we may be disappointed by the decision, that they are somehow responsible for the letting of American blood, I suggest that the message that the United States should ever suggest to an ally like Turkey is we are fighting in Iraq to destroy Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction, but I also thought we were fighting for international law, that people, the international community could help them install a democracy. So what is the message? That the United States is their friend if they are a democracy only when they decide in agreement with what we believe? Is there no room for allies in the midst of a hot debate, in the midst of competing interests to have honest discussions, and do there have to be catastrophic consequences if a country disagrees?

If I were an ally of the United States today, the message that I would get from this amendment is they are only as good as long as they agree 100 percent, but if they spill their blood with the United States for 6 decades like Turkey in World War II, Turkish soldiers have done shoulder to shoulder with American soldiers, if they spill their blood for 6 decades, but they exercise their democracy and come up with a differing result, then the United States says all bets are off. We are better than that. We are better as a people, and we owe it to our soldiers that are fighting now to defeat this amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Cunningham amendment to strike $1 billion in foreign aid to Turkey. Turkey is a NATO ally; and because of its location just to the north of Iraq, it was strategically important to the United States in our military plans to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

But at a time when we needed Turkey the most, on March 1, 2003, the Turkish Parliament rejected a resolution to allow 62,000 U.S. troops, 255 planes, and 62 helicopters to enter Turkey.

Saddam Hussein is a ruthless, systematically aggressive dictator with a history of attacking several countries bordering Iraq. Our country has incurred many casualties. We spent billions of dollars to help reestablish the reign of peace and stability throughout the Middle East. Why is Turkey not giving us $1 billion?

And these fair-weather friends in Turkey, are they even grateful that the United States is giving them $1 billion in American taxpayers' money, money that is extracted from the paychecks of waitresses, secretaries, and small businessmen? The answer is no. Recently the Turkish Ambassador to the United States stated, "This is not something Turkey has asked for. It is a unilateral action by the U.S. administration."

We are giving $1 billion to Turkey in the name of friendship when it is clear to everyone with a sense that friendship cannot be bought.

One billion dollars is a lot of money. It is enough to send 250,000 American children to college on Pell grants. Let us use our taxpayer dollars wisely. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Cunningham amendment and strike the $1 billion in foreign aid to Turkey.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member on our Committee on Appropriations for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, but I certainly understand where the distinguished Member from California is coming from. But in a bill that includes $7.5 billion in direct assistance and authorization for another $19.5 billion in guaranteed loans with the Turkish government and United States behind them, Turkey needs to be part of this package. They are too strategically an important ally not to be because they are a member of NATO, they border Iraq and Iran. They are, in fact, cooperating in our battle with the Taliban and al-Qaeda in southern Afghanistan. We cannot, we cannot have it both ways in Turkey or any other country; and that is what is all about. When 90 percent of the Turkish people are opposed to the war in Iraq, of course, 90 percent of the Turkish people are Islamic, it is perhaps understandable; but we ought to respect that and respect Turkish leaders and work with them.

Turkey needs to be a member of the European Union. One of the reasons they are held back is because of corruption, which at least has been endemic in Turkey, and human rights abuses. We need to use this money, in my opinion, as leverage in advancing America's priorities, the priorities of the American people, the priorities of human rights and democratization.

There is a woman by the name of Leyla Zana, for example, who goes on
trial today. She has been in prison for 11 years. When she was inaugurated a duly elected member of parliament, she made a speech urging that the Kurdish minority work with the Turkish majority in a more integrated and peaceful society. Turkey needs to work with the Kurdish minority. Many of us were concerned about the Turkish military going into the northern part of Iraq into the Kurdish zone for fear they might attempt a military occupation. Turkey needs to understand that we provide this money, but we expect them to integrate the Kurdish people within their entire society and, in fact, their economy.

So that is our objective, advancing America's priorities; and America's priorities are more consistent with Turkey's long-term priorities than many of the countries that we are providing aid to today.

So I urge the Members of this Congress to give us the $1 billion and in fact the additional $85.5 billion in guaranteed loans for Turkey, but then not to shrug our shoulders and turn our back to work with those in the Turkish society and in politics who want to make Turkey, to enable it to become a member of the European Union, a bridge between East and West and one of the shining examples that democracy can work and human rights can be observed throughout the Islamic world.

I urge defeat of the amendment for that reason, but I congratulate the Member for raising the issue.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining for the proponent and the opponents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has 19 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 9 1/2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) has 4 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Blunt), the distinguished majority whip.

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

As my friend from Virginia just said, I share his admiration and appreciation for the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), one of the true heroes of this Congress, a person who has defended our country, who thinks about those who are in harm's way, who appreciates what they do only as one who has bravely stood there, appreciates what they do, and I appreciate his sense that this is a topic that we need to discuss because we do need to discuss it; and our friends in Turkey need to hear the discussion. We have been disappointed with the act in Turkey in recent months. I think someone just stood up a minute ago, another friend of mine, and said Turkey disappointed us when we needed them most. I think that would be hard to evaluate when we needed Turkey the most because we have needed Turkey often and we have needed Turkey for a long time, and they have been there on all previous occasions.

If we were going to have a debate on this floor about who was the most valued NATO ally, certainly our friends in Great Britain today and in this moment would rank at the top of that list, and they would be widely appreciated. But if we had to look over the history of NATO, certainly as we had that discussion, we would have to have that discussion, and it would have to involve Turkey. Turkey, because of its location, has been at the focal point of so much of the world's chaos and in the last 5 decades has been at that focal point as well. Turkey, who during the 45 years of the Cold War stood facing the Soviet Union on the north, the bulwark of stopping the advance of those that we saw who opposed our way of life for so long. Today, they stood so firmly and so strong that we prevailed in that great conflict of ideology. Now Turkey has had to turn and face the south as the hotbed of the world borders Turkey on the south, and they faced it as a great and determined friend of ours. Certainly Turkey has had a change based on their democracy. The government has changed. The government is working hard, in my opinion, to continue that strong friendship between the United States. They do need to be part of the European Union. They have been discriminated against for many reasons. They need to move in the right direction. We need to encourage that both economically and socially and politically.

This continues to move Turkey in that direction. It continues to show that we appreciate those who 90 percent of the time and plus in the last decades have stood with us.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, it was not long ago we were standing in this place voicing our support of the troops; and when we were voicing that support, I think some of the most poignant remarks came from the soldiers in our midst.

It is hard to imagine what it is like being in the middle of a war for those who have not done it like myself. However, the sponsor of this amendment has been there. He has had the experience of being a soldier in a very perilous situation, and I think today that the sponsor of this amendment is putting himself in the place of the soldiers that are serving us in this conflict right now.

We have not forgotten what Turkey has done for us. My brother-in-law is a Korean War veteran, and we appreciate their friendship and their support through the years. But one of the qualities of friendship is steadfastness, being able to call on a friend in one's time of need. Turkey has failed us now in this present situation. In fact, Under Secretary Wolfowitz told the House of Representatives on March 27, "There is no question if we had had a U.S. armored force in Iraq right now, the end of the war would have been closer."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERTEUTER), a leader in this House.

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

Turkey may need assistance, but today is not the day to approve that assistance. Today we send a clear signal to America and the rest of the world that we support our troops. Turkey has not supported our troops.

The U.S. over the last number of months has consistently and frequently consulted with Turkey as to the direction of the war with Iraq and the role that Turkey would take. Turkey showed us to make important investments to their infrastructure. We invested millions of dollars, contracted with Turkish companies to work, yet they would not allow us to deploy our troops. The Pentagon supported their economy by purchasing Turkish-made apparel for U.S. troops for 1 year, waiving a Buy America provision, sacrificing American jobs for Turkish jobs. The U.S. continues to promise protection to Turkey in the event of an attack. That is more than what we can say Turkey did for us.

Turkey has been an ally for a long time. So maybe sometime in the future would be the appropriate time to come back and take a look at how to help a friend in tough economic times. But in this vote, where we are supporting our troops in our war effort, this is not the place to reward Turkey.

Let us remove this from the bill. Let us make this a clean bill that signals to our troops that we stand with them and that we will be with them through the conclusion of this war effort.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERTEUTER) and given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)
Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Cunningham amendment.

We have heard a lot about the distinguished history of Turkey as a NATO ally, and as an ally in Korea as well, and I think we can agree with the gentleman leading the ISAF for 8 months, and in Operation Northern Watch over Iraq where they provided the air base for our flights for the last 12 years. They have been an incredibly faithful ally.

Now, we keep reminding ourselves, Turkey is really this, when it comes down to it. They had an election in November. They swept in a new party. Ninety percent of their national assembly is new. This party, the Justice and Development Party, had never been in power; and never had even shared power before. And through inexperience and incompetence they were surprised to have lost the vote. They got the plurality. They had too many absentee votes and too man abstentions and they were surprised that they did not have the absolute majority vote.

This is not the time to punish Turkey for that inexperience.

Their own party leader, a charismatic man, was not eligible to serve in the Parliament at that time. Now he is the Prime Minister.

They have done an incredible amount of things, but the other thing I want my colleagues to consider is that they were the biggest loser in the Gulf War. Not the United States in terms of costs, no one else: the cost to them was somewhere between $50 billion and $90 billion, unreimbursed. We have our costs paid for, primarily so, by Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

Now, let us see what Condoleezza Rice said in behalf of the President today. She said in this letter addressed to the chairman, “American and Turkish soldiers stood side by side during the Cold War and on battlefields from Korea to Vietnam. The President’s supplemental request recognizes and reflects that past, and his desire,” that is the President’s desire, “to strengthen the relationship further. This assistance can play a significant role in bolstering the U.S.-Turkey partnership.”

This is not the time to undercut our President. And this very moment is certainly not the time, because the concessions and the kind of agreements recently conveyed to Colin Powell says Turkey is there for us.

Please defeat the amendment. The costs for passing this amendment are extraordinary.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this very important amendment. I think the debate itself is very important one.

It has been said that this amendment is emotional. I am not sure where folks are coming from. A lot of what we do up here is certainly emotional, and certainly not everything we do up here is logical. But I will say this, in terms of the logic of this important amendment, if we can picture Baghdad and if we can picture the 3rd Infantry Division, the 4th Infantry Division, yes, it is. It is certainly not the exact number of years, and I am not sure of the exact level. I think it is in the $200 million range.

But people are coming up here acting like this is Turkey’s one shot for money. It is not. It is a supplemental support check. That is a lot of money.

If we support the Cunningham amendment, we will get a second shot at Turkey, for those of us who feel that we should support them. They are allies and I think we should have some level of support for them, but we might not need to do it right here, right now. Let us wait until the fiscal year 04 budget and take a look again.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, Mr. DeFazio.

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

The debate has been a little surreal because we have had such impassioned speeches about Turkey as an ally and how could we do this to them, how could we deprive them of this money, they did not ask for. I remember the Turkish Ambassador, Faruk Logoglo, told us yesterday, “This is not some thing Turkey has asked for. It is a unilateral action by the U.S. administration.”

Mr. Chairman, this is $1 billion they did not ask for, they did not expect, and yet now it has become an imperative in this bill, making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations. Why? Why now? Why is it in this bill?

As the gentleman who spoke before me said, there will be a time and place to debate aid to Turkey and the many other worthy nations around the world who need United States assistance. But should this bill be more focused? I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, we are not every penny. Every penny of the $74 billion in this bill will be borrowed. We do not have the money in the bank somewhere. It is not coming from a contingency fund. It is going to be borrowed. So we should borrow $1 billion to send to Turkey who has not asked for it, and if we do not borrow the money to send to Turkey who has not asked for it, we are somehow penalizing them. I do not think they will see it that way. It does not sound like the Ambassador is going there.

There are other needs that are unmet in this bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin attempted to enhance homeland security. I have been on the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Committee on Homeland Security, and I can tell my colleagues, our ports are not safe. We have not done everything we need to do. We need more funds to make those ports safe. The most likely way of delivering a weapon of mass destruction
in the United States is not an intercontinental ballistic missile, it is a container on a rogue ship. That is how it will get here in all probability.

So why are we not making those investments? We could spend, if we need to, the $1 billion. I believe that there are a lot of ways to spend it. We could even spend it here at home. There is $3.4 billion in this bill to rebuild Iraq: 6,000 new schools, universal health insurance. Guess what? We have $4 million a day lost. We have Medicaid in my State. I have thousands of Oregonians who do not have health insurance, that need work. Our schools are crumbling. We cannot run a full school year. We could take this $1 billion and spend it here in the United States of America. I have to question a lot of the foreign aid that is in this bill and the priorities that are being set here.

So therefore, I rise in support of the gentleman’s amendment, and if this is successful, that would be good; and if not, I will offer an amendment later to reduce the funds to Turkey to fund National Guard weapons of mass destruction teams with the 4th Infantry Division. That State and 17 other States do not have, which have been authorized by this Congress, but we do not have enough money to fund them; but we can send $1 billion to a country that did not ask for it, but does not want it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I just returned from Camp Lejeune, went down with the President and the gentlemen from North Carolina (Mr. McIntyre) and (Mr. Ballance), my colleagues, to say thank you to the families of those who have lost loved ones fighting this war in Iraq.

I just want to say I join my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle. I think it is time that this Congress start looking at what is important to this country.

Let me give an example. Veterans. I have 61,000 veterans in my district. Many of my colleagues in this House have more than that, but I have 61,000 veterans and retired military combined. Yet every year when we debate concurrent receipts for those men and women who have served this Nation, it is also a major issue of where are we going to find the money? How are we going to help those who have served this Nation?

I believe sincerely, and I know that through history, Turkey has been a friend of this Nation and maybe it is now and maybe it will be in the future, but I agree with my colleagues, this $1 billion. I believe the gentleman that spoke before me just said that Turkey has not even asked for the $1 billion. I am saying to this Congress that this is going to be a tough budget year. We do not have to be making hard decisions that we have to make, and let us take this money and let us spend this money on the American people.

2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM); and God bless all who are veterans and retired military.

I hope that, as we vote on this amendment today, we will support the gentleman from California and that we will remember that those who have served this Nation, whether they be retired military or retired veterans, that they have a right to expect this government that made a promise, we will help you if you serve this Nation. If Turkey does not want the $1 billion, let us take it back and spend it on to those who serve this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, God bless America, and God bless our men and women in uniform.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Kirk), and I hope that everyone would pay close attention to someone who has a real-life experience on this issue.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition for this amendment and stand not so much out of concern for foreign policy, but out of concern for the 3,000 American men and women of the 173rd Airborne Brigade whose supplies are today delivered from Turkey.

To the proponents of this amendment, what would the soldiers of the 173rd do in northern Iraq if the diplomatic incident we cause leads to a cutoff in their supplies? The 173rd needs supplies in northern Iraq. Therefore, the United States needs Turkey.

Prior to my election, I served as a Navy air crewman who flew out of Incirlik Air Base in Turkey against al-Qaeda forces with U.S. special operations forces in northern Iraq. It is those arms which rushed the Ansar al-Islam and other al-Qaeda forces with U.S. special operations this week. Tonight, U.S. air force and special operations forces are moving with the Kurds against Saddam. Their beans and bullets to fight Saddam are now rolling through Turkey on the way to the front.

Under the U.S.-Turkey alliance, the Kurds built two powerful armies in northern Iraq. It is those armies who rushed the Ansar al-Islam and other al-Qaeda forces with U.S. special operations this week. Tonight, U.S. air force and special operations forces are moving with the Kurds against Saddam. Their beans and bullets to fight Saddam are now rolling through Turkey on the way to the front.

Look at the past. Turkey sent troops to fight against the al-Qaeda in Korea. Turkey sent troops to stand with us in Bosnia and Kosovo, with me. Turkey replaced us in Somalia and stands with us in Afghanistan. We should not question our Commander in Chief on the hiring of our military, because it should not cause a diplomatic incident now. Think of the Americans in the 173rd, think of their supply lines, and vote “no” as the President, the Commander in Chief, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, my chairman, and the ranking Democrat member of this committee have urged. Vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Cunningham amendment. Condoleezza Rice, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, wrote us a letter: “Secretary Powell addressed important military, political, and economic issues when he met this week with the Turkish leadership. Both sides agreed to continue these fruitful discussions. The President will visit Turkey to discuss vital security issues.”

These are very positive steps.”

The President of the United States has requested this $1 billion. We will be acting like the Turkish Parliament and cut this money out. It will be a mistake. This is not the way to re-build and treat a NATO ally. Let us defeat the Cunningham amendment and move this bill forward.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, if anyone has a right to be upset at the Turks, it is me. I represent Fort Hood, where the 4th Infantry Division is located. The division that was supposed to come down through Turkey. I had met with 50 of the spouses several weeks ago, and have been watching them live under the uncertainty of not knowing what will happen and where their husbands will be deployed.

But this is a well-intentioned but dangerous amendment. While not intended, it could put at greater risk thousands of military soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines in Iraq, including the 4th Infantry Division that was involved in this Turkish decision.

Let us support the President, and let us trust the President on this decision in time of war. Oppose the Cunningham amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. Otter).

Mr. OTTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. Cunningham), on the floor today, as I joined him on the floor not too long ago when all of us sat in this Chamber and listened to these words: “If they are not with us, they are against us.”

I think that acid test that was asked for, not too long ago, we asked that question of our friends in Turkey. That question was asked and they failed the test.

True democracies are joined irrevocably at the heart and soul with one great and unyielding truth, that is, their belief in freedom. This surely was
a test of the love of our freedom for this entire world and this entire effort we are engaged in; freedom, I might add, that swears perpetual hostility over any form of tyranny.

I believe this country should have understood, if they had lived that long with that close of a neighbor, that if they did not understand the tyranny that such a tyrant as their neighbor in Iraq was leading that country with, surely they understood that.

I would just close by asking my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), what would be the price that would have been paid when the wingman left the gentleman’s wing the first time?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Cunningham amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult decision. As a member of the Committee on International Relations, and coming from a State that has produced not only the current chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but also a former chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, Indiana has a great tradition of engagement on international affairs. Hoosiers believe in economic and cultural engagement.

I am very much aware, Mr. Chairman, of the relationship that we enjoy with Turkey. I am also very much aware that in a matter of weeks we will appropriate another quarter of a billion dollars in assistance to Turkey. I will be first among those on this floor at that time to support that funding, to strengthen that relationship.

This is, however, a different question today. The Cunningham amendment is all about whether or not this part of the national government, which is truly the heart of the national government, should resonate with the hearts of the American people who are disappointed in our friend, the nation of Turkey. It is not that they are no longer our friend, but it is that we are disappointed in recent decisions that have endangered American lives and cost us in our effectiveness in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I will vote for the Cunningham amendment to stand with the American people, who choose at this time to send this message to that friend.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a sobering day as we sit on the floor and debate this important issue while our young men and women in the military are outside the city of Baghdad as we speak.

It is my privilege to represent the 101st Airborne Division, which is present in Baghdad today. When I was first elected to Congress, the military leaders at Fort Campbell reiterated to me the importance of Turkey as a military ally. As a result of those discussions repeatedly over many occasions, I joined with others in the Congress, and we established the Congressional Caucus on Turkey and Turkish Americans a couple of years ago.

With the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) I went to Turkey about 3 weeks ago. We met with not the Prime Minister, Mr. Erdogan, he subsequently became the Prime Minister; and we urged him to allow our troops to use Turkish soil to come into northern Iraq. The Parliament, even though they voted more to do it than they voted against it, they did not get the necessary votes, and they did not pass it. We were disappointed.

I think it has been said repeatedly today, and everyone recognizes, we all agree, Turkey is a valuable military ally. But on another note, I would like to point out today that the real tension in the world today, I think all of us would agree, is between Christians and Muslims and the Jewish faith. Everywhere we look we see this tension.

Turkey has been a perfect example of a Muslim country with a secular government that has good relationships with the United States, with democracies, with the State of Israel. It is the type of model that I think is vitally important for the long term. I think that is one of the reasons that we see that President Bush has requested this money. Therefore, I urge the Members today to defeat this amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, maybe some of us that have seen our friends killed in action do have a different view. I have personally witnessed the actions of other countries that caused the loss of many of my friends. Perhaps someone that is responsible for killing my friends, American soldiers, I just do not feel that they should be rewarded.

I do not think anyone disputes on this floor that Turkey’s action damaged our ability to project force into Iraq, specifically from the north. Turkey’s action contributed to the loss of American lives when our paratroopers had to parachute into northern Iraq lightly armed, instead of with a major force.
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